DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 098 434 CE 002 540

TITLE	The Pay-Off to Job Search: The Experience of WIN Terminees. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Pacific Training and Technical Assistance Corp., Berkeley, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C. Office of Research and Development.
PUB DATE	14 Jun 74
NOTE	56p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; Employment Counselors; Employment Experience; Employment Level; *Employment Programs; *Employment Services; Job Analysis; Job Applicants; *Job Placement; Job Tenure; Labor Force; *Program Evaluation; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS	Job Search; WIN; *Work Incentive Program

ABSTRACT

The document reports on a study to determine which job search media are most effective for Work Incentive Program (WIN) clientele and, in particular, whether job placement services associated with WIN program structures are superior in pay-off to other search media. Following the introduction, which summarizes the findings, there are four chapters: (1) a description and analysis of labor force attachment; (2) a description of job search activities and pay-off; (3) an analysis of job search pay-offs; and (4) a retrospective impact evaluation of WIN I. Data on current labor force status, obstacles to employment, recent employment, search patterns, comparisons of search patterns, determinants of job status, weekly wages, job tenure, and expected earnings are tabulated and discussed. Findings are reported relating to the participation of WIN terminees in the labor market and job search characteristics of WIN terminees. (NH)

PACIFIC T & TA CORPORATION

Corporate Offices:
3099 Telegraph Avenue, Berkeley, California 94705 • (415) 549-3101
1900 L Street, N.W., Suite 709, Washington, D.C. 20036 • (202) 659-4553

THE PAY-OFF TO JOB SEARCH:

THE EXPERIENCE OF WIN TERMINEES

Final Report

Submitted To

Office of Research & Development
Manpower Administration
Att: Mr. Jack Newman

June 14, 1974

Introduction and Summary

The basic objective of the Job Search Study was to determine which job search media are most effective for WIN program clientele, and particularly whether job placement services associated with WIN program structures are superior in pay-off to other search media. The significance of this question for policy planning has been underscored by the current administrative plans to allocate more resources to WIN job development and placement (a program redesign often referred to as WIN - R). Accordingly, we have set out to identify the job search behavior of WIN terminees and assess the differential rewards to such activity.

In order to assemble the necessary data on client experiences we conducted personal interviews with WIN terminees in sixteen (16) cities. An interesting feature of our sample is that we sought to interview persons who had participated in WIN I as well as those who participated in WIN II. In particular, we attempted to locate and re-interview individuals who had been the object of an earlier Pacific Training Study, completed in June 1972.* This effort added two dimensions to the research effort; namely: (1) it created the possibility for determining whether or not the program re-design associated with WIN II altered the pattern of job search or the associated pay-offs to search; and (2) it created the potential to construct a limited but unique longitudinal picture of client

---

* Pacific Training and Technical Assistance Corporation, The Impact of Urban WIN Programs (DOL No. MA-51-09-70-10).

experiences (covering a period of up to three years after WIN termination).

Our original intention was to interview 600 former WIN clients, focusing primarily on WIN I participants. However, during the early stages of our interviewing efforts ASPER requested that we place greater emphasis on the job experiences of WIN II participants. Accordingly, we ended up cutting back on our efforts to locate and re-interview WIN I participants. The final sample of respondents includes 571 WIN terminees, broken down into the following three groups:

72 WIN I reinterviews

276 WIN I terminees, not previously interviewed

223 WIN II terminees *

In the following chapters we distinguish between these three samples whenever appropriate. Additionally, in Chapter IV, we examine the longitudinal experiences of the WIN I reinterview subsample.

Summary of Findings

Labor Force Participation:

A very high percentage of WIN terminees are actively participating in the labor market. Indeed, participation rates for both male and female terminees exceed those of the general adult population. However, reported unemployment rates are unusually high, at approximately 22 percent. Thus, only 62 percent of the terminee group is currently employed.

---

* The distinction between WIN I and WIN II participants was based on the respondent's date of entry into the program; clients entering WIN after July 1, 1972 were designated as WIN II.

Those terminees now unemployed report that transportation problems are the greatest barrier to employment, with skill deficiencies and lack of job openings also constituting major obstacles. Those terminees who report that they are neither working nor looking for work cite lack of jobs, child care responsibilities, and poor health as factors inhibiting labor force participation.

Although the obstacles to labor force participation and employment are familiar, it is important to recognize that they are not insurmountable. On the contrary, nearly half of those terminees now out of work report that they have had at least one job since leaving WIN.

Job Search Activity and Pay-off:

The current and recent labor force experience of WIN terminees suggests a great volume of job search activity. In examining this activity, we observe that unemployed WIN terminees generally make less use of public employment agencies than the general job seeking population -- a rather surprising phenomenon in view of their association with WIN -- and virtually no use of private agencies or unions. On the other hand, there is greater dependence on friends and relatives in the search process. i.e. on self-placement efforts.

There is evidence to suggest that alternative job search media offer varying pay-offs for the WIN population. In particular, it appears that WIN itself is a relatively attractive job search medium, both in terms of the quantity and quality of jobs obtained. For the sample of respondents analyzed here, WIN offers the highest probability of search success and the highest expected income.

The regular ES appears to be a less attractive search medium. For the sample as a whole, intensive use of ES does not increase the probability of employment. Moreover, ES appears to be a source of comparatively low-paying jobs for males, although a source of comparatively higher-paying jobs for females. While the distinction between ES and WIN is sometimes difficult to maintain, WIN services might be regarded as a relatively intensive and specifically-targeted adaptation of ES services. From this perspective, it appears that incremental institutional effort pays off.

In reviewing the pay-off to other search media, it is evident that unions are potentially an excellent source of quality jobs, but not accessible to this client group. Private employment agencies are not used often but do lead to jobs, at least lower-paying jobs for women. By contrast, want ads appear to offer comparatively higher-paying jobs for the male respondents, but very low quality jobs for female respondents.

In general, it appears that higher rates of employment success are associated with WIN job-search services than with self-placement efforts (friends, direct application, want ads). Nevertheless, there appears to be a discrepancy between job search patterns currently pursued by WIN terminees and observed pay-offs. In particular, public employment agencies, most notably WIN, are underutilized and held in relatively low regard, despite their relatively high pay-off: self-placement continues to be the preferred mode of job search eventhough it is associated with lower success rates.

WIN I vs. WIN II Experiences:

In examining the different experiences of WIN I and WIN II clients, we discovered that WIN II terminees were slightly more active in job search and made relatively more use of ES than did WIN I terminees.

But the most notable differences within the sample relate to those who graduated from WIN I (i.e., completed their employability plan). WIN I graduates demonstrate a higher labor force participation rate than either WIN I dropouts or WIN II terminees and a markedly lower unemployment rate.. Moreover, over 90 percent of this subsample has had some job experience since leaving WIN. This suggests that WIN I services may have had a longer-term pay-off which has not been adequately gauged heretofore.

The remainder of the report includes:

Chapter I: a description and analysis of labor force attachment

Chapter II: a description of job search activities and pay-off

Chapter III: an analysis of job search pay-offs

Chapter IV: a retrospective impact evaluation of WIN I

Appendix A (attached): an occupational profile of client jobs

I. Labor Force Attachment

The first objective in our study of job search patterns was to determine the extent of job search undertaken by WIN terminees. Specifically, we recognized that not all terminees would be active in job search, as many would either hold jobs or be outside of the labor force (i.e., neither working nor looking for work). Hence first sought to determine the current labor force status of respondents, as that would give us an indication of the volume of job search going on.

The job search patterns of currently unemployed* respondents are not the only object of interest of course. On the contrary, the search activities previously undertaken by those who now hold jobs are a critical benchmark for evaluating the relative pay-off to different modes of search. Likewise we want to know what kinds of search patterns were pursued by those who are now out of the labor force, particularly for the insights they might reveal about ineffective job search patterns.

A. Current Labor Force Status

Table 1 indicates the reported labor force status of the respondents at the time of the interview (sometime between September 1973 and February 1974). As is apparent,a substantial proportion (81 percent) of the respondents were actively participating in the labor force. Indeed, the labor force participation rate for the WIN terminees is generally higher than for the U.S. population as a whole (61 per cent for the noninstitutional population 16 years and over). This striking difference is primarily attributible to the fact that female WIN terminees are much more active in the labor

*Here and throughout this report the term 'unemployed' is used to refer to people actively seeking employment, as per standard DOL terminology. When it is necessary to combine those unemployed with those out of the labor force we shall speak of the "nonemployed."

Table I: Current Labor Force Status

	Labor Force Status			
	Employed	Unemployed	Out of Labor Force	Total Population
All respondents	340	98	107	545
by sex:				
Male	105	29	9	143
Female	235	69	98	402
by program status:				
WIN I:				
dropout	41	37	44	122
graduate	178	19	18	215
TOTAL	219	56	62	337
WIN II	121	42	45	208

market than the general adult female population. The participation rate for the female respondents was 76 per cent, compared with a rate of 44 percent for all U.S. females over the age of sixteen and a rate of 41 percent for married women with children. Male WIN terminees evidenced a labor force participation rate of 94 percent.

While the labor force participation rate of WIN terminees is substantial, their reported rate of unemployment is also unusally high. For the sample as a whole the unemployment rate was a staggering 22 percent.* This is not only many times higher than average U.S. unemployment rates, but also significantly higher than the unemployment rates which have been calculated for poverty areas. However, the higher rate is consistent with expectations, especially in light of the fact that welfare families are typically the least employable of the low-income population. What is perhaps more surprising is that there is no significant difference in the unemployment rates reported by male and female respondents. The male unemployment rate was 21.6 per cent, the female rate 22.6 per cent.

In interpreting these profiles of current labor force status some caution is necessary. Our categorization, like that used by the U.S. Census, depends on respondents telling us whether or not they are "actively looking for work." No one can be certain of the validity of such responses. In order to reinforce the significance of our response patterns we asked respondents to describe whether or not they had consulted specific job sources during the previous week. One purpose of this question was to ascertain the degree of "activeness" associated with "looking for work." While we will discuss the answers to this question in greater detail below, it is

---

* The unemployment rate is computed by dividing the number of unemployed by the number of labor force participants.

important to point out that only 67 "unemployed" respondents reported consulting any specific job search medium (e.g., want ads, friends, etc.) during the sample week. Were we to use this as the basis for identifying current job status, the labor force participation rate for the sample as a whole would fall from 81 per cent to 75 per cent. At the same time the unemployment rate would fall from 22 per cent to 16 per cent. Accordingly, all such sample values should be regarded as approximations. In the rest of the report we use reported rates (Table 1), because their origin is most compatible with standard Census procedure.

Table 1 may also be used to examine the differential labor force status of WIN I and WIN II clients. In this table we have distinguished among WIN clients according to whether or not they completed their employability plan. Under WIN I the employability plan typically included some vocational training plus other pre-employment services. Such a distinction is less meaningful for WIN II, as there is little in the way of an employability plan and virtually no (institutional) vocational training. Hence, the distinction between "graduates" and "dropouts" for WIN I generally refers to the amount of vocational training, if any, received by the respondent. From this perspective one could speculate that WIN I dropouts are more similar than WIN I graduates to WIN II terminees because of their lack of special training.*

---

*Caution must be exercised with this distinction, however. As PTTA's Project Director has demonstrated, official program classifications with respect to termination status do not necessarily convey information on services received. See Bradley R. Schiller, "Discrimination in WIN Programs," August 1973.

In this light it is interesting to note that the labor force participatior of WIN I graduates is much higher (92 percent) than the other two groups, while their unemployment rate (10 per cent) is way below that of both WIN I dropouts (48 per cent) and WIN II terminees (26 per cent). While the difference between WIN I graduates and WIN II terminees might be explained in part by the longer post-program experience of the former group, the even larger difference between WIN grads and dropouts tends to cast doubt on that hypothesis. Instead, its seems more reasonable to suggest that there is a self-selection bias operating in the WIN I graduate vs. dropout distinction--a possibility we have not been able to confirm in the demographic data, as we shall see---or that the long-run benefits of vocational training are higher than suggested by earlier studies of immediate employment pay-off.

B. Reasons for Not Working

While it is apparent that WIN terminees have a significant attachment to the labor force and have thus engaged in considerable job search activity, it is important to ask why so many respondents are out of work, i.e., either unemployed or out of the labor force. Their current nonemployment may be due in part, of course, to their failure to have pursued the right (or any) job search activities. But before looking at current and previous job search patterns, we may examine the respondents own explanations for their unemployment.

In Table 2 the responses of unemployed WIN terminees to a question about obstacles to successful job search are indicated. The greatest single obstacle to job acquisition was perceived to be lack of adequate transportation, a barrier cited by over one-third of the currently unemployed respondents. Beyond that, only two obstacles received significant mention.

Table 2: Obstacles to Employment

Q:	What are your major problems in finding a job?	
A:	Transportation problems	35
	Lack of job openings	25
	Don't know where to look	3
	Child care responsibilities	0
	Discrimination	7
	Lack of skill/training	17
	Other	7
	Total	96

The frequent mention of skill deficiencies reinforces our earlier suggestion about long-run training benefits. The even more frequent mention of lack of job openings may reflect in part the same problem, but also suggests the potential for significant discouragement as unemployment and job search continues.

The discouraged worker hypothesis finds additional support in the explanations given for labor force nonparticipation. Approximately one out of four respcndents reported that a lack of available job openings was the reason they were neither working nor looking for work (see Table 3). Approximately the same percentages of respondents

Table 3: Obstacles to Labor Force Participation

Reasons for not actively seeking employment:

Lack of jobs	24
Child care	25
Health	25
Inadequate pay	1
Transportation	6
In school or training	5
Not interested	10
Other	11
Total	107

cited child care and health problems as the major barrier to participation. There is undoubtedly considerable interaction among these obstacles, making definitive statements about either employment or participation barriers difficult. Nevertheless, the results of Tables 2 & 3 are quite suggestive and should be kept in mind when assessing the relative value of different job search media.

C. Extent of Recent Employment

While the data in Table 1 suggests that at least 98 WIN terminees (the "unemployed") are active in current job search activities, that figure should not be mistaken for an estimate of total job search activity for the respondent sample. As we have already noted, it is obviously of central importance to determine the kinds of job search activity pursued by those WIN terminees who are now employed. Did they use the same search media? have superior qualifications? keep their jobs for a longer time? Even those presently out of the labor force may have actively sought jobs at some point in their post-program experiences and perhaps even held jobs. Accordingly, we want to determine not only the extent of current search activity but also the extent of recent search and employment.

Table 4 provides some indication of recent search and employment by detailing the number of jobs held by respondents since leaving WIN. As is apparent, over 80 per cent of the respondents have held at least one job--- and thus, presumably engaged in job search activities---since WIN. Of these, one out of three has held at least two jobs.

Of particular interest is the relationship of current labor force status to number of post-WIN jobs. One-third of those now employed have held other post-WIN jobs, suggesting relatively short job retention, an issue we will explore further in Chapter III.

For the subject of job search activity, the post-WIN employment record of the currently unemployed respondents is of even greater significance. Over fifty per cent of those reporting active job search have held at least one job since WIN.

Table 4: Recent Employment

	Number of Jobs Held Since WIN Termination				
	0	1	2	3	4-9
All respondents	106	312	101	27	15
by current labor force status:					
employed	0	235	81	21	11
unemployed	.46	38	12	4	2
out of labor market	60	39	8	2	2
by program status:					
WIN I					
dropout	46	48	15	7	8
graduate	7	150	47	12	5
Total	53	198	62	19	13
WIN II	53	114	39	8	2

When viewed against the multiple job experience of the currently employed, this suggests not only real labor force attachment, but also the possibility that we have intercepted these people in a transitional stage identical to that experienced by the currently employed respondents. In other words the characteristics of those currently unemployed but with post-WIN job experience may not differ significantly from those of the currently employed.

The status of those 46 respondents who are now unemployed but without any post-WIN job experience is less clear. There is a strong possibility that they most resemble those 60 respondents who are now out of the labor force and without post-WIN job experience. This suggestion is reinforced by our earlier observations about the ambiguities attached to client's reports of "active" job search.

The second half of Table 4 indicates the relationship of WIN termination status to number of post-WIN jobs. Surprisingly, the distinctions between WIN I and WIN II terminees are not great. This suggests that the amount of time spent in the labor force is of minor significance for post-WIN employment prospects. The one really noteworthy observation is the distinction between WIN I dropouts and graduates: fully 97 percent of the graduates have held post-WIN jobs vs. only 63 percent of the dropouts. Demographic characteristics undoubtedly account for much of this differential, but the suggestion of long-run benefits to training again emerges.

II. Job Search Patterns

Given the extensive current and recent labor force participation of WIN terminees, there is clearly a broad basis for evaluating patterns of job search. We begin that inquiry in this section by describing the patterns associated with different labor force groups.

A. Search Patterns for the Unemployed

We may begin by looking at the search patterns associated with those who are currently unemployed. This group is of primary interest both because it now most actively engaged in job search and because, as a consequence, its recall of search activities is likely to be most complete. We asked this group of respondents how long they had been looking for a job, what kind of work they were seeking, the media they utilized, which media they had used in the previous week, and which they regarded as helpful. The general objective of this set of questions was to determine the specificity and extensiveness of each respondent's search activity.

Table 5 provides a first glimpse of which job search media are utilized by unemployed WIN terminees and how such media are regarded. One can start to digest the data in Table 5 by first noting that private employment agencies and labor unions are virtually never used by unemployed WIN terminees as potential sources of job leads. The low utilization factor for private employment agencies is aaproximately one-half of the utilization rate reported for all U.S. job seekers, as surveyed by the census.*

*As reported in Thomas F. Bradshaw, "Jobseeking Methods Used by Unemployed Workers" Monthly Labor Review, February, 1973.

Table 5: Search Patterns of the Unemployed

Search Medium	Extent of Utilization: Frequent ("daily" or "often")	Extent of Utilization: Infrequent ("seldom" or "never")	Regarded as Helpful*
State ES	25.9%	74.1%	41.9%
WIN	20.7	79.3	26.9
Friends, Relatives	36.3	63.7	55.2
Want Ads	61.5	38.5	29.5
Private Agencies	3.7	96.3	26.1
Unions	4.4	95.6	26.7
Employers Directly	57.0	43.0	31.0
Other	9.8	90.2	28.6

* percent of those making any use of medium ("daily", "often", or "seldom") who indicated it was helpful.

Table 5 distinguishes between WIN and ES placement assistance. While WIN is a component part of ES services, it has often been observed that the smaller program operates with considerable functional autonomy. Hence, in many cities the distinction is useful and important. In other areas, however, and particularly since the introduction of WIN II, the distinction between WIN and ES placement services is difficult to maintain. Accordingly, the distinction made in Table 5 should be regarded as merely suggestive; our analysis often combines the two institutions into one search medium.

Table 5 suggests that unemployed terminees make relatively little use of either WIN or ES. Indeed, in view of the fact that 30 percent of the general population of unemployed persons reports using "public employment agencies" (per Bradshaw, op. cit.), the utilization of WIN and ES by our sample population seems surprisingly low for a group that has had so much previous contact with ES/WIN and is generally available for many of the job orders that ES tends to process.

One might conclude from this pattern of utilization that WIN terminees have been disappointed in their previous encounters with ES/WIN. While we shall address this question further in a later section, we may note here the relationship between utilization and perceived helpfulness. Exactly what "helpful" means to each respondent is not unambiguous, but Pacific Training interviewers stressed things like job leads, job interview

appointments, and general job search counseling. On this basis, there appears to exist a generally positive attitude toward ES services, as over 40 percent of the individuals who used ES thought it was helpful. We were somewhat surprised at this high response factor, and believe it may suggest the need to promote ES services more widely so as to dispel unfavorable impressions that still linger in many communities. WIN services fared less well on this criterion but still evidenced a respectable degree of helpfulness. There was, of course, considerable variation among local projects, with respondents in Boston, Oakland and San Jose expressing higher opinions of ES and respondents in Houston speaking more favorably of WIN services.

Personal friends are frequently consulted by WIN terminees and generally regarded as being more helpful than any other source. Indeed, the utilization of friends by WIN terminees is much greater (36 percent vs. 15 percent) than that reported by Bradshaw for the U.S. jobseeking population as a whole. We are skeptical about the size of this differential, especially in light of the fact that the Current Population Survey did not probe this question at all, thus possibly biasing the responses in favor of institutionalized job sources. Nevertheless, it seems apparent that a significant differential must underly the reported one.

Unemployed WIN terminees also make extensive use of direct employer applications, reporting a utilization factor which is just slightly less than that reported by the rest of the population. It is interesting to note, however, that those who make direct applications apparently get

less satisfaction from their efforts (in terms of helpfulness) than those terminees who rely on ES.

Search Patterns During Survey Week:

While Table 5 provides a general picture of the search patterns pursued by unemployed WIN terminees, it may be biased in two respects. First of all, welfare clients may feel some pressure to report that they are "looking for work", regardless of how convincing the interviewer's assurances are with respect to confidentiality. Hence, the reported amount of unemployment is likely to exceed the real rate of job search.

A second bias is introduced by the fact that respondents were asked to respond affirmatively or negatively to the use of specific search media, i.e. because the survey questions were 'closed' rather than 'open'. Hence a respondent who felt some pressure to report job search activities would also feel the need to respond affirmatively to specific media.

Table 6 seeks to reduce, though certainly does not eliminate, these biases by depicting the media respondents reported utilizing in the survey week. Were we to use this table for the purpose of classifying respondents' labor force status, it is evident that the number of "unemployed" respondents would fall and the number "out of the labor force" would rise by an equal amount. That is to say, nearly a third of those who stated they were "actively looking for work" also responded that they had not used any of the job finding services depicted here during the survey week. As we noted earlier, this would suggest that the labor force

Table 6: Recent vs. General Search Patterns

	Extent of Utilization	
Search Medium	Frequent	Used Last Week
State ES	25.9%	25.5%
WIN	20.7	3.1
Friends	36.3	23.5
Want Ads	61.5	37.8
Private Agencies	3.7	4.1
Union	4.4	4.1
Employers	57.0	30.6
Other	9.8	5.1
Nothing:	___	32.7
		(n=98)

participation rate for the sample is 75 percent rather than 81 percent, while the unemployment rate is 16 percent instead of 23 percent. In other words, reported job search is probably greater than actual job search. *

In addition to this differential for 'recent' and 'general' job search activity, Table 6 also indicates how the pattern of recent search varies from patterns of general search. On this basis we can identify very clear discrepancies. Recent use of WIN, for example, is much lower than that indicated by "frequent" utilization. This very large differential for WIN services may reflect the biases described above or a general dis-association with WIN as time elapses. On the latter point, the lack of a differential between "frequent" and recent use of ES may indicate that WIN serves the purpose of familiarizing clients with regular ES services, which they then continue to utilize. *

Also noteworthy in Table 6 is the observation that unemployed respondents made much less recent use of want ads and direct employer applications than suggested by their suggestions of "frequent" ("daily" or "often") use. In general, then, Table 6 alters the patterns of search

---

This may be true for all population groups of course. Moreover, we have no basis for validating whether reports on "this week's" search activity are themselves an accurate reflection of actual search; but the direction of bias seems clear.

**

From this perspective caution must be exercised in interpreting the observation that terminees don't "go back to WIN" for employment services (see David Roesner, Employment Contexts and Disadvantaged Workers, Bureau of Social Science Research, 1971)

indicated earlier in Table 5, by strengthening the relative use of ES and diminishing the relative significance of WIN. It also suggests a lower intensity of job search among the sample group than earlier reflected.

B. Search Patterns of the Employed

Although the search patterns of the unemployed are of intrinsic interest, they acquire policy significance only in a comparative framework. In particular we need to know whether the patterns pursued by unemployed are likely to lead to employment. One way to gain a tentative answer to this question is to contrast their search patterns with those of respondents who are now employed. Table 7 provides a basis for such a comparison.

Table 7 not only depicts the previous search patterns undertaken by currently employed respondents, but also indicates whether specific search media were regarded as "helpful" or actually lead to a job. In this regard, several observations are noteworthy. First, currently employed respondents have used WIN services more than any other medium, in striking contrast to the unemployed respondents (Table 6) and the general population (in terms of "public employment agencies"). Moreover, WIN services are credited as being the source of jobs for one out of three employed respondents. *

* Even this percentage may be an understatement as WIN frequently provides job leads only, letting the respondent make initial employer contact and interview appointment. Respondents tend to report "direct employer application" as the source of a job in such cases. Although our interviewers were trained to probe all "direct employer" responses -- something census surveys do not do -- it is likely that some misreporting of this nature nevertheless occurred.

Table 7: Search Patterns of the Employed

	Extent of Utilization		Regarded	Source
	Frequent ("daily" or "often")	Infrequent ("seldom" or "never")	as Helpful*	Present J
State ES	26.3%	73.7%	24.2%	6.1%
WIN	54.7	45.3	17.8	33.0
Friends, Relatives	40.6	59.4	24.6	24.6
Want Ads	44.4	55.6	21.6	7.0
Private Agencies	5.3	94.7	13.4	2.3
Unions	1.2	98.8	5.9	0.9
Employers Directly	45.6	54.4	23.8	21.6
Other	7.6	92.4	15.2	4.5

* percent of those making any use of source (either "daily", "often", or "seldom") who indicated it was "helpful".

What is particularly interesting about Table 7 are the discrepancies which are reflected in the last two columns. Strangely enough, WIN services rank relatively low in terms of "helpfulness" despite the fact that WIN is the most frequent source of jobs. It is hard to make sense of this wide differential unless one hypothesizes that WIN staff are not regarded as very personable (a suggestion we believe ill-founded, especially in view of client responses about WIN staff) or that jobs obtained with WIN assistance are considered inferior in some respect. We will explore this latter hypothesis in Chapter III.

The discrepancy between reported helpfulness and job source is reversed for ES services: ES is regarded as helpful by one out of four respondents but is credited with only one out of sixteen jobs. Want ads, and to a lesser extent, private agencies, exhibit the same tendency. The most reasonable explanation for this pattern would seem to be the reverse of that suggested above; in this case the jobs processed may be more attractive but just out of reach.

Table 8 provides a summary comparison of the search experiences of currently employed and unemployed respondents. Table 8 differs from earlier tables in one important respect; namely that for unemployed respondents the search patterns during the survey week include the responses of only those who reported using some medium. That is to say, we have excluded those who reported "actively" looking for work, but who were unable to cite a specific medium for the survey week. Thus, the second column of Table 8 reflects the distribution of search effort on the part of those

Table 8: A Comparison of Search Patterns

	Unemployed Respondents		Employed Respondents	
Search Medium	Frequent Use	Use During Survey Week*	Frequent Use	Source of Job
State ES	25.9%	37.7%	26.3%	6.1%
WIN	20.7	4.6	54.7	33.0
Friends, Relatives	36.3	34.8	40.6	24.6
Want Ads	61.5	55.9	44.4	7.0
Private Agencies	3.7	6.1	5.3	2.3
Unions	4.4	6.1	1.2	0.9
Employers Directly	57.0	45.3	45.6	21.6
Other	9.8	7.5	7.6	4.5

* includes only those who reported some search during survey week (N=66); hence, adjusts figures in Table 6 for respondents reporting no search activities

unemployed respondents who were actually searching for jobs in the survey week.

Comparing columns three and four of Table 8, it is apparent that those unemployed respondents now engaged in job search are using much the same media as the presently employed respondents. There is only one marked difference, and this concerns ES and WIN. In general, unemployed WIN terminees make virtually no use of WIN placement services, even though employed respondents made extensive use of WIN and found a great many jobs through WIN assistance. Part of this movement away from WIN is reflected in a higher reliance on ES services, as seems appropriate for program terminees. Nevertheless, there is a clear tendency for currently unemployed terminees to utilize public employment agencies less than did their currently employed counterparts.

C. WIN I vs. WIN II Patterns

Table 9 provides one final perspective on search patterns, this time differentiated by whether the respondent participated in WIN I or WIN II (only those reported as being in the labor force are considered). In view of the fact that WIN II involves a greater emphasis on job development and placement, as compared with manpower training and related services, it seems reasonable to expect different search patterns for each group. The figures in Table 9 provide only a limited confirmation of this expectation.

WIN II respondents do make more use of public employment agencies than do WIN I respondents, but the differences are not large. The observed difference is apparently due to the fact that fewer WIN II respondents

Table 9: WIN I vs. WIN II Patterns

Search Medium	Frequent Use		Never Use	
	WIN I	WIN II	WIN I	WIN II
State ES	25.4%	29.2%	48.4	37.5
WIN	43.5	46.4	32.5	31.5
Friends, Relatives	35.3	46.4	28.3	25.0
Want Ads	47.7	50.6	27.7	23.8
Private Agencies	0.3	7.7	83.7	76.8
Unions	0.2	2.3	94.3	90.5
Employers Directly	44.5	52.4	30.0	19.0
Other	8.5	8.3	---	---
	(N=283)	(N=168)		

shun the state ES completely, instead visiting ES on infrequent occasion ("seldom use" rather than "never use")

Proceeding down the list of search media, it is apparent that WIN II respondents tend to use all sources with greater frequency than do WIN I respondents. Especially large differences are evident for the use of friends and relatives, private agencies, and employers directly. This suggests that WIN II respondents were more active in job search and/or that they were better advised as to the different search media available.

III. Relative Pay-off to Job Search Media

The preceeding chapter has provided a picture of the search patterns pursued by WIN terminees and some suggestions as to the pay-off to different job media. In this chapter we will examine more closely the relative pay-off to job search patterns. Our earlier discussion will be extended in three important dimensions, namely; (1) whether demographic factors influence search success; (2) whether the utilization of specific job search media affects the odds of finding a job, and (3) the quality of jobs obtained through alternative media.

A. Demographic Influences on Job Status

We cannot measure the true pay-off to different search media (or, indeed, any WIN services) until we recognize and control for the fact that different individuals enter the labor market with varying degrees of employability. In any given labor market situation certain groups and individuals will normally stand a better chance of finding a job than others, even with the same job search effort.* Employability differences arise primarily from personal characteristics, including both demographic traits and previous skill development.

To determine the extent to which such employability factors influenced the job status of our sample respondents, we subjected the interview data to a series of multivariate analyses (primarily step-wise linear

---

* The local labor market conditions are themselves an important and independent determinant of employment prospects, of course. (see Pacific Training and TA Corp., The Impact of Urban WIN Programs, (MA 51-09-70-10), May 5, 1972) But we are limited to an analysis of the interactions between demographic characteristics, job sources, and job status.

regressions). Only the more significant findings are presented and discussed here.

As a quick perusal of Table 10 may make clear, demographic characteristics appear to have had little influence on the job status of the WIN terminees. Equation 10.1, for example, suggests that very little of the variation in employment status can be explained by demographic variables, a conclusion reached on the basis of the low R^2. Nevertheless, within this limited explanatory power, two variables are highly significant, namely education and sex. Education is treated as a dichotomous variable here, with 12 years or more of schooling distinguished from lesser attainments. Thus, equation 10.1 suggests that the attainment of a high school degree increases the probability of employment by 18 percentage points, a very significant impact.* Equation 10.1 also suggests the importance of sex for job prospects. Indeed, the quantitative impact of the sex variable equals that of the education variable, with women, of course, suffering the reduced probability of employment.

Equation 10.2 adds nothing in a positive sense to our explanation of employment probabilities. What it does demonstrate, however, is that neither race nor prior vocational training affects the job status of the terminee group as a whole.

---

* Alternative calculations using years of schooling in continuous form manifested much lower impact; hence, there appears to be a threshold effect at work with respect to high school graduation.

Table 10: Determinants of Job Status

A: For all sample respondents (N=567)

(10.1) Probability of Employment = 0.7 + .004 Age (1.8) - .18 Sex (3.9) + .18 Educ. (4.3) $R^2 = .057$

(10.2) Probability of Employment = .7 + .005 Age (1.8) - .19 Sex (3.7) + .18 Educ. (4.3) - .009 Race + .014 Voct. + .008 Time $R^2 = .058$

B: For those respondents in the labor force (N=451)

(10.3) Probability of Employment = 0.6 + .005 Age (2.3) - .05 Sex (1.1) + .16 Educ. (3.8 $R^2 = .040$

(10.4) Probability of Employment = .67 + .004 Age (1.9) - .11 Sex (2.6) + .13 Educ. (3.3) - .07 U - ES (2.7) +.19 U-WIN (7.6) - .06 U-Ads (2.2) + .07 U-Agency (2.0) - .10 U-Union (1.4) $R^2 = .177$

Notes: t-statistics in parentheses (only those that are greater than one are shown); see text for further explanation of variables.

Calculations of differential employment probabilities for the WIN terminees may be biased, however, by the presence in the sample of respondents who never looked for a job. That is to say, there are really two distinct phenomena wrapped up in equations 10.1 and 10.2: The probability of employment depends on the probability of search activity and the probability of search success. Hence, if we want to focus on the determinants of search success, we have to eliminate the non-searchers from our analysis. This exclusion is performed in equation 10.3.

Even when our analysis is confined to those respondents who are in the labor market, our ability to explain job status differences is exceedingly small. But a comparison of equations 10.1 and 10.3 highlights a couple of interesting points. First of all, sex is much less significant an explanation of job search success than it is of labor force status. In other words, the female WIN terminees manifest a much lower tendency to enter the labor market but only a marginally reduced probability of search success once there. This is consistent, of course, with our observation in Chapter II that the unemployment rates for male and female terminees is virtually equal. The second implication one can derive from equations 10.1 and 10.3 is that education is in fact a significant determinant of search success, and less of a determinant of labor force entrance.

Further calculations with this subsample of labor force participants failed

---

* Note that we are including only those presently in the labor force; as shown in Chapter II, many of those now outside the labor force previously sought and held jobs.

to uncover any significant relationship for race, for vocational training, or for the time elapsed since WIN termination. In general, then, we would conclude that education -- in particular, the attainment of a high school degree -- is the only measured demographic variable influencing the search success of our WIN Terminee group.

Unmeasured Demographic Traits: A Digression

It is highly likely that personal characteristics of job-seekers have a greater influence on the probability of employment than is suggested by Table 10. In particular, we must recognize that factors such as personal appearance, communication skills, and motivation are apt to have a profound influence on job prospects. The influence of client motivation on job search success was stressed repeatedly by local WIN job developers and was also mentioned by PT&TA interviewers. We have no acceptable method for measuring such variables, however, despite repeated attempts at quantification in a host of different studies. Accordingly, it is important to emphasize -- and we shall repeat our message -- that the explanatory power of our analysis is constrained by an inability to measure all variables believed to have impact significance. We hope, of course, that our analysis of quantifiable variables indicates some of the forces which are important to (or unimportant to) job search success.

B. The Influence of Search Media on Job Status

Our major interest here is not to identify demographic determinants of job search success, of course, but rather to isolate the influence of

different search patterns on employment probabilities. As we illustrated in Chapter II, WIN terminees utilize a variety of job source media and have markedly different experiences with them. The question remains, however, how utilization of specific search media affects employment probabilities.

Ideally, what we would like to do is measure the amount of time and effort expended on alternative job search media and relate job status to such an intensity-of-use measure. There are two problems with this approach, however. First of all, the very different character of the search media impose varying requirements on a job-seeker's time and effort. An hour's time spent in the office of a private employment agency, for example, may effectively transfer some of the search burden to others (the agency's personnel). By the same token, an hour's time spent reading the want ads and calling possible leads can cover a lot more territory than an hour spent on the street knocking on employers' doors (direct application).

The fact that different search media require varying commitments of time and effort is of intrinsic interest, of course, for an assessment of job search pay-offs. In other words, a critical question is how an hour of search activity is best allocated among alternative media. Unfortunately, this question cannot be answered with a reasonable degree of confidence. First of all, respondents have a very incomplete recollection of how much time they spent on different search activities. Second, there is

no conceptually-satisfying way to measure the amount of time one spends soliciting job leads from friends and relatives. This particular search activity is integrated into everyday social contact, and few people could faithfully say that X percent of their social time was spent in seeking job leads. What makes this conceptual barrier so important is the fact that one out of four employed respondents reported friends as their job source (see Table 7).

Our own measure of search intensity focuses on the frequency of use rather than on the amount of time or effort spent at each occasion. Thus, our intensity measure is more concerned with the question "Did you check the want ads today?" rather than the question "How much time did you spend reading the want ads today?" Accordingly, we can gauge whether a respondent utilized a particular job source medium "daily," "often," "seldom" or "never". Although this index is less specific than an intensity measure based on hours of search effort, it strikes us as a reasonable adjustment to data realities. Moreover, it is not evident that a day-based rather than an hour-based index is less meaningful, since the most important aspect of search may be simply to "get out on the street," i.e., involve onself in <u>some</u> search activity every day.

Equation 10.4 depicts the impact of our intensity measure on the probability of locating a job. The intensity index ("used-(source)", or simply "U (source)") is calibrated:

daily = 3, often = 2, seldom = 1, never = 0 *

The first thing to notice about equation 10.4 is how the inclusion of search media data increases the explanatory value of our model: the R^2 increases from .040 to .177 once we take search patterns into account.

According to equation 10.4, the most significant determinant of job status is the use of WIN job placement services. Those who utilized WIN frequently had a much higher probability of finding a job than those who did not.

In contrast to WIN, more intensive use of ES does not appear to increase the probability of employment. On the contrary, intensive use of ES has a statistically-significant, negative impact on employment prospects. The same may be said of more intensive use of want ads. Aside from WIN services, only private employment agencies appear to have a demonstrably positive impact on employment probabilities.

In interpreting the results of equation 10.4, we must call attention to the fact that is is difficult to attach a specific causal relationship to the data. Suppose, for example, that ES was so successful in placing highly employable job-seekers that it could move such persons into a job after only one visit to ES offices, but that it had great difficulty in placing marginally employable persons. Under these assumptions, any

---

* The average intensity for the different media were : ES (.76), WIN (.94), Friends (1.08), Ads (.96), Agencies (.22), Unions (.08), Employers Directly (1.12), and Other (.21).

intensity-of-use measure would indicate that ES was a comparatively unproductive search medium. But such a conclusion would obviously obscure some important relationships. There is no easy way to sort out these relationships in a cross-section study, particularly where unmeasured demographic variables may be an important component of employability. All we can say with confidence is that more intensive use of WIN was associated with higher employment rates, while lower employment rates were associated with ES and want ads.

C. Job Quality

Finding a job is obviously critical to the attainment of financial independence. However, it is equally clear that job acquisition is not a sufficient condition for assuring a movement from welfare to self-support; as we noted in chapter I, over 80 percent of our respondent group had held at least one job since leaving WIN, yet many are now unemployed or receiving welfare. As other studies have shown, a successful movement from welfare to workfare requires not only a job, but a job which provides some stability and a decent level of income. Accordingly, job quality is as important a component of job search success as job acquisition per se.

The objective of this section is two-fold. First, we want to provide an impression of the quality of jobs held by WIN terminees. Second, we want to determine wnether the search medium is significantly related to job quality; for example, whether jobs located with the help of public employment agencies are significantly different from those located via other media. The answer to this latter question may provide some further insights into the relationships discussed in the previous section, particularly on the influence of unmeasured demographic traits. If, as suggested above, the probabilities of employment associated with different media are biased by the characteristics of their specific clientele, then we might expect to observe some job-quality differences associated with those media. In exploring these issues we will focus on two basic measures of job quality, wages and tenure.

Wages:

In examining the wages of WIN terminees we will consider only those of respondents who are employed at full-time jobs (N=302). For this group, the average weekly wage is $118, or approximately $2.95 per hour for a typical 40-hour week. This figure is substantially higher than previous studies have suggested, and sufficient to generate a standard of living substantially in excess of poverty or welfare-benefit levels.

Although the average level of wages is quite high, there is a large difference in the wages received by male and female terminees. Indeed, the weekly wage of male respondents ($147) is forty percent higher than that received by female respondents ($106). This is certainly not a new finding, but does underscore the greater difficulty females confront when attempting to move from welfare to financial independence on their own.

Table 11 provides a first impression of the association between wages and alternative job sources; male and female respondents are distinguished in the table because of the large wage differential we have already noted. Reading across the first row of Table 11, it can be observed that jobs obtained by men through ES pay slightly less than those obtained through other channels. The real stand-out in the first row is union wages, however, which average $50 a week higher than those received in other categories. Unfortunately, only two respondents had obtained jobs through unions. Hence, the union wage figure is probably a better indication of the potential benefits to institutional change rather than a realistic guide to where individual job-seekers should focus their efforts.

The second row of Table 11 indicates the relation of weekly wages to job sources for female respondents. One observation is particularly noteworthy; namely that the jobs female WIN terminees locate with ES or WIN help pay substantially better wages than jobs obtained through other sources.

Table 11: Weekly Wage, by Source of Job

	ES	WIN	FRIENDS	WANT ADS	PRIVATE AGENCY	UNION	EMPLOYER DIRECTLY	OTHER
Average Wage:								
Males (N=99)	$135	$143	$151	$141	Ø	$197	$159	$124
Females (N=203)	128	111	102	86	98	Ø	109	112
Total (N=302)	131	118	122	111	98	197	128	114

Jobs obtained by female respondents through the want ads pay considerably less than other jobs.

We can generalize the findings of Table 11 by noting that: (1) male wages are substantially higher than female wages; (2) public employment agencies are a relatively better source of high-wage jobs for female respondents than for male respondents; and (3) the highest-paying jobs, those obtained with union help, are largely nonexistant among WIN terminees.

In Table 12 our analysis of weekly wages is expanded to a multivariate framework. Equation 12.1 focuses on demographic variables only, and confirms the significance of sex for weekly wages. In addition, the possession of a high school degree has a significant impact on wages, to the extent of approximately $12 a week. Neither race nor age appear to have a significant impact on the wages of the terminee sample.

Equation 12.2 introduces two additional variables, vocational training ("Voct") and length of time employed on the current job ("Tenure"). As is apparent, neither factor adds much to our understanding of weekly wage variation, eventhough the impact of vocational training approaches statistical significance.

Equation 12.3 is of more immediate interest as it relates wages to reported job sources. For the respondent group as a whole none of the job sources has a statistically significant impact on weekly wages, eventhough the gross differences, as reflected in both the regression coefficients of Table 12 and the averages of Table 11, are quite large. On the basis of

Table 12: Determinants of Weekly Wages

For all respondents with full-time jobs (N=302):

(12.1) Wages = 178.3 - 42.0 Sex + 11.8 Educ. + 8.1 Race - .3 Age $R^2 = .173$
(6.0) (2.0) (1.6)

(12.2) Wages = 182.2 - 42.3 Sex + 12.2 Educ. + 8.9 Race - .2 Age + 6.6 Voct + .3 Tenure $R^2 = .180$
(6.0) (2.0) (1.8) (1.2)

(12.3) Wages = 163.8 - 40.1 Sex + 12.1 Educ. + 9.2 Race - .3 Age + 6.6 Voct + .3 Tenure
(5.5) (2.0) (1.8) (.8) (1.2) (.9)

+ 15.7 S- ES + 12.5 S- WIN + 14.2 S-friends + 3.8 S-ads
(1.0) (1.0) (1.1) (.2)

+ 6.6 S- Agency + 66.9 S-union + 21.8 S - emp. + 13.5 S-other $R^2 = .198$
(.3) (1.7) (1.7) (.8)

For male respondents (N=99):

(12.4) Wages = 181.3 + 14.9 Educ. + 5.2 Race - 1.1 Age + 3.0 Voct + .3 Tenure - 31.4 S-ES/WIN $R^2 = .072$
(.8) (.5) (1.2) (.2) (1.9)

For female respondents (N=203):

(12.5) Wages = 106.1 + 11.1 Educ. + 34.3 Race - .2 Age +13.6 Voct + .2 Tenure + 8.5 S-ES/WIN $R^2 = .117$
(.9) (4.4) (.4) (1.7) (.5) (1.0)

Note: t-statistics in parenthesis; see text for discussion of variables

this equation the most one can say is that union and direct employer applications have the largest and most significant impact.

We must recognize again, however, that the dominant influence of sex on wages may disguise more substantial relationships between wages and job sources. To test this possibility we have separated the subsample into male and female groups and subjected the data to another series of regression analyses. In general, we were not able to discern stronger relationships in these explorations, as equations 12.4 and 12.5 indicate. With respect for the male respondents (equation 12.4), we discovered that none of the explanatory variables attained statistical significance, although a newly-created dummy variable indicating ES or WIN as the job source ("S-ES/WIN") approaches significance and has a very substantial coefficient (-$31). This indicates that jobs located through public employment agencies are of even less relative attractiveness for male terminees suggested earlier in Table 11. The difference in impact estimates is accounted for by the fact that we are here controlling for some of the demographic characteristics of individuals who utilize different sources.

Equation 12.5 is representative of the many regressions we developed for female respondents. One observation is particularly striking: Race is a dominant influence on the wages received by female terminees, with whites having a differential advantage of $34 a week. This impact estimate is net of education and age, of course, and thus all that much more dramatic.

Vocational training appears to have a stronger impact on female earnings than male earnings, although statistical significance is not quite achieved. With respect to job sources, we were again unable to discern any statistically significant relationships. The coefficient for public employment agencies variable (U-ES/WIN) conforms to the expectations generated in Table 11, but is not significant. Additional tabulations revealed that direct employer applications had the most significant impact (t=1.8) for female respondents, with a positive value of $17 a week. WIN by itself had a slightly less significant impact (t=1.7) and a positive value of $19 a week. These two estimates contradict the impressions created by Table 7, which depicted gross wage differentials with no demographic controls.

We may summarize the foregoing observations by noting that specific job search media do not have a substantial impact on wages for the WIN terminees. There are some noteworthy exceptions, but their statistical significance is tenuous. In this regard we found public employment agencies tend to yield relatively low-paying jobs for men, while WIN alone yields relatively high-paying jobs for women. Unions are apparently the source of the highest-paying jobs for this group, but so few respondents obtained jobs with union help that the relationship has no statistical significance.

Job Tenure:

Our second measure of job quality is the length of time a terminee has been on the job. Given the limited nature of our study, we are constrained to analyzing a respondent's recollection of the number of months employed on the courrent job. Although this is not as reliable or meaningful as a longitudinal analysis, which would monitor a respondent's job status over a larger period of time, it may provide some indication of job stability. Another complicating factor in our analysis is that our sample includes both WIN I terminees and WIN II terminees, with the latter group obviously having less potential for time-on-the-job. We adjust for this factor in our multivariate analysis.

Table 13 provides a preliminary view of job tenure patterns for the respondent group, again distinguished by source of job. It is noteworthy that the average job tenure for those respondents now fully employed is 12 months, with virtually no sex differential (11.5 for men vs. 12.3 for women). This high average is particularly impressive in view of the fact that it includes so many recent terminees for whom post-program experiences are severely constrained.

The distinction between WIN I and WIN II terminees is undoubtedly reflected in the much higher tenure reported for jobs located with WIN assistance, as WIN I terminees were more likely than WIN II terminees to have used WIN as a job source. A clear distinction between males and females shows up in the job tenure associated with jobs located through the want ads, with

Table 13: Job Tenure, by Source of Job

	ES	WIN	FRIENDS	WANT ADS	PRIVATE AGENCY	UNION	EMPLOYER DIRECTLY	OTHER
Average Months on Present Job:								
Males (N=99)	10.6	15.0	9.1	15.6	Ø	4.0	10.8	12.0
Females (N=203)	11.3	13.7	11.1	6.5	3.8	Ø	[illegible].0	13.7
Total (N=302)	11.0	14.0	10.3	10.6	3.8	4.0	12.2	13.3

male jobs manifesting a great deal more stability than female jobs. In view of the fact that the jobs female respondents locate through the want ads also pay the lowest wages (Table 11), want ads look like a distinctly inferior job source for female terminees. Private agencies do only marginally better in terms of weekly wages, and still worse in terms of job tenure.

Table 14 summarizes our multivariate analyses of job tenure. Equation 14.1 is presented simply to demonstrate that measured demographic characteristics have no apparent influence on job tenure; the sex variable was so insignificant that it did not enter our step-wise regressions.

In equation 14.2 we confirm that the amount of time since WIN termination is the most important determinant of job tenure. Our "LeftWIN" variable is coded:

1 = left 1971 or earlier
2 = left Jan. - June, 1972
3 = left July - Dec., 1972
4 = left in 1973

Thus, WIN II terminees are those who fall into categories 3 and 4. Given their relatively brief exposure to the labor market since leaving WIN, it is not surprising that their typical job tenure is much shorter.

Alternative computations with specific job sources yielded no significant relationships. The only relationship approaching statistical significance is that reported here for jobs found through public employment agencies ("S-ES/WIN"): Even after controlling for the amount of time that has elapsed since program termination, WIN and ES appear to provide a bit more job stabilit

Table 14: Determinants of Job Tenure

(14.1) Tenure = 14.1 + .0 Age - 1.3 Race - 1.5 Educ. $R^2 = .013$
(in months) (1.5) (1.3)

(14.2) Tenure = 31.6 + .0 Age - 1.0 Race - 5.4 LeftWIN - .5 Voct. + .0 Wages + 1.8 S-ES/WIN $R^2 = .254$
(1.3) (9.5) (1.7)

It is interesting to note that neither vocational training nor wages have a significant impact on tenure. With respect to wages, we hypothesized that people would have a greater incentive to stay on higher-paying jobs, at least to the extent that they have some control over job tenure. The hypothesis is not confirmed by the available data, however.

It appears, then, that job tenure is not much affected by measured demographic variables or specific job sources. The only meaningful relationship, with borderline statistical significance, is reflected in the fact that jobs found through ES and WIN appear to provide a bit more stability.

Expected Earnings:

To provide a more comprehensive measure of job quality, we have combined our data on wages and job tenure into an estimate of expected earnings. The expected earnings depicted in Table 15 is simply the product of weekly wages (Table 11) and job tenure (Table 13), multiplied by four. Thus, it conveys the mean earnings actually received by our respondents from their current jobs.

The figures in Table 15 are quite revealing in several respects. WIN emerges as a relatively good source of jobs for both men and women, with the differentials often quite striking. In the case of female respondents, the earnings from full-time jobs found through want ads or private agencies are grossly inferior to those found through other media. For male respondents however, want ads are apparently a good source of quality jobs.

Table 15: Expected Earnings, by Source

		ES	WIN	FRIENDS	WANT ADS	PRIVATE	UNION	EMPLOYER DIRECTLY	OTHER
Males	(N=99)	5724	8580	5496	8798	Ø	3152	6869	5952
Females	(N=203)	5786	6082	4529	2236	1490	Ø	5668	6138
Total	(N=302)	5764	6608	5026	4706	1490	3152	6246	6065

IV Longitudinal Perspectives

A primary objective of our study was to determine the status of former WIN clients two years subsequent to program termination. To do this, it was our intention to relocate clients we had interviewed two years earlier and assess their current status. However, as explained in the introduction, a shift in priorities at DOL compelled us to cut back on this effort in favor of more information on WIN II terminees. Nevertheless, our early efforts did produce enough re-interviews (72) to provide a basis for a discussion of longitudinal status changes. In this chapter we will examine the status of this re-interview group.

Current Status

The labor force status of the re-interview group is roughly the same as that of the sample as a whole. The labor force participation rates, for example, are 76 percent for both the sample and subsample females and close to 100 percent for the males in each group. Unemployment rates are virtually identical as well.

The wages received by the re-interview group are slightly higher than those received by the rest of the sample, but the differences are not significant. The average full-time wage for re-interviewed males was $159 a week, as compared with $147 for the terminee sample as a whole. Among female respondents the average wages were $112 and $106, respectively.

Status Determinants

Because our sample of re-interviews is small, the potential for multi-

variable analysis is quite limited. Nevertheless, we have attempted to identify at least some of the salient relationships between personal background and current job status. Of particular interest in this regard is the question of whether current job status is related to job status two year's ago, i.e., whether there is some sort of longitudinal stability to WIN pay-offs. Table 16 summarizes our limited findings.

Two equations are presented in Table 16; the first relating to the current job status of the re-interview group, the second relating to the status of the whole sample (equation 16.2 is the same as equation 10.2). For both groups we attempt to explain job status on the basis of demographic characteristics and vocational training experience ("Voct"). For the re-interview group we add to that explanation by including three pieces of information obtained in our 1971 interviews, namely:

"Welfare" - how many months the person was on welfare prior to entering WIN *

"Exp" - whether the person had any full-time job experience prior to entering WIN

"71 Job" - whether the person was employed when interviewed in 1971

One can begin to digest Table 16 by noting that the explanatory power of equation 16.1 is nearly four times larger than that of equation 16.2, as manifested in their respective R^2s. This suggests that longitudinal variables are, indeed, an important determinant of current status. Upon examining equation 16.1, it is evident where the added explanatory

* This variable would have little significance for the current WIN program as eligible clients are supposed to enter WIN when they apply for welfare.

Table 16: Determinants of Job Status

For Longitudinal Subsample (N=70):

(16.1) Probability of Employment = .301 + .007 Age (1.0) + .081 Race (0.8) - .061 Voct. (.6) - .067 Welfare (1.0) + .086 Expl (0.7) + .358 '71 Job (3.1)

$R^2 = .201$

For Entire Sample (N=567):

(16.2) Probability of Employment = .7 + .005 Age (1.8) - .19 Sex (3.7) + .18 Educ. (4.3) - .009 Race + .014 Voct. + .008 Time

$R^2 = .058$

power comes -- from "71 Job." Thus,the most significant determinant of job status in 1973 is the client's job status in 1971; all other available variables have little impact (the education and sex variables did not even enter a stepwise regression).

The extraordinarily undimensional strength of equation 16.1 suggests that there is a positive and unique pay-off to WIN services. Apparently, a successful movement into employment has a high degree of longitudinal stability. Thus, short-run measures of occupational or earnings changes may seriously underestimate the true impact of WIN.

Given the small size and limited nature of our sample it is not possible to subject our observations to rigorous examination. But, the nature of the results underscores the kind of insights which may be provided by longitudinal studies which incorporate control groups and can guage status changes on a more frequent basis.