DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 254 CE 001 807

AUTHOR	Stanfield, Robert E.
TITLE	The Uses of Paraprofessionals in the Delivery of Manpower and Social Services Through Public Service Employment: The Vermont Experience. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Vermont State Employment Service, Montpelier. Dept. of Employment Security.
SPONS AGENCY	Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C. Office of Research and Development.
REPORT NO	DLMA-82-48-70-30-5-FR
PUB DATE	Sep 73
NOTE	68p.; For related documents, see CE 001 805-818
AVAILABLE FROM	National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22151 ($3.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Employment Programs; Employment Qualifications; *On the Job Training; Personnel Selection; Pilot Projects; Public Service Occupations; *Service Occupations; *Subemployment; Supervision; *Task Performance; Unskilled Workers; Work Experience
IDENTIFIERS	Manpower Research; *Paraprofessionals; Vermont

ABSTRACT

Trainees in a Public Service Employment program may find work training as paraprofessional aides in manpower agencies, social services, and human services. The work experience is valuable for the trainees. However, the actual structure of their training needs close attention. Supervisors are likely to rate the effectiveness of on-the-job training highly, while trainees give at least equal credit to the "common sense" which they bring with them to the job. Also, there may be little consistency in the training experience of different trainees. One answer to this problem is for employers to be more flexible in accepting the practical experience and "common sense" of the trainees as a substitute for more formal requirements, while at the same time formalizing the necessary on-the-job training into a regular curriculum. Transferability and placement prospects for trainees in paraprofessional slots are limited, especially in view of the tight job market. (Also included is a 22-item bibliography and a list of tables.) (Author)

CE

THE USES OF PARAPROFESSIONALS IN THE DELIVERY OF MANPOWER AND SOCIAL SERVICES THROUGH PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT:

THE VERMONT EXPERIENCE

Vermont Department of Employment Security

Madelyn Davidson, Commissioner

The Experimental and Demonstration Manpower Pilot Project on the Special Work Project for the Unemployed and Upgrading for the Working Poor

September 1973

THE USES OF PARAPROFESSIONALS IN THE DELIVERY OF MANPOWER AND SOCIAL SERVICES THROUGH PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT: THE VERMONT EXPERIENCE

This report was prepared for the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, under research and development contract No. 82-48-70-30. Since contractors conducting research and development projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgement freely, this report does not necessarily represent the official opinion or policy of the Department of Labor. The contractor is solely responsible for the contents of this report.

Contract No. 82-48-70-30 funded the Experimental and Demonstration Manpower Pilot Project on the Special Work Project for the Unemployed and Upgrading for the Working Poor. This Project was conducted by the Vermont Department of Employment Security, Madelyn Davidson, Commissioner. The principal author of this monograph is Robert E. Stanfield of the Department of Sociology, University of Vermont.

September, 1973

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET	1. Report No. DLMA 82-48-70-30-5	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.
4. Title and Subtitle THE USES OF PARAPROFESSIONALS IN THE DELIVERY OF MANPOWER AND SOCIAL SERVICES THROUGH PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT: THE VERMONT EXPERIENCE			5. Report Date Sep. 73 6.
7. Author(s) Robert E. Stanfield, University of Vermont			8. Performing Organization Rept. No.
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Vermont Department of Employment Security Box 488, Green Mountain Drive Montpelier, Vermont 05602			10. Project/Task/Work Unit No. 11. Contract/Grant No. DL 82-48-70-30
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address U.S. Department of Labor Manpower Administration Office of Research and Development 1111 20th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210			13. Type of Report & Period Covered Final: 11/1/70-6/30/73 14.

15. Supplementary Notes Prepared as part of the Experimental and Demonstration Manpower Pilot Project, conducted by the Vermont Department of Employment Security

16. Abstracts Trainees in a Public Service Employment program may find work training as paraprofessional aides in manpower agencies, social services, and human services. The work experience is valuable for the trainees. However, the actual structure of their training needs close attention. Supervisors are likely to rate the effectiveness of on-the-job training highly, while trainees give at least equal credit to the "common sense" which they bring with them to the job. Also, there may be little consistency in the training experiences of different trainees. One answer to this problem is for employers to be more flexible in accepting the practical experience and "common sense" of the trainees as a substitute for more formal requirements, while at the same time formalizing the the necessary on-the-job training into a regular curriculum. Transferability and placement prospects for trainees in paraprofessional slots are limited, especially in view of the tight job market.

17. Key Words and Document Analysis. 17a. Descriptors
Employment
Manpower
Unskilled Workers

17b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms

17c. COSATI Field/Group 5A, 5I

18. Availability Statement Distribution is unlimited. Available from National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Va. 22151.

19. Security Class (This Report) UNCLASSIFIED — 21. No. of Pages 80

20. Security Class (This Page) — 22. Price 3.00

PREFACE

In mid-1970, as a consequence of welfare reform legislation then pending in the United States Congress, the Vermont Department of Employment Security was chosen to test and document experimentation in the manpower training aspects of the proposed legislation. The overall objective of the resulting Experimental and Demonstration (E&D) Manpower Pilot Project was to explore the feasibility and value of alternative approaches and procedures for conducting the Special Work Project (Public Service Employment) for the unemployed and Upgrading training for the working poor, as a means of helping to develop guidelines and other knowledge required to facilitate and make more effective national implementation and rapid expansion of manpower projects aimed at enhancing the employability of heads (and other members) of low-income families.

The project thus had two major components within the overall project:

- "Special Work Project" whereby unemployed persons, by performing work (at public and private nonprofit agencies in the public interest) can develop job skills which enable them to obtain nonsubsidized (private or public) employment,

- "Upgrading training" whereby low-income employed persons ("working poor") can develop new job skills for which they receive increased salary.

More specifically the project:

- developed various designs for operating the two manpower programs,

- tested operating practices to identify smooth running procedures,

- tested the feasibility and relative effectiveness of alternative operating procedures,

-identified problems and issues central to the establishment and running of these programs,

-prepared technical materials and other aids for use in the programs,

-monitored and evaluated outcomes of activities,

-determined requirements for administration, facilities, staff and financing of the programs,

-established guides for determining how these programs might fit into the overall mixture of manpower programs and services at the local level,

-developed the necessary guidelines and manuals for effectively replicating the programs elsewhere,

-researched and documented the effect of the program on E&D manpower clients and,

-produced monographs on salient aspects of project experience, relevant to planning activities at the national level for implementation of welfare reform and/or public service employment programs.

The project was initiated on July 1, 1970, and terminated on October 31, 1973. Operation of the project was divided into the following segments:

July 1, 1970, through October 31, 1970: Planning, initiation, and startup,

November 1, 1970, through June 30, 1971: Operations limited to Chittenden and Lamoille counties,

July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972: Statewide operations,

July 1, 1972, through June 30, 1973: Statewide operations,

July 1, 1973, through October 31, 1973: Evaluation, writing, printing and publishing.

FINAL TRAINEE SUMMARY			SPECIAL WORK	
As of July 2, 1973	Number	Number	Number	Percentage of Total Enrollees
Total Special Work Enrollments		656		100%
Completed Training		430		65.6%
-Completed, Placed in Employment	307			46.8%
-Completed, Placed in Work Training	26			4.0%
Total Placements			333	50.8%
-Completed, Placed in Education or Skill Training	6			0.9%
-Completed, Awaiting Placement	91			13.9%
Terminated Training		226		34.4%
-Good Cause	99			15.1%
-Without Good Cause	127			19.3%

FINAL TRAINEE SUMMARY		UPGRADING	
As of July 2, 1973	Number	Number	Percentage of Total Enrollees
Total Upgrading Enrollments		144	100%
-Completed Training		118	81.9%
Upgraded	114		79.2%
Not Upgraded	4		2.8%
-Terminated Training		26	18.0%
Good Cause	17		11.8%
Without Good Cause	9		6.2%

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The principal investigator for this monograph acknowledges the very great contribution of those who assisted him in the study. Mr. Brian K. Martin was invaluable in preparing and submitting the data for analysis by computer. Miss Jenny Johnson took responsibility for bibliographic research. Both Mr. Martin and Miss Johnson devoted much time to traveling throughout the State of Vermont to conduct interviews. Mrs. Beverly Randall prepared the interview schedules and the typescript of this monograph.

Some of the analysis of data in this study was facilitated by Mr. J. Michael Polich of the Department of Sociology of the University of Vermont and by the Administrative Computation Center, the Academic Computing Center, and Social Science Data Laboratory of the University of Vermont.

Robert E. Stanfield
University of Vermont

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

SECTION I

INTRODUCTION

The Vermont Experimental and Demonstration (E&D) Manpower Pilot Project is part of an effort to develop national policy for increasing the employability of persons from low-income families. The project, sponsored and supervised by the Vermont Department of Employment Security (DES) under a contract with the United States Department of Labor (DOL) investigates the effectiveness of two approaches. One of these approaches, "Upgrading Training", involves employed persons with low incomes (the underemployed) in a program to develop new job skills for which they should receive increased salaries. The second approach, primarily intended for unemployed persons, is called the "Special Work Project".

The Special Work Project is a program of subsidized employment with public agencies or with private agencies acting in the public interest. Such subsidized employment should develop job skills and work experience that may enable a person to obtain nonsubsidized employment in the public or private sectors.

This monograph presents the findings of a study of the uses of paraprofessionals within the Special Work Project (SWP) of the Vermont Experimental and Demonstration Manpower Pilot Project.

Since the inception of the Special Work Project on November 1, 1970, several hundred persons (623 trainees as of Feb. 2, 1973)

have been placed in Public Service Employment (PSE) and a proportion of these have been placed in positions that involve directly the delivery of manpower and social services to a public. When someone who has not been professionally trained is given the resporsibility of providing certain services generally provided by a professional, that person may be called a para-professional. It is the success of placing persons in such paraprofessional positions that is the focus of this monograph.

In evaluating success, there are two major issues. The first is the success of the program in shifting persons from subsidized employment as paraprofessionals to other nonsubsidized employment. The second is the success in increasing the effectiveness and the efficiency of an agency's delivery of manpower and social services. This monograph will attempt to address itself to those issues.

The monograph evaluates these aspects of the Vermont Experimental and Demonstration Manpower Pilot Project from June 30, 1970 to September 30, 1972.

SECTION II

THE ROLE OF THE PARAPROFESSIONAL

One may say that the decade of the 1960's involved the rediscovery of the role of the paraprofessional. Ours was not the first generation to recognize the utility of employing untrained but experienced members of a population to provide certain kinds of services to that population. Paraprofessionals were used several decades past in the Henry Street Settlement, in Hull House, and in the Chicago Area Project. A number of the New Deal programs of the Roosevelt administration during the 1930's placed individuals in paraprofessional roles. In his study of Street Corner Society, William H. Whyte (1943) describes at least two occasions when he encouraged and aided young men of limited education to enter the field of social service.

Although the 1960's did not create the role of the paraprofessional, the 1960's did become more fully conscious of that role and gave it a name. The impetus for developing the role in recent years seems to have come from programs initially funded through the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development. Use of the role proliferated in the war on poverty waged by the Office of Economic Opportunity. Further expansion came in the Model Cities Program. The Department of Labor sponsored a large number of projects directed toward realizing the full potentiality of the role. Paraprofessionals are now to be found throughout the full range of manpower, social service, health, educational, and community action programs.

Early writings on the role make reference to nonprofessionals and preprofessionals. A favored term of reference in the early 1960's was "indigenous nonprofessional". The concept of "new careers" appeared about 1965. It did not catch on as a general term for the role, but it was adopted as the name of a particular program for paraprofessional employment sponsored by the Department of Labor.

"Paraprofessional" is now the term most commonly accepted to refer to the role. The word takes its prefix from the Greek signifying "near". Thus, the worker is not identified by a negation of his status, as he would be with "nonprofessional". Further, there is no fixed expectation that the worker will move by way of formal education into a fully professional role, as there would be if he were a "preprofessional". Rather, he is perceived as a near-professional -- a paraprofessional.

There have been a large number of reasons offered to justify

the role of the paraprofessional. Some of these reasons concern advantages to the worker himself. Other reasons relate to the gains for an agency that employs a paraprofessional worker.

At the very least, paraprofessional employment is stopgap employment for the unemployed person. If nothing more, it is employment provided to someone in need of employment. Some have said, however, that the paraprofessional role must be more than stopgap employment. It should be the start of a "new career" for someone disadvantaged in education or experience. In this view, the paraprofessional role must be established in the context of a career ladder. It must not be a dead-end job. Rather, opportunities for advancement, for greater responsibility, and for greater reward must be part of the job situation. In evaluating the success of a program for paraprofessionals, then, one must consider whether the paraprofessional role has been a temporary expedient for employment or whether it has been a means of stabilizing an individual's work experience.

For an agency, the paraprofessional role can be an aid in several ways. The paraprofessional may be assigned a number of simple tasks that do not require the effort of professional staff, so that the professionals can invest their time in other tasks. Alternatively, the paraprofessional may be someone with whom the professional shares his responsibilities: the paraprofessional assumes a portion of the work load under the supervision of a professional.

To another way of thinking, the paraprofessional can bring to the job some characteristics that qualify the paraprofessional for new tasks that not even the professional staff may be competent to perform. For example, a study of the attitudes of professional and nonprofessional workers in public and private agencies recommended from its findings that "indigenous nonprofessionals can be utilized to 'de-bureaucratize' the handling of cases and to bridge the gap between the client and the professional" (Main, Bowman, and Peters, 1972, p. 312). Their data showed that professionals, particularly in public agencies, were more likely than nonprofessionals to "perceive the existence of more tension between themselves and clients" (p. 311). Seymour Lesh (1966, p. 4) has said that the paraprofessional "can do what most professionals cannot do -- he can communicate, in the broadest sense of the term, with those youth deemed 'unreachable' or beyond hope by the professionals".

Apart from the matter of what the paraprofessional might be, there is the question of what it actually signifies to people working in the field. At the end of a 1966 workshop on nonprofessional careers, 54 participants from governmental agencies, private organizations, universities, and labor unions reported what they regarded as the main objectives of such nonprofessional career programs (Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth, 1966, pp. 7-8). Seventy-three percent ranked

as the main objective the providing of income to the poor. Improving services to clients, alleviating professional shortages, and heightening participation of the poor lagged behind.

In an effort to deal with the present problem of unemployment and to develop the capability for continued employment, the Vermont Experimental and Demonstration Manpower Pilot Project has provided the means for over 600 persons to be trained through temporary employment with public agencies and private nonprofit agencies. Some of the training positions opened have been paraprofessional positions, and the project has tried to realize the potentiality of the paraprofessional role. This particular study is an effort to assess the success of that one aspect of the Vermont Experimental and Demonstration Manpower Pilot Project and to make recommendations on ways that the paraprofessional might be more effectively used.

The population of trainees in this study numbered 556. This population included all those persons who had entered the Special Work Project sometime between November 1, 1970 and September 30, 1972. Some of these had left the program, and others were still involved with it. Further, some individuals had had two or more placements within the program. Among those no longer in the program, some had completed their training and had been placed in nonsubsidized employment, others had completed training but had not yet been placed, others had gone into another government-sponsored training program, others had terminated for what was regarded as good cause, and others had terminated for what was not good cause. Thus, the population was comprised of 556 persons who had had different kinds of exposure to the program. Some had just come into it, others had been in it for a while, others had just left it, others had been out of the program for quite a while, some had had a single training slot with the program, others had had as many as four training slots. Because the study population has had such varied exposure to the program, a clear evaluation of the effectiveness of the program is difficult.

The wide range of project experiences among the trainees means that the trainees have not been exposed to a single shared experience that can be credited with observed changes in the characteristics of trainees. As one controls for extraneous factors, one finds the size of the study population diminishing to levels that obscure possible effects. This is particularly true when one tries to analyze the consequence of project experience in transition from subsidized training into nonsubsidized employment.

Within the population of 556 trainees, there were 168 who were assigned at least once during their experiences in SWP to a training slot that may be considered paraprofessional. These paraprofessional placements included not only the manpower and social services but also the fields of health, education, and corrections.

Among the 168 paraprofessional trainees, there were 71 who had one or more assignments to paraprofessional positions in the area of manpower and social services. The larger population of these were involved in the programs of social service agencies.

The field of manpower services involved ten trainees placed in positions as paraprofessional aides with the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation and with the Department of Employment Security.

Within this report, the following classifications hold:

Manpower paraprofessionals refers to those ten of 556 trainees who were placed at least once in their project experience in the position of case aide with the Department of Employment Security or with the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Manpower and social services paraprofessionals include the ten manpower paraprofessionals plus another 61 trainees who were placed one or more times as paraprofessional aides with social service agencies.

Other paraprofessionals are the 97 other trainees who had one or more training slots as aides in health, education, and corrections.

Paraprofessionals, used in the general sense, signifies the 71 manpower and social service paraprofessionals and the 97 other trainees placed in paraprofessional positions--a total of 168 among the 556 trainees.

Other trainees refers to the 388 trainees who had no paraprofessional training slot within SWP during the period covered by this study.

The primary data for this study were the records maintained by the Department of Employment Security on the clients who were enrolled in SWP. These data consisted of information acquired at several stages in the project and post-project experience of every client. The first file of data provided facts on the characteristics of the client as he entered the program and on the nature of his first training slot. If the client had a second, third, or fourth training slot in the program, there were additional files recording information on those placements. When a client terminated with the program, there was information acquired through interviews at termination, 30 days after termination, 90 days after termination, and 180 days after termination. Since these records had been developed as a monitoring system for a program still in progress, data were not complete on all clients.

In order to assess the task performance of paraprofessionals, their training and their supervision, a special series

of interviews was carried out (See the APPENDIXES). The principal part of the interviews involved the interviewer in assisting the trainee or the supervisor in filling out a worksheet on the kinds of tasks performed by the trainee. This worksheet was set up with overlays that made it possible to ask particular questions about the frequency of task performance, training, and supervision for each of the tasks that had been identified as one of the kinds of things that the trainee did on the job. The objective of these interviews was to make some estimate of what actually happened with regard to certain training positions.

Survey research is usually directed toward the measurement of attitudes within a population by means of interviewing a sample of that population. In the present instance, the aim was to find out something about behavior. A form of survey research was adopted for this purpose.

The interviews with paraprofessional trainees and their supervisors in this study were based on an interview schedule developed by the National Committee on the Employment of Youth (1971, pp.4-5, 140-143). In its study, the National Committee on the Employment of Youth had identified a number of activities that a paraprofessional in human service agencies might be asked to perform. The interview asked the paraprofessional about the extent to which he performed each task, the training associated with each task, and the supervision that he received on the job.

For this study of paraprofessionals in the Special Work Project, we decided to expose each trainee and his supervisor to substantially the same interview format. The objective of this was to assess the amount of agreement between trainees and supervisors regarding the nature of the tasks assigned, the training for such tasks, and the supervision given over those tasks. A copy of the interview schedules for trainees and supervisors may be found in the appendix of this monograph.

There was a total of ten persons who had been assigned paraprofessional positions in the manpower field. One of these had left the training slot during the first two days, and so no effort was made to interview her or her work supervisor regarding performance on the job. Of the remaining nine, seven trainees were contacted and interviewed. Two others were no longer residents in the state: one was in Iowa, and the other in California. The supervisors of all manpower trainees were interviewed, including the supervisors of the trainees no longer in the state. This is, then, a survey of the population of manpower trainees. Since it is a population rather than a sample, statistical tests of significance are inappropriate. The relationships reported are actual relationships for that population.

In addition to the interview study with the manpower trainees and their supervisors, there was a series of inter-

views with a small number of paraprofessionals in the social service fields. Here a sampling procedure, drawing respondents randomly from the population of social service paraprofessionals, might have been used. An alternative procedure was employed. As suggested earlier, there is considerable variability among agencies on the kind of tasks that may be assigned to paraprofessional workers. Rather than sampling among several agencies, a decision was made to interview trainees and supervisors with two particular agencies. One of these agencies was a private nonprofit agency operating in the Burlington area. The other was a state institution situated elsewhere in the state.

The chapters that follow present the findings of an analysis of records and interviews. Section III deals with factors involved in the recruitment of trainees into the paraprofessional role. Section IV concerns the training and the supervision intended to get a paraprofessional competent to function in his new role. Section V presents material on the kinds of tasks performed by paraprofessionals. Section VI assesses the success of SWP in moving paraprofessionals into nonsubsidized employment.

SECTION III

RECRUITING THE PARAPROFESSIONAL

An assessment of the success of any program must start with consideration of the ways in which those involved in the program might have differed at the outset from others not in the program. To determine whether a particular program had an actual impact, one must be able to satisfy himself that the observed impact was not ultimately traceable to the initial characteristics of persons recruited into the program. It is for that reason that we must begin by examining the formal and informal criteria used by project staff and by employers in selecting trainees as paraprofessionals. Insofar as we estimate the extent to which the paraprofessionals differed from other trainees in the Special Work Project, we have a basis for deciding whether observed differences in transition from the training role at the end of project experience are attributable to the project experience itself.

The trainees of SWP entered the program in a number of different ways. The largest proportion of them, 36.9% were referred by the Department of Social Welfare (DSW). Another 19.6% initiated contact with the program on their own. There were 7.6% who entered from other programs of the Department of Employment Security, 6.7% referred by the Work Incentive Program (WIN), and 5.9% from the Outreach program. The rest of the trainees came from a variety of other sources.

As a trainee entered the program, he met with an Employment Service (ES) Counselor. They established an employment goal and worked out a plan for achieving that goal. The trainee was then referred to employers who had training slots open, or an attempt was made to develop slots for trainees' special needs.

Whatever formal criteria existed for paraprofessional training positions were specific to each employer. Such criteria tended to be expressed in vague and general terms. They are difficult to judge in particular cases.

Formal and informal criteria may be inferred, however, by examining the patterns of characteristics shown in the aggregate of trainees. The question explored here is whether persons having certain characteristics were more likely than others to be channeled into paraprofessional positions. The characteristics to be considered here include the trainee's

sex, age, marital status, educational level, and employment status at entry. The opportunities for paraprofessional positions among handicapped persons and welfare recipients will also be considered.

In being assigned to a paraprofessional position, being female made a difference (See TABLE 1). Thirty-nine percent of the females were given a paraprofessional slot at some time in their project experience, while the comparable figure for men was 19%. For the paraprofessional positions in manpower and social services, women were more often assigned than men--15% of the women to 10% of the men. The difference was sharper in the other paraprofessional fields. One of four female trainees received at least one paraprofessional assignment in the fields of health or education; for men, the proportion was one in ten. Thus, we find that women were more likely than men to be channeled into paraprofessional positions that involve working with people by way of providing service.

TABLE 1

Training Slot Assignment by Sex of Client

	Sex	
Training Slot Assignment	Male	Female
Manpower or Social Service Paraprofessional	9.8%	15.0%
Other Paraprofessional	8.9%	23.7%
Other Training Slot	81.3%	61.4%
	100.0%	100.0%
	(N=235)	(N=321)

The concentration of women in paraprofessional positions within SWP is not peculiar. The 74% female percentage in paraprofessional training slots in this Vermont program was actually less than the national average for paraprofessionals. A nationwide study of paraprofessionals (cited by the National Committee on the Employment of Youth, 1971, p. 8) found that 80% were female.

In a statistical sense, racial identity did not matter in this project. This is because only two of the 556 persons involved as trainees in this project were classified nonwhite. This number is not out of line with the population characteristics of the State of Vermont. The 1970 United States census indicated a nonwhite population of less than two-tenths of one

percent resident within the State of Vermont.

Age seems to have had little to do with assignment to training positions (See TABLE 2). There was a tendency to avoid assigning persons less than 21 years of age to training slots as paraprofessionals in the manpower and social service fields.

The marital status of an idividual seems to have been associated with the likelihood of being given a paraprofessional training position (See TABLE 3). The widowed, the separated, and the divorced were much more likely to be designated paraprofessionals than were either the single or the married. This relationship held for the manpower and social service fields as well. If one was widowed, separated, or divorced, the chances of getting a paraprofessional slot in manpower and social services were one in six. If one was married, those chances were one in ten. If one was single, the chances were less than one in 20.

Indeed, while a majority of other trainees were married, a majority of paraprofessionals were divorced or separated. Approximately 60% of the other trainees were married. The percentage divorced or separated was about 51% for manpower and social service paraprofessionals, 52% for other paraprofessionals.

The particularly large percentage of divorced, separated, and widowed persons among manpower and social service paraprofessionals was largely accounted for by women (See TABLE 4). This is part of the general pattern of all trainees that found 81.7% of the men married but 55.7% of the women no longer married. The percentage of widowed, divorced, and separated women in paraprofessional positions was, however, larger than the percentage of married women and the percentage of single women holding such positions. Seventy-six percent of the women who were manpower and social service paraprofessionals were widowed, divorced, or separated, while 85% of the men in such training slots were married. Another finding of this study relevant to this relationship between marital status and training slot assignment was the fact that 79% of the women in manpower and social service paraprofessional positions were the heads of their own households.

Handicapped persons were less likely than the nonhandicapped to be assigned paraprofessional positions (See TABLE 5). The fields of health and education accounted for this difference. Nine percent of the handicapped held training slots as paraprofessionals in health and education. The percentage of nonhandicapped persons holding such positions was 20%. In the manpower and social services, the figures were close: 16% of the handicapped and 12% of the nonhandicapped.

TABLE 2

Training Slot Assignment by Age of Client

Training Slot Assignment	Year of Birth 1900-29	1930-39	1940-49	1950-59
Manpower or Social Service Paraprofessional	16.0%	13.1%	15.3%	2.3%
Other Paraprofessional	16.0%	13.1%	20.7%	17.0%
Other Training Slot	67.9%	73.8%	64.0%	80.7%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	(N=81)	(N=145)	(N=242)	(N=88)

TABLE 3

Training Slot Assignment by Marital Status of Client

Training Slot Assignment	Marital Status				
	Single	Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed
Manpower or Social Service Paraprofessional	4.3%	10.4%	16.7%	18.3%	22.2%
Other Paraprofessional	17.4%	12.0%	18.3%	27.5%	33.3%
Other Training Slot	78.3%	77.6%	65.0%	54.2%	44.4%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	(N=46)	(N=299)	(N=60)	(N=142)	(N=9)

TABLE 4

Training Slot Assignment by Sex and Marital Status

	Female			Male		
	Single	Married	Widowed, Separated, Divorced	Single	Married	Widowed, Separated, Divorced
Manpower or Social Service Paraprofessional	2.9%	10.3%	20.7%	9.1%	11.5%	9.4%
Other Paraprofessional	14.3%	22.4%	24.0%	18.2%	6.3%	15.6%
Other Training Slot	82.9%	67.3%	55.3%	72.7%	82.3%	75.0%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	(N=35)	(N=107)	(N=179)	(N=11)	(N=192)	(N=32)

TABLE 5

Training Slot Assignment of Handicapped Persons

Training Slot Assignment	Handicapped	Not Handicapped
Manpower or Social Service Paraprofessional	15.7%	11.8%
Other Paraprofessional	9.3%	20.3%
Other Training Slot	75.0%	67.9%
	100.0%	100.0%
	(N=140)	(N=414)

With regard to paraprofessional positions, it mattered little whether a trainee was a welfare recipient, although there was a slight tendency for welfare recipients to be less likely to be paraprofessionals (See TABLE 6). Welfare recipients accounted for 61% of the manpower and social service paraprofessionals, 65% of other paraprofessionals, and 68% of other trainees.

TABLE 6

Training Slot Assignment of Welfare Recipients

Training Slot Assignment	Welfare Recipients	Not Welfare Recipients
Manpower or Social Service Paraprofessional	11.7%	15.0%
Other Paraprofessional	17.1%	18.2%
Other Training Slot	71.3%	66.8%
	100.0%	100.0%
	(N=369)	(N=187)

The more education a person had, the more likely that person was to be assigned to a paraprofessional position

(See TABLE 7). Paraprofessional job slots went to 62% of the college graduates, 48% of those with some college, 30% of those holding high school diplomas or equivalency certificates, 25% of those with some high school, 28% of those who graduated from elementary school but went no further, and 11% of those with less than a full elementary school education. Consistently, then, the more years of schooling an individual completed, the better were his chances of being designated a paraprofessional. The pattern was less consistent with regard to the manpower and social service positions alone, but the general tendency remained: the paraprofessional training slots went to the better educated.

There are at least two ways that one may react to this association between education and assignment to a paraprofessional position. One response is positive. Such an association suggests a rational use of the knowledge and skills of individuals. Paraprofessional work is working with people, and education in the United States today is particularly geared to training people to work with people. The more educated a person is, the more likely he is to have developed the skills of communication and the knowledge of bureaucratic structure that is essential in providing service. Assignment of the better educated to paraprofessional roles is assignment of the better qualified. Further, placing the better educated in less stimulating and less satisfying positions than the paraprofessional positions would have generated greater frustration with the better educated than would have been the case with the less educated. Assigning the better educated to the paraprofessional positions is consistent with the principle of employing persons on the basis of qualifications and merit.

The manpower paraprofessional aides tended to be fairly well-educated persons, and they themselves believed that their advanced educations were necessary to success in their jobs. One of them was asked by an interviewer whether he thought it would be possible to bring in a hard-core unemployed person and train him to do the job of an aide. The trainee replied that he thought not--that a prospective aide did need some education and some experience.

Another manpower paraprofessional aide was not only a college graduate but also a former school teacher. He had taken assignment as a trainee within SWP because of the unavailability of teaching positions in school systems of the state.

One of the manpower paraprofessional aides commented on another that had left the agency after only three days on the job: "Well, I don't think she was qualified." The interviewer asked what he meant by that, and the aide replied: "If you want to do this job, you have to have a good education. Like me, for instance. I'm a college graduate. I graduated from ---------- College. If I didn't have an education, I wouldn't be able to understand this job as well as I can."

TABLE 7

Training Slot Assignment by Education of Client

Training Slot Assignment	Years of Education Completed					
	0-7 years	8 years	9-11 years	12 years*	13-15 years	16 years and more
Manpower or Social Service Paraprofessional	5.7%	14.9%	6.8%	11.9%	25.0%	34.5%
Other Paraprofessional	5.7%	13.5%	17.8%	18.1%	22.7%	27.6%
Other Training Slot	88.6%	71.6%	75.3%	69.9%	52.3%	37.9%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	(N=35)	(N=74)	(N=146)	(N=226)	(N=44)	(N=29)

*Includes those granted an equivalency certificate.

A supervisor acknowledged that the paraprofessional aide then in training could probably pass the state examination for a permanent position with the agency but then added that he would still need additional training. In the view of the supervisor, more experience would be needed to compensate for the lack of advanced education.

Most of the views expressed by trainees and supervisors were positive toward the assignment of better educated persons to paraprofessional positions. Another response, however, would be somewhat negative. The concept of the paraprofessional role is the concept of opening up a new career line for the less educated part of the population. Lack of education should not deprive an individual of the opportunity for a stimulating and satisfying job. Further, the less educated but experienced people who have lived under conditions of poverty may be particularly qualified to provide certain kinds of service. In accord with this line of thinking, education should not have been associated with assignment to paraprofessional positions--or, if it were associated, that association should have been the reverse of that observed. The less educated should have been preferred for these jobs.

Other programs putting persons in paraprofessional positions have tended to have a lower percentage of well-educated persons. A nationwide study (cited by the National Committee on the Employment of Youth, 1971, p. 8) found that 48% of paraprofessionals had not completed high school. Forty-six percent were high school graduates but had gone no further. Six percent had had some college education.

In this Vermont study (See TABLE 8), 36% of the paraprofessionals had not completed high school. The percentage of those who had finished high school or received an equivalency certificate was 41%. Twenty-three percent had had some college or university education. Clearly, the paraprofessionals in SWP tended to be better educated than the paraprofessionals of other programs throughout the country.

On the other hand, the trainees in Special Work Project, whether paraprofessional or not, were better educated than the paraprofessionals of other programs in the United States. For all trainees in SWP, the figures were: 46% with less than a high school education, 41% with a high school diploma or certificate, and 13% with some higher education in college or university (See TABLE 9).

Whatever one feels about the association between education and the paraprofessional role in the Vermont Experimental and Demonstration Manpower Pilot Project, a crucial fact is that the employment structure of the State of Vermont has made the median school years completed for the population of SWP 12 years (See TABLE 10). One trainee of every eight had had at least some college education. Indeed, one trainee in 20 was a college graduate. Moreover, this fact about Vermont is

TABLE 8

Educational Attainment of Paraprofessionals Nationwide and in this Vermont Study

	Nationwide Sample of Paraprofessionals*	Vermont Project Paraprofessionals
0-11 years	48.0%	36.3%
12 years	46.0%	40.5%
13 years and more	6.0%	23.2%
	100.0%	100.0%
		(N=168)

*Derived from National Committee on the Employment of Youth, 1971, p. 8.

TABLE 9

Years of Education Completed by Project Trainees

0-7 years (some elementary school	6.3%
8 years (elementary school graduate)	13.4%
9-11 years (some high school)	26.4%
12 years (high school diploma or equivalency)	40.8%
13-15 years (some college)	7.9%
16 years (college graduate)	5.1%
17-20 years (some graduate training)	0.2%
	100.0%
	(N=554)

true of the nation as a whole. One is dealing not only with the poorly educated individual who cannot get work but also with the well educated individual who cannot get work. If the labor market of the United States cannot make available employment for those who have spent time in college, what can one ask for those who have not had the advantage of education?

TABLE 10

Educational Attainment of Project Trainees and of Unemployed Persons in the United States

Educational Level Attained	Percentage of Project Trainees	Percentage of U.S. Unemployed Persons*
Less than 8 years	6.3%	9.7%
8 years	13.4%	9.5%
9 to 11 years	26.4%	24.9%
High School Diploma or Certificate	40.8%	37.0%
1 year of College or more	13.2%	18.9%
	100.0%	100.0%

*Derived from Deutermann, 1972, Table M.

Part of the ideology for a program of this sort holds it necessary to develop among those who have grown up within a culture of poverty those attitudes and motivations necessary for success in employment. Within this ideology, it is necessary that people be moved from a "welfare ethic" to a "work ethic". Whatever the merits of that ideology, it nonetheless seems to fall short of an all-embracing theory when one encounters the circumstances found in this program. With a population that has spent more than 12 years in educational institutions, one cannot be said to be developing an ability to adjust to the demands of a work situation. The large number of college-educated people in this program suggests that this program has had to be, first and foremost, stopgap employment. For these people, the government has had to be the employer of last resort.

The Special Work Project was intended primarily for the unemployed, and 83% of those enrolled in the program were unemployed at the time of their entry. Nine percent were not

in the labor force, four percent were underemployed, and four percent were employed[1] at the time that they were admitted to the program.

The employment status of trainees at entry into the program was related to the kind of training slot assignment given (See TABLE 11). One-half of the employed and underemployed persons became paraprofessionals, with over two-thirds of those going into the manpower and social service fields. Only about 30% of those unemployed or not in the labor force at the time of entry were made paraprofessionals. Training roles as manpower and social service paraprofessionals accounted for 35.7% of the employed and underemployed, for 10.9% of those unemployed or not in the labor force.

Since the better educated tended to have a better chance of becoming paraprofessionals, and since the employed and underemployed also tended to have a greater likelihood of receiving paraprofessional training assignments, one may wonder whether paraprofessional slots were reserved for employed persons of advanced education. This appears to be not true. In fact, the better educated tended to be underrepresented among those holding jobs at entry. Eight percent of the trainees with 12 years or less of schooling were employed or underemployed at the time

---

[1]The Special Work Project was limited to enrollment of persons who were unemployed or underemployed at time of enrollment in Special Work. Of the first 566 Special Work enrollees, 19 were initially classified as "employed" when the correct designation should have been "unemployed". The employment status of these 19 trainees at time of enrollment was as follows:

Four trainees had been notified of impending layoff.

One trainee had been notified of impending discharge.

Two trainees were forced to terminate due to health.

One trainee had given two weeks notice to employer.

Three trainees were employed less than 28 hours per week.

Two trainees had been employed under the federally-funded "STEP" Program and were transferred to Special Work.

Two trainees had been employed under the federally-funded "Operation Mainstream" Program and were transferred to Special Work.

Four trainees were improperly designated "employed" due to clerical error.

TABLE 11

Training Slot Assignment by Employment Status at First Entry

Training Slot Assignment	Employment Status			
	Employed	Underemployed	Unemployed	Not in Labor Force
Manpower or Social Service Paraprofessional	45.0%	27.3%	11.0%	9.8%
Other Paraprofessional	10.0%	18.2%	18.1%	13.7%
Other Training Slot	45.0%	54.5%	70.8%	76.5%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	(N=20)	(N=22)	(N=463)	(N=51)

that they were recruited. For those with at least some college education, the figure was four percent. Indeed, the percentage of employed or underemployed persons with at least some college education was one-half of one percent of all trainees in the program.

The relationship of education, employment status, and training assignment was complex. Paraprofessional slots, particularly paraprofessional positions in the manpower and social service fields, tended to go to employed or underemployed persons with 12 years or less of education and to unemployed persons and persons not in the labor force having 13 years of education or more (See TABLE 12). That is, those holding jobs at entry who became paraprofessionals tended to be poorly educated, while those well-educated persons who became paraprofessionals tended to be unemployed or not in the labor force at the time of their entry into the program. Indeed, the more poorly educated persons with jobs and the better educated persons without jobs together accounted for 48% of the manpower and social service paraprofessionals. Less educated persons who were unemployed or not in the labor force were 51% of these paraprofessionals. Only one percent of the manpower and social service paraprofessionals fell into the category of employed or underemployed persons with some college education.

From the data presented here, one may draw some general conclusions about the characteristics of trainees in SWP, particularly with regard to those assigned to paraprofessional training slots at some time during their project experience.

The typical trainee in SWP was a white female, about 30 years of age, married, with a high school diploma or equivalency certificate, and receiving some form of welfare, most likely Aid to Needy Families with Children (ANFC). The typical trainee was not handicapped, was unemployed at the time she entered the program, and had been referred to the program by the Department of Social Welfare.

The profile of the typical paraprofessional is not much different. Again, she was likely to be a white female, 30 years of age, with 12 years of education, not handicapped, but a welfare recipient receiving ANFC, unemployed at entry, and referred by the Department of Social Welfare. The one difference is in marital status. The paraprofessional was more likely to be living without a spouse, principally because of divorce or separation.

The profile of the manpower and social service paraprofessional conforms to the profile of the typical paraprofessional in SWP. The majority of manpower and social service paraprofessionals were female, were white, were divorced or separated, were recipients of ANFC, were unemployed at the time of entry into training. The larger proportion of man-

TABLE 12

Training Slot Assignment by Education of Client and Employment Status

Training Slot Assignment	Education and Employment Status			
	0-12 years		13 years and more	
	Unemployed or Not in Labor Force	Employed or Underemployed	Unemployed or Not in Labor Force	Employed or Underemployed
Manpower or Social Service Paraprofessional	8.1%	36.8%	28.6%	33.3%
Other Paraprofessional	16.7%	13.2%	24.3%	33.3%
Other Training Slot	75.2%	50.0%	47.1%	33.3%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	(N=443)	(N=38)	(N=70)	(N=3)

power and social service paraprofessionals had been referred to the program by the Department of Social Welfare. About half were over the age of 30 and half under the age of 30. Approximately 38% had achieved a high school diploma or equivalency certificate, 32% had received less than a full high school education, and 30% had gone beyond high school into college. In all these regards, with the exception of marital status, the characteristics of manpower and social service paraprofessionals accorded with the characteristics of all trainees in SWP.

There were some characteristics, however, that were somewhat overrepresented among the manpower and social service paraprofessionals. These included sex, marital status, employment status at entry into the program, and educational level achieved. Sex, marital status and employment status at entry may have had limited effect on the outcomes of the program, but educational status is an important factor. If trainees assigned to paraprofessional training slots tended to be more educationally advantaged than other trainees, then some of the success in task performance as paraprofessionals and some of the success in moving into nonsubsidized employment may have to be credited to that educational advantage rather than to the program itself.

SECTION IV

INTRODUCING THE PARAPROFESSIONAL TO HIS ROLE

The literature on paraprofessionals stresses the importance of introducing the paraprofessional to his new work role. By definition, the paraprofessional is not a professional. He does not meet the qualifications of the professional in either education or experience. Consequently, training and supervision are essential to fulfilling the conception of the paraprofessional role as the beginning of a career ladder.

Since the paraprofessional trainee enters his new career from a condition of unemployment and limited income, it is essential that training be designed as on-the-job training. Arthur Pearl and Frank Riessman (1965, p. 4) have said that, if the problems of poverty are to be solved then, "for the most part, training for the poor must take place after employment is secured."

On-the-job training of the paraprofessional, particularly in the fields of manpower and social services, has some particular needs. Seymour Lesh (1966, p. 6) says that the on-the-job training of a paraprofessional should be "flexible" but "demanding". Flexibility is needed to respond to the particular needs of the individual, while high expectations for performance are required in order to inculcate the seriousness of responsibility in the individual's job. Pearl and Riessman (1965, pp. 158-163) identify five problem areas to be anticipated in the training of paraprofessionals:

1. Maintaining confidentiality in the field of human services.

2. Accepting and using formal authority.

3. Avoiding over-identification with the agency and under-identification with the client.

4. Overcoming over-optimism that turns into defeatism.

5. Establishing relationships with professionals within and outside the agency.

With these thoughts in mind, we may consider the training

experiences of paraprofessionals in the manpower and social services within the Special Work Project. The data for this analysis came from a series of interviews with trainees and their supervisors. Talking with both trainees and supervisors made it possible to compare perceptions of the training experience from two sides of the training situation.

Supervisors were more likely than trainees to see training as having occurred on the job. The nine supervisors of manpower paraprofessionals identified 112 tasks performed by trainees under their supervision. The supervisors described 87.5% of these tasks as involving on-the-job training; only 12.5% of the paraprofessional's activities were said to have been learned prior to taking the position. For the seven manpower paraprofessional aides, there were 97 tasks reported. Of these, 50.5% were claimed to have been work activities learned on the job, 44.4% learned before the job, and 5.2% involving no training at all.

In interviews, trainees and supervisors reported that there was an official training period of two weeks at the outset of each training assignment, but trainees and supervisors differed in their perceptions of this training period. Supervisors tended to see it as a time when the trainees were given some training in skills needed on the job. This was the on-the-job training that supervisors said that paraprofessionals received. The paraprofessional trainees, however, tended to consider that training period as redundant. It introduced them to things that they already knew. For the paraprofessional trainees, then, their training in job skills had occurred before they had ever entered the program.

A somewhat similar situation was to be found in the private social service agency where interviews were conducted. There, again, the supervisors were more likely to perceive training as having occurred on the job. For example, one paraprofessional aide acknowledged that she had learned some ten of her 15 job tasks while in training with the agency, but she also claimed that the skills at following up clients by telephone, filing and typing, supervising other workers, and assigning jobs to other workers had been learned prior to entering this training slot assignment. The supervisor, however, believed that the paraprofessional had acquired all her job skills on that job. In another instance, the trainee said that there were only seven of 20 tasks that she had actually learned with the agency; her supervisor maintained that the trainee had learned all the relevant job skills with the agency.

From the interviews, one must conclude that on-the-job training of manpower and social service paraprofessionals was not at all formal. Job supervisors as trainers had no fixed curriculum. This may be accepted as the flexibility needed to respond to the particular needs of the individual trainee, but it seems not to have been demanding. Training was just learning enough to do the job. The problem with that

evidences itself later, when one considers transition from the training role to nonsubsidized employment. Specific job tasks are not easily transferable to employment outside the agency involved in training.

Perhaps what should be considered is establishing a formal and specific training course for paraprofessionals that is provided concurrently with on-the-job training experiences. Professional training in the manpower and social service fields includes a component with formal course work. Paraprofessional training should, perhaps, include a component of formal course work along with the on-the-job training experience. Eleanor Gilpatrick (1970) has criticized the way that legislation tends to separate manpower bills on the one hand and education bills on the other hand. As she sees it, developing job ladders in paraprofessional programs requires parallel developing of curriculum ladders to provide appropriate training for such jobs.

It seems appropriate to have greater formality and structure not only in training but also in supervision of manpower and social service paraprofessionals. Seymour Lesh (1966, p. 7) asserts that supervision of the paraprofessional should be highly structured, at least at the outset:

> ...for the nonprofessional, supervision becomes the make-or-break element because his job description will be different from any previous worker's description and, therefore, supervisory techniques will have to be somewhat different from those used with professionals or graduate students.

The supervisors of manpower paraprofessional aides in SWP perceived themselves as giving more supervision than their trainees saw them giving. For the 112 tasks mentioned by supervisors, 22.3% were said to involve a lot of supervision, 44.6% to involve some supervision, 26.8% to involve little supervision, and 6.3% no supervision at all. The trainees, however, responded with regard to 91 tasks in this fashion: 17.6% with a lot of supervision, 31.9% with some supervision, 37.4% with little supervision, and 13.2% with no supervision. Thus, the supervisors tended to say that some two-thirds of the paraprofessionals' activities involved some or a lot of supervision, while the paraprofessionals themselves said that there was some or a lot of supervision only for about half of their activities.

The initial two week training period led trainees and supervisors to point out in interviews that supervision was greater at the outset than it was later during a person's assignment in SWP. As one trainee put it, "When I first came in, someone was always hanging over me."

Of the seven manpower paraprofessional aides interviewed, two rated the supervision over any of their activities as no greater than "some supervision". They, therefore, made no judgments of what tasks involved the most supervision. Among the other five aides, however, one said that providing information was the most supervised activity, another said that providing materials was most closely supervised, and three asserted that they were supervised most of all with regard to the keeping of records.

Two of the nine supervisors reported themselves as having given less than a lot of supervision over all job activities of the manpower aide. Of the seven who did say that they provided a lot of supervision, one said that most supervision involved filing, typing, and other clerical tasks, two said that their supervision focused most strongly on the counseling of clients, and four maintained that the emphasis of their supervision was on interviewing and screening of clients at intake.

The interviews suggest, then, that the trainees tended to perceive supervision as preoccupied with administrative procedures, while the supervisors tended to interpret their supervision of the trainees as directly related to dealing with the clients of the agency.

In the private social service agency, the supervisors tended to believe that they provided more supervision than the paraprofessional trainees perceived themselves as receiving. In one case, there were nine job tasks in which the supervisor claimed to provide a lot of supervision. The trainee, however, reported no more than some supervision for four of these tasks, only a little supervision for one of the tasks, and no supervision at all for four of the tasks. In another case, the supervisor saw herself giving some supervision in most instances, but the trainee reported no supervision in more than half of her job tasks.

The overall conclusion would seem to be that neither training nor supervision was as intensive as the theorists of the paraprofessional role suggest is necessary. This may be attributed to the decentralized nature of the program. Trainees were assigned to particular employers, and each training employer accepted just as much responsibility for training and supervision as he himself thought appropriate. There was no close monitoring of training and supervision by a central authority. More centralized control would, however, seem undesirable for a program of this sort. The alternative would be the development of parallel structures for training.

SECTION V

PERFORMANCE IN THE ROLE

There are two basic areas of job activity in which paraprofessionals may be used. One is to perform tasks that are normally done by professionals or technicians but that may also be satisfactorily handled by relatively untrained persons. The other is to carry out activities that have not previously been provided but for which there is recognized to be a need. Thus, on the one hand, the paraprofessional may relieve the professional of some responsibilities, and, on the other hand, the paraprofessional may open new avenues of human service.

The major focus of this analysis is on the performance of the manpower paraprofessionals on the job. To some extent, there is also concern for the task performance of paraprofessionals in social service agencies. For these purposes, it is appropriate to develop some idea of the kinds of tasks the paraprofessional aide might be called on to perform.

Seymour Lesh (1966, pp.3-4) listed ten duties that a paraprofessional aide might perform in an employment program. These may be summarized in six major areas:

1. Recruitment
2. Reception
3. Testing and interviewing
4. Teaching
5. Job development
6. Counseling

The National Committee on the Employment of Youth (1971) analyzed the tasks of the paraprofessional in five basic areas:

1. Outreach
2. Intake and verbal information and communication
3. Written information and communication
4. Administration, organization, and supervision
5. Testing and teaching

The interview schedule developed for this study was oriented to seven major spheres of job activity:

1. Recruitment and outreach to clients
2. Reception, testing, and teaching

3. Job development and outreach for clients
4. Counseling and communication with clients
5. Administrative efforts
6. Organizing efforts
7. Supervisory efforts

Recruitment and outreach to clients involved recruitment of clients, follow-up on home visits, follow-up in the community, and follow-up by telephone.

The activities involved in reception, testing, and teaching included interviewing or screening at intake, the testing of clients, and the teaching or training of clients.

Job development and outreach for clients had such tasks as accompanying clients to agencies, contacting agencies for clients, and contacting employers for clients.

Counseling and communication included not only counseling itself but also the providing of information, of advice, or of materials.

Administrative efforts consisted of filing, typing, and other clerical tasks, the keeping of records, the writing of reports, and the writing of letters.

Under organizing efforts, there were organizing activities, organizing meetings and training other workers.

Supervisory efforts represented supervising other workers, assigning jobs to other workers, and administering a project.

An informational brochure on the Work Incentive Program (Manpower Administration, 1970) provides an example of the kind of thinking that exists about the tasks to be performed by paraprofessionals in the field of manpower services:

> The job coaches are the troubleshooters on the WIN team. Selected partly for their ability to relate to participants, they help work out difficulties. If a person fails to attend classes or report for work, his coach visits him, finds out why, and seeks any needed help. For example, the coach may notify the welfare agency that a participant needs new child care arrangements because the previous ones have broken down, or that he needs help with family or other problems. At crucial steps along the route to employment, the coach offers his help. He may find out about bus routes to a training site or go along for job interviews with a participant who needs his support. (p. 3)

This statement emphasizes the particular advantage that

the paraprofessional may have in communicating with a client from a similar background and environment. Home visits, contacts with agencies, and providing information are stressed.

In the present study, we find that trainees and supervisors identified home visits, contacts with agencies, and providing information as aspects of the manpower aide's role (See TABLES 13 and 14). One manpower paraprofessional expressed his feelings that home visits were the most important aspect of his job. The home visit was a form of personal contact that gave him a clearer idea of what the client really wanted and really needed.

Manpower paraprofessionals and their supervisors were agreed that follow-up with clients at their homes or by telephone and the providing of information were among the kinds of tasks performed by paraprofessional aides. All of the manpower paraprofessionals added that contacting employers for their clients, keeping records, and writing reports were parts of their jobs. Generally speaking, the manpower paraprofessionals found outreach to clients, reception, outreach for clients, communication with clients, and administrative effort involved in their training positions. The recruitments, testing, and teaching of clients were less often reported by these manpower aides, and they found organizing or supervisory efforts rarely part of their tasks.

The job tasks identified by manpower paraprofessionals in SWP conform to the kinds of tasks reported by paraprofessionals trained in the program of the National Committee on the Employment of Youth. In its study, the National Committee found contacting other agencies on behalf of clients, intake interviewing, the providing of information, advice, and materials, and the writing of reports cited as most frequent activities by its paraprofessionals. Recruiting, screening, testing, teaching, and counseling were rarely mentioned.

In SWP, two of the manpower aides said that follow-up with clients in home visits was their most frequent job task. Another two trainees gave interviewing at intake as their most frequent job activity. One listed counseling clients in that category. Two aides replied that filing, typing, and other clerical tasks took up more of their working time than any other activity. Supervisors were generally agreed in these perceptions. One saw follow-up on home visits as the most frequent job task of the manpower paraprofessional aide. Four spoke of interviewing at intake and three of counseling. None cited filing and typing as most frequent paraprofessional tasks, but one did identify the keeping of records that way.

One is led to conclude from the interviews that there were no particular tasks identified as the special province of the paraprofessional. Having paraprofessional aides available did not lead to the development of new tasks for

TABLE 13

Job Tasks of Manpower Paraprofessionals as Perceived by Trainees

	Number of trainees reporting that they did this job task
Follow-up on home visits	7
Follow-up by telephone	7
Contact employers for clients	7
Provide information	7
Keep records	7
Write reports	7
Interview or screen at intake	6
Accompany clients to agencies	6
Contact agencies for clients	6
Provide advice	6
Write letters	6
Provide materials	5
Filing, typing, other clerical	5
Follow-up in the community	4
Counsel clients	4
Recruit clients	3
Train other workers	2
Test clients	1
Teach or train clients	1
Supervise other workers	1

TABLE 14

Job Tasks of Manpower Paraprofessionals as Perceived by Supervisors

	Number of supervisors reporting that trainees did this job task
Follow-up on home visits	9
Follow-up by telephone	9
Provide information	9
Follow-up in the community	8
Contact agencies for clients	8
Provide advice	8
Keep records	8
Interview or screen at intake	7
Accompany clients to agencies	7
Contact employers for clients	7
Counsel clients	6
Provide materials	6
Filing, typing, other clerical	6
Write reports	6
Write letters	4
Recruit clients	2
Test clients	1
Teach or train clients	1

either the professionals or the paraprofessionals. The professional staff shared some of the work load with the paraprofessional trainee. When the aide was gone, the agency went back to its original work load for agency personnel.

Within a large, public, social service institution, the paraprofessionals were given substantially the same kind of job assignments as the professionals. There was a sharing of the case load on social service work in the community. To some extent, the paraprofessional role was used to give the trainees sufficient experience to meet the personnel qualifications for the professional positions.

The private social service agency surveyed showed a different pattern of paraprofessional activity from the public agencies. In the private social service agency, special roles were developed for the paraprofessionals. For example, one paraprofessional became a kind of administrative assistant or office manager for the supervisor. Her duties involved her not only in some client services but also in the full range of administrative, organizing, and supervising activities. She reported her own most frequent job activity as supervising other workers. Her supervisor said that the paraprofessional's work freed the professional for client interviews of greater length and depth.

Another paraprofessional's role in the same agency was oriented to a special outreach program. Without the paraprofessional, the program would not have been started. The paraprofessional's special assignment was the recruitment of clients. The professionals found it possible to concentrate their attention on client services within their "clinic".

There was only one instance in which a manpower paraprofessional was described as having done something on the job that no one else on the staff would have been able to do. At one local office of a state agency, the aide knew so many people within the community that she was able to get a lot of work done through informal contacts on the street.

In one office, the paraprofessional aide was assigned the duties of the receptionist so that the receptionist could be used to do intake interviews with clients. The judgment of the staff there was that the receptionist could do intake interviews as well as any of the counselors, and so the paraprofessional aide was asked to answer the telephone and respond to inquiries.

In a sense, SWP was not only stopgap employment for the trainees; it was also stopgap employment for the agencies. The agencies were able to ease work loads by the use of temporary employees.

One supervisor explained that he had reduced his own case load of 130 clients to 100 cases by assigning 30 cases to the paraprofessional aide. Thus, there was no increase in the number of cases handled by that office, merely a reduction of the case load with a reported increase in the quantity and quality of services provided.

Another supervisor reported reducing his case load from 150 clients to 100 clients by assigning 50 of his cases to the paraprofessional aide. As he expressed it, this improved the quality of service to all.

When one supervisor was asked whether services would have been provided to the clients if the paraprofessional aide had not been available, he replied: "Oh, yes, the job would have been done, but not with such quality--not with such depth."

The sharing of the work load between professional and paraprofessional means that the paraprofessional aide had to be prepared to do every kind of thing that the professional might have to do. One aide, however, thought that a paraprofessional should not be expected to handle everything that a professional does. It may be that defining the job of the paraprofessional aide too broadly put considerable pressure for successful performance on persons who had not yet developed confidence in their abilities to cope with the problems of a client population.

SECTION VI

TRANSITION FROM THE TRAINING ROLE

Those who have been concerned with the development of the role of paraprofessional have stressed the concept of career (See, for example, Gartner, 1971, and Pearl and Riessman, 1965). The paraprofessional job may serve the function of emergency employment, but it should do more than that. The paraprofessional position should have within it the potentiality for vertical advancement in employment. A review of paraprofessional programs observed that "this large national experiment in the creation of 'new careers' is in danger of remaining stalled at the level of dead-end jobs" (National Committee on the Employment of Youth, 1971, p. v).

A career ladder is necessary not only for the economic well-being of the paraprofessional but also for his effectiveness on the job. After some 18 months of effort, the administrator of a program of mental health services in New York saw among her nonprofessional aides "a kind of burned-out quality--a sense that they have invested all this time in the neighborhood service center working with clients and where do they go from here?" (Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth, 1966, p. 48). A lack of opportunity for upgrading for the paraprofessionals themselves seems, at least in part, to account for this.

In its study of the graduates of its training program, the National Committee on the Employment of Youth (1971, p. 113) found that "opportunities for genuine career advancement for paraprofessionals are either severely limited or completely nonexistent." Of eight agencies involved in their survey, only one developed a pattern for career mobility among its paraprofessionals.

For this study, assessment of the transition from training roles in SWP is based on data in the files of the Vermont Department of Employment Security on September 30, 1972. Since that time, more trainees have terminated from the program and the status of other trainees may have changed. The data here are based on information about 517 trainees who were recorded as terminated during the final week of September in 1972.

Approximately one-third of the trainees terminated with SWP had completed training and were placed in nonsubsidized employment. This figure represents clear and immediate successes for the program. There were some 16% who had termi-

nated with good cause and some 22% who had terminated with what was regarded as not good cause. This 38% represents persons who ended their involvement with SWP for reasons generally external to the program itself. They cannot be counted either successes or failures for the program. Twelve percent had moved from SWP into another government sponsored training program. This group cannot be considered as either success or failure. In a sense, success or failure have been deferred. The remaining 17% are those who completed training in the program, who were available for nonsubsidized employment, but who did not find work. These trainees would have to be regarded the failures of the program. Considering only those completed and placed and those completed and not placed, one might say that SWP was successful with two-thirds of the trainees who completed training in the program.

If one considers success for the program as represented by those who completed training and were placed in nonsubsidized employment, then the program was somewhat less successful with its paraprofessionals than it was with other trainees (See TABLE 15). The percentage completed and placed among all paraprofessionals was 29%. For other trainees, the figure was 35%. The outcome for manpower and social service paraprofessionals was, however, somewhat different than it was for other paraprofessionals. A somewhat larger percentage of the paraprofessionals in manpower and social service agencies were transferred to other government training programs. A larger percentage of paraprofessionals in health and education fell into the category of those who completed training but were not placed in nonsubsidized employment.

Being a paraprofessional does not seem to have improved an individual's chances of finding nonsubsidized employment. Indeed, it may have actually had an adverse effect compared to other training slot assignments in SWP. There are some other ways, however, that the paraprofessional position may have benefited the trainee.

Having a paraprofessional training position seems to have been a condition for obtaining initial employment as a paraprofessional. This was particularly true for paraprofessional roles in the manpower and social service fields (See TABLE 16).

Trainees who were manpower and social service paraprofessionals were more likely than others to be retained by their employers in training after termination (See TABLE 17). The number of cases is rather small, however, and, combining manpower and social service paraprofessionals with other paraprofessionals, one finds no difference between paraprofessionals and other trainees. About one of every two trainees employed after the first training assignment continued on with his training employer.

Although being a manpower or social service parapro-

TABLE 15

Status at Final Termination by Training Slot Assignment

Status at Final Termination	Training Slot Assignment: Manpower or Social Service Paraprofessionals	Other Paraprofessionals	Other Training Slot
Completed and Placed	29.2%	29.4%	35.1%
Completed but Not Placed	15.3%	29.4%	14.2%
Continued in Other Training	20.8%	10.9%	10.2%
Terminated with Good Cause	16.7%	16.3%	16.4%
Terminated without Good Cause	18.1%	14.1%	24.1%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	(N=72)	(N=92)	(N=353)

TABLE 16

Job Role in Nonsubsidized Employment Following Final Termination by Training Slot Assignment

Nonsubsidized Job Role	Training Slot Assignment: Manpower or Social Service Paraprofessional	Other Paraprofessional	Other Training Slot
Manpower or Social Service Paraprofessional	60.0%	0.0%	1.3%
Other Paraprofessional	13.3%	35.7%	4.6%
Other Job Role	26.7%	64.3%	94.1%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	(N=15)	(N=28)	(N=153)

TABLE 17

Continuing in Nonsubsidized Employment with Training Employer Following Final Termination by Training Slot Assignment

	Training Slot Assignment		
	Manpower or Social Service Paraprofessional	Other Paraprofessional	Other Training Slot
Initial Employer Was Training Employer	66.7%	57.1%	54.6%
Initial Employer Was Not Training Employer	33.3%	42.9%	45.4%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	(N=15)	(N=28)	(N=152)

TABLE 18

Wage Levels Achieved in Nonsubsidized Employment Following Final Termination by Training Slot Assignment

Wage Levels Achieved	Training Slot Assignment		
	Manpower or Social Service Paraprofessional	Other Paraprofessional	Other Training Slot
$0.00 to $1.99	21.4%	18.5%	14.9%
$2.00 to $2.49	57.1%	55.6%	56.8%
$2.50 to $3.49	21.4%	22.2%	24.3%
$3.50 or more	0.0%	3.7%	4.1%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	(N=14)	(N=27)	(N=148)

fessional seems to have improved one's chances of remaining with the training employer and getting another paraprofessional position, being a paraprofessional did not constitute an advantage in terms of wages.

Paraprofessional training positions did not move trainees into better paying jobs in their initial nonsubsidized employment (See TABLE 18). The first jobs of 76% of the paraprofessional trainees paid less than $2.50 per hour. Trainees who had not held paraprofessional training positions tended to do a little bit better. Seventy-two percent of those trainees earned less than $2.50 in their initial nonsubsidized employment.

Follow-up interviews with trainees in the Special Work Project provide little basis for comparing paraprofessionals and others in terms of satisfaction with initial nonsubsidized employment. There was a tendency toward yea-saying on questions regarding satisfaction. Ninety-five percent expressed overall satisfaction. The percentages were even higher with regard to satisfaction with the job supervisor, with the kind of work, and with the work site location. Only wages seemed a basis for some dissatisfaction, and even in that case only 22% expressed such dissatisfaction. With such little difference among trainees on expressions of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, there is no statistically sound basis for comparing the effect of paraprofessional roles on job satisfaction.

One attitude shared by all the manpower paraprofessionals interviewed was regret that their positions were temporary. The paraprofessional role was satisfying to each of them, and each would have liked to continue work as a paraprofessional. The rewards of the job are not merely monetary. The paraprofessional feels that he is doing something that needs to be done.

In his review of research on programs of welfare reform, Schiller (1972, p. 15) concludes that: "Much more serious attention should be given to the potential for job development and job creation: such efforts have been neglected due to the assumed availability of jobs."

Job development and job creation were among the intended consequences of SWP. The hope was that a period of subsidized employment would stimulate the employer to make provision for continuing the position on a nonsubsidized basis. In some instances, trainees completed the period of subsidized employment and then continued on with the same employer. Ironically, the manpower agencies were among those who were not able to continue their trainees in nonsubsidized employment. As State agencies, they were constrained by budgetary limitatio and by personnel requirements that prevented them from keeping their trainees beyond the period of subsidy.

The private social service agency was somewhat successful in keeping its paraprofessional trainees by including their positions within their budgets. For the particular agency involved, this seems to have been possible because the agency actually received its operating resources from three sources: the federal government, the State government, and the local community. There were, in effect, three budgets, and it was possible to fit a position in at least one of the three. The State agencies did not have such flexibility in budgeting.

One manpower paraprofessional aide said that she liked the job and that she was really sorry that she couldn't have it on a permanent basis. She complained: "They trained me, and then they couldn't hire me."

An unfortunate unforeseen aspect of the interviewing done for this study is that it seems to have raised the hopes of one or more of the trainees. At the conclusion of his interview, one of the manpower paraprofessional aides asked the interviewer: "Will I be permanent now?" For him, the interview offered the possibility of security in his job.

Although they liked the training positions that they held and wished that they might hold them permanently, the paraprofessional aides in manpower services felt that their training slots did not develop vocational skills transferable to other kinds of employment. They were trained to provide the kinds of services provided by one and only one agency. As one paraprofessional trainee expressed it: "If you're trained as an Employment Security aide and you don't work for the State of Vermont, you don't work."

Another paraprofessional was asked this question: "With the training you received as an Employment Security aide, where do you think you could apply afterward?" Her reply was: "Nowhere, unless I worked for the State."

The supervisors of manpower paraprofessionals held differing views on the qualifications for personnel working on client services in their agencies. One felt that formal training is necessary for effective counseling and so stood by the personnel requirements of the State. Another believed that formal training was not necessary. For him, SWP was good because it made available competent though not formally trained counselors. Yet another reported that his views had changed as a consequence of observing the paraprofessional aide in action. His original belief had been that formal education was essential. The paraprofessional's performance had led him to conclude that effective services to clients could be provided by persons of less education and less experience than required by state regulations.

It might be that State agencies could develop new paraprofessional positions with somewhat lower expectations of

education and experience. Alternatively, provision might be made for extended experience at a paraprofessional level to be counted for experience in lieu of education in meeting the qualifications for professional positions.

The director of a State institution with a staff of several hundred persons reported that several trainees had been employed for a period of six months under the SWP program as aides in training for regular paraprofessional positions. At the start of training, they did not satisfy the requirements of education or experience for the regular positions, but, at the end of six months, they did meet those requirements in terms of experience. A substantial turnover in personnel made it possible to place the trainees in the same kind of work within the institution at the completion of training. No new positions had to be requested in the budget and no change in job specifications had to be made. The turnover in personnel opened the positions, and the training period satisfied personnel requirements for experience.

Although the paraprofessional trainees liked their jobs, they did not like the contract system under which they held the jobs. The contract had a fixed term of about six months, and so there was no job security. They received no fringe benefits. One trainee said that she would have wanted at least medical coverage under the program.

One person who had been a manpower paraprofessional described the circumstances under which he refused a renewal of his training assignment. He had apparently been satisfied in his first assignment to the agency. When the opportunity to be renewed with the same agency came around, the trainee approached the supervisor and asked the likelihood that he would get a permanent job with the agency at the expiration of the second period of training. Under the personnel regulations of the agency, the supervisor could afford no assurance, and so the trainee refused the assignment under the second contract.

One must conclude that transition from the training role was not as successful as had been hoped. For several years, the paraprofessional role has been a role of great promise, but that promise has not yet been fully realized. In the paraprofessional role, one is speaking not merely of job creation and job development. One is speaking of career creation and career development. There is a need for people to help in the area of human services, and there are available people who feel pride and worth in doing that work. What are needed are the resources to put the need and the people who can meet that need together.

SECTION VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Paraprofessional training in the Special Work Project of the Vermont Experimental and Demonstration Manpower Pilot Project must be evaluated a limited success. A substantial percentage of paraprofessional trainees were shifted from subsidized employment to nonsubsidized employment, but that percentage was slightly less than the percentage of those who had held other kinds of training slots within the program. Further, there is some evidence that manpower and social service agencies assessed the effectiveness and efficiency of their delivery of services to clients as increased. To a considerable extent, however, this increased effectiveness and efficiency resulted not from the development of new job tasks for paraprofessionals but from the sharing of the professional case load with paraprofessionals.

Among the 556 trainees considered in this study, 168 were paraprofessionals. Ten of these were in manpower services, 61 were in social service agencies, and 97 held training slots in other human services. The ten manpower aides held training positions with the Vermont Department of Employment Security and with the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Paraprofessional trainees were less likely than other trainees in SWP to complete training and be placed in nonsubsidized employment. The paraprofessionals in manpower and social services were more likely than others to be continued in some form of government training program at the end of their experience with SWP. Paraprofessionals in the fields of health and education were more likely than other trainees to fall into the category of completed and not placed--that is, to return to the status of unemployed persons at the end of their project experience.

For those paraprofessionals who did find nonsubsidized employment when they finished training in this program, the wage levels achieved tended to be lower than the wage levels achieved by other trainees who had not been paraprofessionals.

About one-half of all trainees completed and placed continued in nonsubsidized employment with their training employers. This appears to have been particularly important for manpower and social service paraprofessionals, for they tended to report that the job skills that they acquired in training were limited to the agency in which they received

training.

Insofar as paraprofessionals are persons of limited education and experience in the areas they are asked to work, the nature of training and of supervision comes to be regarded as a major factor in the success of the paraprofessional. In SWP, the training and the supervision of manpower and social service paraprofessionals seem to have been informal and limited. Supervisors tended to perceive considerable training on the job and substantial supervision, particularly with regard to client services. Trainees, however, felt that many of the skills that they applied in their training positions had been acquired before assignment to the training slot. Further, they saw supervision as less intense than the supervisors had seen it, and the trainees reported that the closest supervision tended to be over administrative matters like the keeping of records. A training curriculum established parallel to the training experience might have increased the success of this aspect of the program.

The tasks of paraprofessionals in the manpower and social service fields were basically the same as the tasks performed by the professionals. New tasks were not devised for the paraprofessionals. The roles of professional and paraprofessional were not differentiated in terms of specific job tasks. Rather, the professional staffs in client services came to share a part of their case loads with the paraprofessionals. The quantity and quality of service may have been improved in that the total amount of staff time available for work with clients increased. There is some evidence that the presence of paraprofessionals eased some personnel shortages in agency offices.

The data indicate that there were several social groupings whose members were more likely than others to be assigned to training slots as manpower and social service paraprofessionals. This was true for women. It was true for the widowed, the separated, and the divorced in contrast with the single and the married. It was true of the better educated. Generally, the more years of schooling completed, the more likely a person was to be made a paraprofessional in manpower and social services. Although a majority of manpower and social service paraprofessionals were welfare recipients, welfare recipients were less likely to become manpower and social service paraprofessionals than were others. Likewise, a majority of paraprofessionals in the field of manpower and social services were unemployed at the time of entry into the program, but persons employed or underemployed at the time of entry were more likely to receive such paraprofessional training slots.

The most significant of these initial characteristics of paraprofessionals is education. To some extent, success in task performance despite limited training and supervision may be attributed to the educational advantage that paraprofessionals tended to have. Contrary to the general idea of

paraprofessionals as persons of limited education and experience, the paraprofessionals of SWP seem to have been qualified by several years of education to communicate with clients, with employers, and with the staffs of service agencies. They may not have been able to satisfy formal personnel requirements, but they were competent to do their jobs.

The supervisors of trainees in the manpower and social services reported no major changes in hiring policies, performance standards, job descriptions, or methods of service delivery. In interviews, they said that having a paraprofessional aide made it possible to improve the quantity and the quality of services to clients, but this assessment was based on their general feeling that any measure that reduces the case load per worker, whether he be professional or paraprofessional, improves the quantity and quality of services.

According to the supervisors of trainees, the major barriers to nonsubsidized employment existed in the personnel regulations of the State government. The paraprofessional aides could rarely meet the qualifications for education and experience. When asked whether the requirements might not be lowered, the supervisors generally expressed support for the present requirements. Only one supervisor interviewed stated that his observations of the work of his paraprofessional aide had changed his mind about the need for formal higher education in providing professional services to clients. Perhaps, it might be possible to create new positions within the state personnel system with limited requirements for education and experience with the provision that extended experience in such a position could count toward satisfying the requirements of the present professional positions.

There seems little evidence that the task performance of paraprofessionals has been included in the regular budgets of the manpower and social service agencies. In one instance, the supervisor in a manpower agency indicated that he had asked for continuance of the paraprofessional aide in his regular budget but that this ended up being one of the items easily cut at the time of budget tightening.

The general picture of manpower and social service paraprofessionals is a picture of women with marriages broken by death, desertion, or divorce, unemployed, receiving ANFC, and a little better educated than most other women in their circumstances.

To that, one must add the picture of project experience as stopgap employment in paraprofessional positions that seemed satisfying to the trainees and useful to the agencies. As stopgap employment, however, these training positions were not clearly the first step of a career ladder leading to permanent nonsubsidized employment.

In these regards, the experience of the Vermont Experimental and Demonstration Manpower Pilot Project is not very different from the national experience. A general finding of research on paraprofessionals in the human service field is that "with few exceptions, these employees are women employed in entry-level jobs which are not part of comprehensive new careers development programs incorporating education and training" (Yabroff and Matland, 1970, p. 11).

Juanita Kreps (1972) has observed that the one premise of the Emergency Employment Act and of comparable manpower legislation has been that jobs do exist. There is some question whether that premise is sound. The economy of the United States is troubled by problems of both inflation and unemployment. One of the more dismal principles of the dismal science of economics seems to be that one cannot solve one problem without exacerbating the other. Dr. Kreps says that a trade-off is required: "full employment and wage-price stability seem not to be compatible." In an economy with a shortage of jobs, the better educated and better experienced individual must be prepared to move where the jobs are. For the severely disadvantaged worker, that option may not even exist.

An objective of the Special Work Project has been to provide the unemployed with work experience. This work experience is intended to accustom the individual to job routine, to develop good work habits, and to gain confidence in job abilities (See, for example, Manpower Administration, 1970, p. 21). The records and the interviews of trainees in this program suggest, however, that what they require is not work experience but work.

Our society cycles in its interpretations of the problems of poverty, unemployment, and welfare. At one point in time, emphasis is put on economic factors. At another time, cultural factors are stressed. The economic determinists trace the problems to the impersonal forces of the economy, and the solutions proposed are structural. Opportunities for employment must be created. The cultural determinists, however, argue that problems of poverty, unemployment, and welfare are perpetuated from generation to generation by patterns of values. The scientifically minded among the cultural determinists search out the historical origins of such patterns of value, often finding them in economic conditions. The moralizers among the cultural determinists attribute it all to defect of character. In either case, the solutions proposed focus not on the economic structure but on the poor and the unemployed themselves. They must be rehabilitated either by social services or by moral preaching.

The social programs of the 1960's began with a strategy essentially economic in nature. This strategy was fostered by two significant books: Delinquency and Opportunity by Richard A. Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin (1960) and The Other America

by Michael Harrington (1962). In Cloward and Ohlin, the Kennedy administration found the guidelines for the programs of delinquency prevention and control that it desired to initiate under the Juvenile Delinquent Offenses Act of 1961. Briefly stated, the theory of Cloward and Ohlin was that the problems of gang delinquency were generated by the lack of access that lower class youth had to legitimate opportunity structures in society. They argued that delinquency could be prevented and controlled by opening access to educational and employment opportunities. Programs like Mobilization for Youth in New York and the Boston Youth Opportunities Project received substantial federal support for such efforts. The Johnson administration discovered through the aid of Harrington's book that the same approach could be used to deal generally with problems of poverty, and so the Economic Opportunity Act and the Office of Economic Opportunity came into being.

In the mid-1960's, American society began to see that the strategy of economic opportunity was flawed. Flinging wide the doors of opportunity did not produce the large numbers of the poor seeking education and employment. As policy makers strove to understand why the economic strategy was not being successful, the cultural determinists came into the ascendancy. Notable among these was Oscar Lewis, an anthropologist who coined the term "culture of poverty" and described it in books like La Vida: A Puerto Rican Family in the Culture of Poverty--San Juan and New York (1966). Daniel P. Moynihan, Jr., analyzed the errors of government policy explicitly in Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding (1969). Under the influence of the cultural determinists, government policy began to shift toward doing something to change the values and the attitudes of the poor. Employment training came to signify not only job skills but also work experience. Inducements to break free from the culture of poverty were built into such government efforts as the Work Incentive Program. The welfare reform legislation proposed by the Nixon administration was oriented to this theory.

In recent months and years, the cultural theories of poverty have been appearing flawed as well. Critiques have begun to appear in print. Joel Handler's Reforming the Poor (1972) assaults the strategy of "reformation through rehabilitation" that is based on "the tenaciously held view that character defects and social pathology are the causes of poverty rather than the consequence" (p. 49). In Do the Poor Want to Work? (1972), Leonard Goodwin concludes from an extensive study of the Work Incentive Program that they do. This study of paraprofessionals in the Vermont Experimental and Demonstration Manpower Pilot Project itself suggests that the unemployment problem of Vermont is that people who want to work cannot find work.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

SWP EMPLOYEE'S SCHEDULE 1-73

We are going to talk about your position with _____ _____. Here is a list of things that you might have been asked to do on your job.

1. Think about each of these things and then say whether you did that kind of thing on your job. "Yes" means that you did it as part of your job. "No" means that you did not do it as part of your job. Are there any things that you would add to the list?

2. Now look back at each of the things about which you said, "Yes." How much of your working time did you spend on each of them? Was it a lot of your time, some of your time, or very little of your time?

3. Now look at all those things that you said took a lot of your time. Which one of these things took more of your time than any of the others? That is, which thing took most of your time?

4. Now look again at each of the things about which you said, "Yes." Did you have any training to do that sort of thing? If you did have training, was the training before you started the job or while you were on the job?

5. Now look again at each of the things about which you said, "Yes." How much did your supervisor check up on how well you were doing? Did the supervisor check up a lot of the time, some of the time, very little of the time, or not at all?

6. Now look at all those things that you said that your supervisor checked up on a lot of the time. Which one of these things did the supervisor check up on more than any of the others? That is, what thing did the supervisor check up on most of the time?

Are there any other things that you would like to discuss about that job?

APPENDIX B

WORKSHEET ON TASK FREQUENCY

Name _____

JOB ACTIVITY SCHEDULE	Did you do this kind of thing?		How much working time was spent on this?			
	YES	NO	LITTLE	SOME	A LOT	MOST
1. Recruit clients						
2. Follow-up on home visits						
3. Follow-up in community						
4. Follow-up by telephone						
5. Interview or screen at intake						
6. Test clients						
7. Teach or train clients						
8. Accompany clients to agencies						
9. Contact agencies for clients						
10. Contact employers for clients						
11. Counsel clients						
12. Provide information						
13. Provide advice						
14. Provide materials						
15. Filing, typing, other clerical						
16. Keep records						
17. Write reports						
18. Write letters						
19. Organize activities						
20. Organize meetings						
21. Train other workers						
22. Supervise other workers						
23. Assign jobs to other workers						
24. Administer a project						

APPENDIX C

WORKSHEET ON TASK TRAINING

Name _____

JOB ACTIVITY SCHEDULE	Did you do this kind of thing?		Was there any training? If so, when?		
	YES	NO	NONE	BEFORE	ON JOB
1. Recruit clients					
2. Follow up on home visits					
3. Follow up in community					
4. Follow up by telephone					
5. Interview or screen at intake					
6. Test clients					
7. Teach or train clients					
8. Accompany clients to agencies					
9. Contact agencies for clients					
10. Contact employers for clients					
11. Counsel clients					
12. Provide information					
13. Provide advice					
14. Provide materials					
15. Filing, typing, other clerical					
16. Keep records					
17. Write reports					
18. Write letters					
19. Organize activities					
20. Organize meetings					
21. Train other workers					
22. Supervise other workers					
23. Assign jobs to other workers					
24. Administer a project.					

APPENDIX D

WORKSHEET ON TASK SUPERVISION

Name _____

JOB ACTIVITY SCHEDULE	Did you do this kind of thing?		How much supervision?				
	YES	NO	NONE	LITTLE	SOME	A LOT	MOST
1. Recruit clients							
2. Follow-up on home visits							
3. Follow-up in community							
4. Follow-up by telephone							
5. Interview or screen at intake							
6. Test clients							
7. Teach or train clients							
8. Accompany clients to agencies							
9. Contact agencies for clients							
10. Contact employers for clients							
11. Counsel clients							
12. Provide information							
13. Provide advice							
14. Provide materials							
15. Filing, typing, other clerical							
16. Keep records							
17. Write reports							
18. Write letters							
19. Organize activities							
20. Organize meetings							
21. Train other workers							
22. Supervise other workers							
23. Assign jobs to other workers							
24. Administer a project							

APPENDIX E

SWP SUPERVISOR'S SCHEDULE 1-73

We are going to talk about one particular trainee, _____. Here is a list of things that he might have been asked to do on the job.

1. Think about each of these things that he might have done, and then say whether he did do that kind of thing on the job. "Yes" means that you believe that he did it as part of his job. "No" means that you believe that he did not do it as part of his job. If you are not sure, you should say "yes" or "no" as your best estimate. Are there any things you would add to this list?

2. Now, look back at each of the things about which you said "yes". How much of his working time did he spend doing each of these things? Was it a lot of his time, some of his time, or very little of his time?

3. Now, look at those things that you said took a lot of his time. Which one of these things took more of his time than any of the others? That is, which thing took most of his time?

4. Now, let us look again at each of the things about which you said "yes" in answer to the first question. Did the trainee have any training to do that sort of thing? If he did have training, was the training before he started the job with you or was it while he was on the job?

5. Now, we will go back again and look at each of the things about which you said "yes" in answer to the first question. As his supervisor, how much did you check up on how well he was doing? Would you say that you checked up a lot of the time, some of the time, or very little of the time?

6. Now, look at each of the things that you said you checked up on a lot of the time. Which one of these would you say you checked on more than any of the others? That is, what thing did you check on most of the time?

There are just a few more questions to be answered.

7. Thinking about those things that the trainee did as part of his job, are there any that you feel would not have been done at all in your office if the trainee had not been available? What were those things?

8. Are there things that might have been done by one of the professional staff in your office if the trainee had not been available? What were they?

9. Are there any particular things that the professional staff was free to do because the trainee took some of the work load? What were they?

10. What kind of impact would you say having the trainee has had on your office?

10a. ...on the delivery of services to clients?

10b. ...on standards of performance on the job?

10c. ...on the way jobs are designed or described?

10d. ...on the way that employees are hired?

11. Were you able or will you be able to keep the trainee employed without the subsidy from the Special Work Projects? If "yes", then how are you able to do it (that is, how is it covered in your budget)? If "no", why not (that is, what barriers exist)?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Borus, Michael E., and William R. Tash. Measuring the Impact of Manpower Programs: A Primer. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Michigan, 1970.

Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth. Summary of Proceedings: Workshop on Nonprofessional Careers for Disadvantaged Youth - December 14-15, 1966. New York: Graduate School of Social Work, New York University, 1966.

Cloward, Richard, and Lloyd Ohlin. Delinquency and Opportunity: A Theory of Delinquent Gangs. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1960.

Deutermann, William V. Educational Attainment of Workers. Special Labor Force Report 140. U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, March 1971.

Dietz, Norma Panaro. Who's Who Among the Nonprofessionals. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, 1966.

Ferman, Louis A. Job Development For the Hard-to-Employ. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Michigan, 1969.

Gartner, Alan. Paraprofessionals and Their Performance: A Survey of Education, Health, and Social Service Programs. New York: Praeger, 1971.

Gilpatrick, Eleanor. "Technical Support for Building Job and Educational Ladders", Conference on Upgrading and New Careers. National Manpower Policy Task Force, Washington, D. C., 38-50, 1970.

Goodwin, Leonard. Do the Poor Want to Work?: A Social-Psychological Study of Work Orientations. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1972.

Handler, Joel F. Reforming the Poor: Welfare Policy, Federalism and Morality. New York, Basic Books, 1972.

Harrington, Michael. The Other America: Poverty in the United States. New York: Macmillan, 1962.

Kreps, Juanita M. "Facing Up to the Unemployment Problem," The New York Times (December 10, 1972), 14F.

Lesh, Seymour. The Nonprofessional Worker in Youth Employment Programs. New York: Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth, Graduate School of Social Work, New York University, 1966.

Lewis, Oscar. La Vida: A Puerto Rican Family In the Culture of Poverty--San Juan and New York. New York: Random House, 1966.

Main, Eleanor C., Lewis Bowman, and B. Guy Peters. "Model Cities Workers' Perceptions of Clients", Urban Affairs Quarterly (March 1972, 309-313.)

Manpower Administration. Win For a Change: Through the Work Incentive Program. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1970.

Moynihan, Daniel Patrick, Jr. Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding. New York: Free Press, 1969.

National Committee on the Employment of Youth. Career Mobility For Paraprofessionals in Human Service Agencies. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, MDTA Experimental and Demonstration Findings No. 8, 1971.

Pearl, Arthur, and Frank Riessman. New Careers For the Poor: The Nonprofessional In Human Service. New York: Free Press, 1965.

Schiller, Bradley R. "Facts and Fictions of Welfare Reform". Unpublished paper, 1972.

Whyte, William H. Street Corner Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943.

Yabroff, Bernard, and Marc A. Matland. New Careers For the Subprofessional. Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970.