

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 141 605

CE 011 747

TITLE Summaries of R & D Reports. No. 17.
 INSTITUTION Employment and Training Administration (DOL),
 Washington, D.C.
 PUB DATE Jun 77
 NOTE 26p.
 AVAILABLE FROM National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port
 Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22151

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Abstracts; *Employment Problems; *Employment
 Programs; *Employment Services; Federal Programs;
 Health Personnel; *Research Projects

ABSTRACT

These summaries of research and development reports are issued by the Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor (DOL) and are designed to provide pertinent information about specific research and development (R&D) studies. Each of the 10 summaries includes availability and cost (where applicable), source of the report, completion date, contract number, subject of the report, title, abstract, and a file number. (The file number is part of a filing system organized by the major categories of employment and training operation: Planning and administration, applicant services, placement services, employer services, correction/legal, public employment programs, manpower economic and social policies, and special manpower research grants--not elsewhere classified.) Titles of the reports included are "Health Manpower Employment," "Youth in the WIN Program," "What Has Been Learned from the Work Incentive Program and Related Experiences: A Review of Research with Policy Implications," "The Impact of Work Tests on the Employment Behavior of Welfare Recipients," "The Implementation of CETA in Ohio," "Improving Employment Opportunities for Female Black Teenagers in New York City," "The Comparative Labor Market Role of Newspaper Help Wanted Ads and Public Employment Service Job Listings," "Back on the Street--From Prison to Poverty," "Rural Oriented R&D Projects Supported by ETA/USDL: A Review and Synthesis," and "Employment Service Management; Job Marching; Employer Services; Job Search; Public Employment; Job Placement." (SH)

 * Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
 * materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
 * to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
 * reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
 * of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
 * via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
 * responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
 * supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ROUTE TO

| |
|--|
| |
| |
| |
| |

U.S. Department of Labor
Employment and Training Administration
Office of Research and Development
Washington, D.C. 20213



DISTRIBUTION NOTE - see next page

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SUMMARIES OF R&D REPORTS

NO. 17
JUNE 1977

This issue continues changes to facilitate your use of our products:
These include:

- A new format that provides clear identification of key information.
- A file structure (see attached) that organizes this and subsequent issues.
- An order form to be used in ordering copies of specific reports.

These summaries tell many of our readers all they need or want to know about specific research and development reports. They are designed to meet this need for readers whose time is limited. Many other readers will want or need to see the full report, having had their interest aroused by the summary. The enclosed order forms are provided to make ordering quick and convenient.

If you would like to know about related research and development, discuss research and development findings with a member of the Employment and Training Administration, or contact the individuals who conducted the research, call the number that is printed on each page (202-376-7258). No collect calls please. One or two names of ORD staff members are noted whom you may ask for more information. If you would like additional copies of a report for distribution to a particular group that would put it to use, please ask for them. You may want to suggest ways to put particular findings or set of findings to work in making policy or in administering a program, or to arrange for a meeting of a particular group to discuss the relevance of a set of findings or a product to the members' work. Perhaps you can suggest a way of packaging that would facilitate use of the material.

We would appreciate ideas such as these, or questions that go into greater detail than were answered by the report itself. We can't promise to do everything you suggest, but we do promise to listen carefully, and do all we can, given our "personpower" and resources and priorities, to follow up on your ideas. Thank you.

ED141605

CE 011 747

IN THIS ISSUE*

OF INTEREST TO:

Planners and Administrators

Allied Health Field Expected to Continue Growing
How Decisions Were Made on Programs, and Patterns of
Client Usage and Service as CETA Prime Sponsors Started
Work in Ohio

High Dropout and Low Placement Rates of Youth in the WIN
Program -- Long Participation Suggested
What Has Been Learned from the WIN Program -- A Review of
Research with Policy Implications
Welfare Recipients and the Impact of Work Tests
A Review and Synthesis of Rural Oriented R&D Projects

Applicant Services Personnel

How one Project Improved Employment Opportunities for
Female Black Teenagers in New York City
Little Financial Assistance Available to Releasees from
Prison
A Review and Synthesis of Rural Oriented R&D Projects

Employer Service Personnel

Why and How Employment Service is Used
Want Ads Used more by Employers and Have more Openings
than ES

To Order Copies:

A limited supply of reports is available from the Employment and Training Administration; when this supply is exhausted, copies must be purchased from a federally operated information storage and retrieval system (NTIS), National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22151. Copies from NTIS are available in hard copy or microfiche. Send remittance with order directly and specify the accession number (PB plus a 6 digit number) given in the listing. NTIS information number is - (703) 321-8500.

Priority for free material from the Employment and Training Administration will be given to staff of the Administration and CETA and SESA personnel who wish the material for utilization purposes. Arrangements have been made with the Office of Information to distribute the Monograph Series. Order forms for ORD and Office of Information are attached.

*Valerie Williams of the ORD staff has been principally responsible for the preparation of the project summaries in this issue.

FILE STRUCTURE

This filing system may be used to file project summaries and other related materials by subject matter. It is organized by the major categories of employment and training operation (i.e., Planning and Administration, Applicant Services Placement, etc.). Each summary here (and in subsequent issues) has a file indication number in the upper right hand corner. You may find it desirable to separate and retain this file system for future use.

FILE KEY

SUBJECT AREAS

- 1-100 Planning and Administration**
Information on the theory and practice of setting up and running of manpower programs
 - 1-100 Needs Analysis**
Labor market information — identification of manpower service needs — projections
 - 1-200 Resource Analysis**
Identification and mobilization of community resources — universities, volunteers, support groups, etc.
 - 1-300 Program Design**
Means of structuring programs to meet needs
 - 1-400 Management**
General ways of organizing and supervising manpower resources not listed below
 - 1-410 Management Planning**
Information on planning staff, finances, etc.
 - 1-420 Program Direction**
Ways of organizing and supervising staff
 - 1-430 Management Control**
Management information systems, financial, subgrant/contract management
 - 1-500 Program Specific Administration**
Planning and administration information that is only applicable for specific manpower programs — WIN, ES, CETA
 - 1-900 Other**
Information on planning and administration not covered by above classifications
- 2-000 Applicant Services**
Information on providing services to manpower program participants
 - 2-100 Recruitment**
Means of attracting manpower program participants
 - 2-200 Intake/Assessment**
Ways of inducing and assessing manpower program participants (see also 2-440 Counseling and Testing)
 - 2-300 Client Skill/Knowledge Development (Training)**
General information on training programs not listed below
 - 2-310 Remedial Training**
Information on courses and programs that focus on basic skills such as Basic Education, language skills, etc.
 - 2-320 Work Adjustment Training**
Programs that are oriented toward entrants and re-entrants to the labor market such as: in school youth, work experience, prevocational orientation courses, etc.
 - 2-330 Occupational Skill Development**
Information on programs, curriculum and courses for entry or upgrading within occupations. Includes institutional, on-the-job, and other non-apprentice training
 - 2-340 Apprentice Training**
Information on apprentice training — administration, entry, training techniques, etc.

- 2-400 **Support Services**
General information on providing support to participants of manpower programs not listed below
- 2-410 **Child Care**
- 2-420 **Transportation**
- 2-430 **Health**
- 2-440 **Counseling and Testing**
- 2-450 **Coaching**
- 2-460 **Supported Employment**
Information on programs that provide supported employment such as financially supported "businesses," sheltered workshops, etc.
- 2-900 **Other**
Information on applicant services not covered by above classifications.
- 3-000 **Placement Services**
General information on services designed to bring together and match jobs with applicants
- 3-100 **Employer Relations/Job Development**
Information on obtaining job orders in general or specifically for an individual including public relations, advertisement, direct solicitation, etc.
- 3-200 **Job Matching, Referral and Follow-Up**
Processes of referring to and following up with employers
- 3-900 **Other**
Information on Placement Services not listed above
- 4-000 **Employer Services**
General information on providing technical services to specific employers or improving the economic climate of the community.
- 4-100 **Technical Assistance**
Information on helping employers with personnel problems including: EEO compliance, turnover, job analysis, upgrading, etc.
- 4-200 **Economic Development**
Programs to improve the economic climate of the community in general or specific sectors including minority business development, plant location assistance, etc.
- 4-900 **Other**
Information on Employer Services not listed above
- 5-000 **Corrections/Legal**
Information on the design and conduct of programs for offenders. These include programs for inmates, pre-trial intervention, work release, etc.
- 6-000 **Public Employment Programs**
Information on programs to place individuals in public employment including*— Public employment, Emergency employment, etc.
- 7-000 **Manpower Economic and Social Policies**
Information relevant to the formulation and direction of National and Regional Manpower Policy
- 8-000 **Special Manpower Research Grants (not elsewhere classified)**
Information on grants not listed in above categories that are limited to special focus areas
- 8-100 **Manpower Institutional Grants**
- 8-200 **Doctoral Dissertations**
- 8-300 **Small Grant Research Projects**
- 8-900 **Other**

| | |
|--|---|
| Subject: Allied Health Field Expected to Continue Growing | File: 1-100-07 Needs Analysis |
| | Contract No: 42-25-72-10 |
| | Completion Date: October 1976 |
| | Availability & Cost: PB 258050/AS - \$6.75 |

Title and Description:

Health Manpower Employment

This study sought to determine whether the apparent decrease in hospital occupancy rates over the period 1968-1973 had some direct effect on the alleged shortage of allied health personnel. The natural consequence would be a cutback in the training and employment of health care workers. More important than the drop in occupancy rates was the shift from inpatient to outpatient services and the introduction of alternative health care providers, such as HMO's and neighborhood health centers.

The study is centered around the tremendous growth in the health care sector over the last 50 years. While the original health care team consisted of physician, nurse and aide, the current estimates of different types of health care occupations range around 450. While progress in medical technology during the five-year study period (1968-1973) has transformed medical examination and treatment into a technologically-intensive service, the latter has by no means become labor-saving. On the contrary, as new technology is introduced more, not fewer, specialized technicians and technologists are needed. In addition, the degree of specialization has increased. Thus, substantial employment opportunities follow the large capital investments in this sector.

The incredibly high personnel turnover rates of allied health manpower has been due to: 1) wages which have not kept pace with their industrial counterparts; 2) limited upward mobility, as a result of administrative inaction and alleged professional licensure practices, and a lack of in-hospital training programs; and 3) the persistent underemployment of skilled workers. Thus, high turnover rates tend to exaggerate the demand for health care workers.

While occupancy rates in the United States hospitals during the period 1968-1973 declined from 78.2 percent to 75.4 percent, bed capacity in short-term non-federal hospitals increased by 12 percent. Adjusting the decreased occupancy rate by discounting the increase in bed capacity, hospital utilization over the five-year study period showed a net increase of 8.1 percent. In Boston-Cambridge, while the number of hospitals and beds remained constant, hospital employment increased 25.4 percent. Outpatient visits increased 31.4 percent (compared to 56 percent nationally), and employment in outpatient facilities almost doubled (97.8 percent over the five-year period).

Continued . . .

*Prices subject to change

The decline in occupancy was due to an increase in the number of beds, which exceeded the actual increase in demand. Still, the employment of health care personnel grew faster than the demand (utilization) of health services. It appears that this second trend will continue. Employment prospects from the viewpoint of allied health personnel should be optimistic. The following are some major factors contributing to this trend:

1) The labor-intensive nature of health services will continue.

2) As health technology becomes more sophisticated, increasing numbers of specially-skilled workers will be required.

3) Emphasis on alternative health care providers will result in a shift from hospital-based inpatient care to outpatient. The rapid growth of outpatient care will not be offset by any possible reduction in the growth of inpatient facilities and staff. Moreover, the geographical distribution of physicians remains uneven, and the absorption of certain physician functions by allied health personnel may become necessary.

4) The imminent introduction of some form of national health insurance, in addition to natural population growth, will be an added stimulus for health care services.

Northeastern University
Boston, Massachusetts

Dr. Harold M. Goldstein and Dr. Morris A. Horowitz, Center for Medical Manpower Studies

For more information: William Throckmorton, (202) 376-7629
Charles Phillips, (202) 376-7258

| | |
|--|---|
| Subject: High Dropout and Low Placement Rates of Youth in the WIN Program - Long Participation Suggested | File: 1-500-03 Program Special Administration Contract No: 51-11-72-04 Completion Date: November 1975 Availability & Cost: \$7.75 NTIS PB247365/AS |
| Title and Description: <u>Youth In The WIN Program</u> <p>This study examines the reasons for the high dropout and low placement rates for youth in the Work Incentive (WIN) program, for which empirical data have been lacking. It was based on interviews with WIN participants.</p> <p>The report shows that differences in the characteristics of participants' program exposure were attributable to city-to-city differences in the WIN program itself, rather than to variations in the characteristics of the participants. Participation in one or another program component differed greatly from city to city, and was unrelated participants' age, sex, race, or pre-WIN work experience. The report finds that WIN staffs tended in general to assign participants who were better prepared for employment to high-employment-potential WIN components, such as on-the-job training (OJT), and that these individuals were more likely to receive direct staff support in job development and placement.</p> <p>The study analyzes the reasons for the program's 28 percent dropout rate. Program size appeared to affect this rate slightly, with large sites usually showing slightly greater dropout rates than smaller ones. Periods of non participation in the program--particularly among black males--appeared to result in a large number of dropouts. In addition, participants who received direct support from WIN staff members had better chances of staying on. Finally, the longer an individual stayed in the program, the better were his or her chances of continuing in WIN. Race, sex, pre-WIN background or program component exposure did not seem to affect the dropout rate.</p> <p>The study also focused on the participants' work experience after they left WIN. Immediately after leaving the program, 61 percent were in the labor force (three-quarters of them at work, the others looking for work); eleven percent were in school or the armed forces; and the remainder were doing "nothing special." Differences in exposure to program components were related to immediate post-WIN activity. Dropouts were more likely to be doing "nothing special" than nondropouts, but were only slightly less likely to be in the labor force. Occupational distributions varied by geographical location, sex, age, education, and pre-WIN job experience, but not by program exposure. Reported earnings, almost always modest, differed from city to city.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Continued . . .</p> <p>*Prices subject to change</p> | |

FILE: 1-500-03
Program Special
Administration

While the trend toward shorter training periods for all WIN participants is increasing, the data suggest that, at least among the younger participants, long program participation leads to successful outcomes. OJT and job sponsorship--available on a limited basis and usually to the eldest participants--appear to have lasting effect. Thus, the report finds, expanding OJT and job sponsorship can lower dropout rates.

Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc.
Washington, D.C.

Laure Sharp, Ann Richardson, Bruce Dunning

For more information: Jack Newman, (202) 376-6520

| | |
|--|---|
| Subject: What Has Been Learned From The WIN Program | File: 1-500-04 Program Specific Administration |
| | Contract No: 5F-25-76-01 |
| | Completion Date: February 1977 |
| | Availability & Cost: R&D Monograph #49 |

Title and Description:

What Has Been Learned from the Work Incentive Program and Related Experiences: A Review of Research with Policy Implications.

This report, reviews research of the last 9 years on whether the Work Incentive Program (WIN) of the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare helps persons get off the welfare rolls by training them for or placing them in gainful employment. Since even before the start of the WIN program in 1967, questions have been raised on the desire to work, trainability, and performance on the job of those receiving public assistance. Goodwin's survey provides these answers:

Welfare recipients want to work and when feasible to work. The barriers that prevent them from working include: lack of skills, poor health, need for child care, and lack of jobs in which they can earn enough to support their families. Those on welfare have less education, less resources, and larger families than other low-income persons.

WIN helps some persons improve their earnings and increase the length of time in jobs, but this assistance succeeds more often when other services besides job referrals are offered.

WIN training does not help large numbers of welfare recipients obtain work in the regular job market, and those who enter WIN and fail to obtain jobs may be harmed by becoming more dependent on public assistance.

Encouraging employment of more welfare recipients by giving tax credits to businesses hiring them, by not deducting all the earnings from their welfare grants, and by imposing stiffer work requirements have had very limited impact. This is because little has been done to change the job market faced by welfare recipients.

Forcing those on public assistance to work off their relief payments in a makeshift job is costly, inefficient, and resented by work supervisors and by participants. On the other hand, many welfare recipients are willing to work and can perform in publicly supported jobs. However, the cost of such jobs is greater than the payments under public assistance, and few persons in such positions later find other work in the job market.

Continued . . .

*Prices subject to change

Many persons get on and off the welfare rolls and rise above and fall below the poverty level each year. But low income families headed by women (especially black women) are much less likely to rise above poverty than those headed by men.

Little is known on why low income men stay with or desert their families, although there is reason to believe that desertion would be less likely if the men could earn enough to support their families adequately.

Given the conclusions, Goodwin sees three options open to the Federal and State agencies offering public assistance.

1. Stop trying to train those on welfare and cut back benefits and raise eligibility standards, forcing some recipients to accept low paying jobs that are available.

2. Keep the status quo whereby welfare payments to 3 or 4 million families are accepted as normal, with training offered to some and supplementary benefits such as food stamps continued.

3. Guarantee jobs to persons who are willing and able to work but who cannot find positions, and guarantee an income to those that are unable to work.

Worcester Polytechnical Institute
Worcester, Massachusetts

Leonard Goodwin

For more information: Jack Newman, (202) 376-6520

Subject:

Welfare Recipients and The Impact of Work Tests

File: 1-500-05 Program
Specific Administration

Contract No:

51-25-73-03

Completion Date:

May 1976

Availability & Cost:

NTIS PB256763/AS \$5.00

Title and Description:

The Impact of Work Tests on the Employment Behavior of Welfare Recipients

This study was launched in late 1973, when the U.S. Departments of Labor and Agriculture were considering proposals to "strengthen" the Food Stamp (FS) work registration program. Interest in increasing the stringency of the FS and Aid to Families with Dependent Children and Aid to Families with Dependent children of Unemployed Fathers (AFDC/AFDC-UF) work tests stems from rising program coverage and cost, which has been particularly dramatic in recent years in the FS program.

The purpose of this study, was to determine whether existing work tests affected the timing and quality of jobs found after a period during which a person both received welfare benefits and had to register with the Employment Service (ES) in connection with their receipt.

The study was based on a survey of 1966 FS and AFDC/AFDC-UF recipients who were registered with the ES as a consequence of work requirements. The respondents came from five cities, in three of which the nationally uniform FS work test was in effect (Fort Worth, Memphis and Omaha) and in two of which local variants of the AFDC/AFDC-UF work test applied (Rochester, N.Y. and San Diego, Ca.). At each site, samples were chosen to be representative of the pool of ES registrants in that locale.

A questionnaire then was designed to capture employment experience following a stretch of unemployment or parttime employment during which they received FS or AFDC/AFDC-UF benefits, depending on the city.

It was found that among the three food stamp cities studies, ES monitoring of work test registrants was most extensive in Memphis, least in Fort Worth. The AFDC/AFDC-UF work test in San Diego engaged in even more extensive monitoring. In these cities, as well as in the other three, ES monitoring was far more extensive for men than for women. There was no evidence that the work test had a significant effect in encouraging the return to work. The question studied was whether being work tested made any difference in the probability of returning to work or in the duration of employment after controlling for a variety of individual characteristics. No significant work encouragement effect of the work test was detected,

Continued . . .

*Prices subject to change

For more information call (202)-376-7258

although the possibility of a weak effect emerged in San Diego. In Omaha, and to an extent also in Rochester, the ES was clearly exerting pressure on those not returning to work.

The results, then, do not prove that there was absolutely no effect of the work test in getting registrants back to work. However, with the possible exception of San Diego, the methods of study were unable to discern any such effect. It was suggested that it is probably safe to conclude that if the work test does have a work encouragement effect, it is small.

Brandeis University
Waltham, Massachusetts

Dr. Leonard J. Hausman

For more information: Jack Newman, (202) 376-6520
Ben Taylor, (202) 376-7249

| | |
|---|--|
| Subject: How Decisions Were Made on Programs, and Patterns of Client Usage and Service as CETA Prime Sponsors Started Work in Ohio | File: 1-300-14 Program Design |
| | Contract No: 21-39-75-10 |
| | Completion Date: 1976 |
| | Availability & Cost: R&D Monograph No. 44 |

Title and Description:

The Implementation of CETA in Ohio

This is a study of the political features of initiating prime sponsor activity in Ohio under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, from 1974 through mid-1976. It covers decisionmaking processes and the content of decisions on the allocation of scarce resources. Specific aspects of group politics, electoral politics, intraorganizational politics, interorganizational politics, and the politics of intergovernmental relations are discussed.

The report focuses on:

Patterns of influence over decisionmaking about CETA at the local level in the 16 Ohio prime sponsorships, other than balance of State

Title I program choices made at the local level

Service deliverers at the local level

Public employment service choices made at the local level

Patterns of client usage of the services provided

Role of the State in Ohio and of the Regional Office of the Employment and Training Administration

The study concluded that the CETA prime sponsor system is highly politicized; that the question of who gets what at the expense of whom is not dealt with directly by anyone; that it is difficult to evaluate the performance of prime sponsors.

Recommendations are directed to these areas:

Client Service Patterns and the Quality of Data for

Program Analysis

Program Comprehensiveness

Public Service Employment

Citizen Input through Manpower Planning Councils

Role of the Regional Office

Role of the State

Continued . . .

*Prices subject to change

For more information call (202)-376-7258

The Ohio State University :
Columbus, Ohio
Dr. Randall B. Ripley

For more information: Richard McAllister, (202) 376-7450
Judah Drob, (202) 376-7258

| | |
|---|------------------------------|
| Subject: How one Project Improved Employment Opportunities for Female Black Teenagers in New York City | File: 2-320-08 Work |
| | Adjustment Training |
| | Contract No: 42-36-73-03 |
| | Completion Date: Winter 1976 |
| Availability & Cost: R&D Monograph No. 47 | |

Title and Description:

Improving Employment Opportunities for Female Black Teenagers in New York City

The project tested the effectiveness of a labor-market-oriented peer group mechanism as a strategy for assisting young black women in their entry into the world of work. An experimental group of 51 young women was matched with a control group of 52, and the experimental group had a significantly higher rate of employment than did the controls.

The experimental group's high rate of employment was attributed to the role that program and staff, including peer aides, played in the job placement process. Eighty-five percent of those in the experimental group held at least one job. In contrast, only 36 percent of the control group became employed at least once.

The program staff recruited young women aged 16 to 19 years old. Those in the experimental group received counseling, were tested, and were organized into five peer groups. Each group met weekly, and in addition members conducted job search interviews, field trips, and engaged in cultural activities. With the assistance of staff they conceived and carried out group projects, including publication of a mini-newspaper and conduct of conferences on topical as well as job-related issues.

Participants developed and carried out job search plans for themselves. They reviewed their experiences in the peer group meetings, conducted role playing exercises, and developed program materials.

Despite the fact that it was not easy to find jobs for this population, placements were made, and attitudes established which made more likely the future success of the participants in the job market.

The report contains detailed accounts of the program's procedures, copies of materials it developed, and an elaborate analysis of the participants and of the peer aides.

Continued . . .

*Prices subject to change

FILE: 2-320-08 Work
Adjustment Training

Hylan Lewis
Mamie Phipps Clark
Richard A. Cloward
Olivia P. Frost
James A. Jones
Sondra Johnson
E. David Nasatir

Metropolitan Applied Research Center in cooperation with the
Northside Center for Child Development
New York, New York

For more information: Diane Edwards, (202) 376-7353
Catherine Howe, (202) 376-7258

| | |
|---|--|
| Subject: Want Ads Used by Employers and Have More Openings Than ES | File: 3-900-01 Contract No: 21-11-74-28 Completion Date: January 1977 Availability & Cost: Monograph in preparation |
| Title and Description: | |
| <u>The Comparative Labor Market Role of Newspaper Help Wanted Ads. and Public Employment Service Job Listings</u> | |
| <p>The employment service and want ads have approximately equal volumes of jobs in their stock at any given time, over all areas, exposing the job seeker to approximately the same volume of listings on initial contact in the job search. However, employers have assigned a considerably smaller role to the employment service than they have to the want ads. In the course of a daily job search the job seeker would encounter a much higher volume of new jobs in the want ads than in the employment service.</p> | |
| <p>A large portion of the employers who list their jobs in the employment service also simultaneously list jobs with the want ads. The employment service has a relatively small portion of the labor market as exclusive employer users, compared to the employers who use the want ads exclusively. Employers who use both mechanisms are unusually heavy users and account for a disproportionate share of the listings in both. The sequence of use suggests that employers who use both regard the employment service as a last resort recruitment device.</p> | |
| <p>The only job market that is identifiable as belonging exclusively to the employment service is that of high-turnover, lower skilled jobs which can be filled almost immediately from the always-present pool of job seekers, or which can be cancelled immediately.</p> | |
| <p>These are the major findings of a study which examined the stocks and flows of jobs listed in want ads and with the public employment service in 12 labor market areas. Implications from these findings are drawn for labor market analysis, and for employment service policy.</p> | |
| <p style="text-align: center;">Miriam Johnson and Marged Sugarman <u>Olympus Research Corporation</u> San Francisco, California</p> | |
| <p>For more information: Bonnie Coe, (202) 376-7360 Ben Taylor, (202) 376-7249</p> | |
| <p>*Prices subject to change</p> | |

For more information call (202)-376-7258

| | |
|--|----------------------------|
| Subject: Little Financial Assistance Available to Releasees from Prison | File: |
| | 5-000-07 Corrections/Legal |
| | Contract No: |
| | 21-11-75-19 |
| | Completion Date: |
| June 1976 | |
| Availability & Cost: | |
| NTIS PR2588801/AS | |

Title and Description:

Back on the Street - From Prison to Poverty

This report identifies the extent and kinds of direct government financial assistance presently available to a releasee departing a state or federal correctional institution. Two previous studies have explored this area, Daniel Glaser's Money Against Crime and Kenneth Lenihan's The Financial Condition of Released Prisoners. The information presented in this report updates portions of those reports.

In preparing the report, questionnaires were sent to each state's corrections department, parole board, work release administrator and correctional industries administrator. The data and statistics in the report derived from the answers provided by these agencies. While recognizing the existence of other programs which provide services to ex-offenders, any of which may be assigned a monetary value, this report concentrates solely on those statutes, practices and programs that give the new releasee immediate economic relief.

The report found that due to the state welfare variations and difficult federal eligibility requirements, the only government assistance a releasee may reasonably expect to receive is gate money. The Federal Bureau of Prisons, in 1962 policy guidelines, described gate money as a gratuity which "when added to personal savings accumulated by the inmate, assures the releasee funds sufficient to enable him to provide frugally for his needs for one week at the place of discharge". The report includes tables which identify the maximum amounts presently authorized by each state and provides comparative data for 1961 and 1971. It was found that the largest distribution of gate money falls within the \$10 to \$100 range (40 states). Unfortunately, most gate money increases have merely tracked the accelerating cost of living.

Another finding in the report was that gratuity amounts actually paid are generally arrived at by one of six methods. A table is included in the report that identifies the method each jurisdiction uses to determine payments.

Continued . . .

*Prices subject to change

Other areas pertaining to the financial resources of releasees include: compulsory saving plan, eligibility for gate money, plans for prolonged income maintenance, clothing and transportation, additional sources of economic assistance and juvenile offenders.

Meaningful financial assistance to released inmates may be justified on numerous grounds. Such aid would play a predominant role within the reintegration process. To successfully reintegrate, the releasee must have a stable economic foundation. His most immediate need is cash. An income maintenance system would satisfy this need, affording the releasee time to locate a worthwhile job, provide resources for the purchase of living essentials pending employment or receipt of the first check, and nurture the equal treatment of ex-offenders with other citizens in need. The rewards to be reaped from advancing reintegration are plentiful. Guaranteed income may result in lower recidivism rates, creating attendant benefits in reduced police, court, corrections and victimization costs.

American Bar Association: Commission on
Correctional Facilities and Services
Washington, D.C.

Melvin T. Axilbund

For more information: Lafayette Grisby, (202) 376-7350
Charles Phillips, (202) 376-7258

| | |
|---|--|
| Subject: A Review and Synthesis of Rural Oriented R&D Projects | File: 1-900-01 Planning & Administration |
| | Contract No: 21-41-76-12 |
| | Completion Date: February 1977 |
| | Availability & Cost: R&D Monograph #50 |
| | |

Title and Description:

Rural Oriented R&D Projects Supported by ETA/USDL: A Review and Synthesis

Seventy-one research and development project reports were reviewed and analyzed in this study.

The report is divided into chapters discussing the demand for rural labor, the supply of rural labor, employment and training programs for rural areas, and conclusions.

The great bulk of the work reviewed was concerned with the demand for and supply of rural labor, and the findings conformed to what is known about the economy as a whole.

The lesser number of projects that were concerned with delivery of services to rural residents produced a number of interesting conclusions:

1. Those projects do best that offer a wide variety of supportive services in addition to basic education and/or training.
2. Program planners need to develop imaginative wage subsidies in order to build in adequate incentive for rural residents to participate in programs in low wage areas, where income from welfare programs may compare favorably with income from working.
3. Program planners should examine innovative transportation programs and/or become involved in the broad area of transportation development.
4. State and/or Federal regulations are necessary to guarantee the incorporation of the disadvantaged into public employment programs.
5. Success in serving the disadvantaged may depend on having program operators who are committed to serving the needs of the intended target groups. These include private non-profit and other agencies rather than elected officials. This implies the need for special target group programs.
6. Programs designed for urban areas may not be adaptable to rural areas if they assume hiring practices, wage rates, job descriptions, and administrative structures which do not exist in rural areas. Incorporation of Federal minimum wage requirements may lead local officials to refuse to implement programs.

Continued . . .

*Prices subject to change

7. Social services necessary for program operation, for example, public transportation and child care, may not exist in rural areas. Their provision requires additional funding for rural programs.

8. Individualized services to applicants are necessitated by the range of problems which affect the rural disadvantaged. Extra staffing is necessary.

9. Employers best equipped for public employment programs for the disadvantaged are either (or both): large, with access to many resources and jobs; or social service oriented, used to dealing with "people" problems.

10. Retention in post-program jobs by participants in public employment programs is most likely where (1) the public employment provided the same job duties as the permanent job; (2) the permanent job pays a higher rate than the public employment job; and (3) the permanent job has the same employer as the public employment job.

Other lessons and conclusions are drawn. A full list of the studies consulted is included.

Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon

Gene S. Leonardson
David M. Nelson

For more information: Judah Drob, (202) 376-7258

| | |
|---|--|
| Subject: Recruitment, Job Search, and The United States Employment Service | File: 3-000-01 Placement Services |
| | Contract No: 20-42-74-34 |
| | Completion Date: 1976 |
| | Availability & Cost*: R&D Monograph #43 |

Title and Description:

Employment Service Management; Job Matching; Employer Services; Job Search; Public Employment Service; Job Placement

The study sought to determine reasons for use or nonuse of public employment service (ES) offices by employers and jobseekers; the frequency, nature, and intensity of use; how services meet users expectations and needs; recommendations for improvement; attitudes toward physical location, hours of operation, and physical layout of ES offices; and how the respondents see the employment service in the context of other job-matching resources and institutions.

Interviews were conducted with employment service personnel, employers, and jobseekers, who are users and nonusers in a representative sample of 20 medium-sized cities.

The report is generally favorable regarding ES performance and employer/jobseeker use of and attitudes toward the ES. Some of the major findings for medium-sized cities during the last 6 months of 1974 are: (1) Two-thirds of vacancies were filled through informal means. Of formal methods, ES was second to newspapers in use and placed 1 out of 17 workers who obtained jobs during the study period. (2) ES was used by 25 percent of all employers (representing 36 percent of all vacancies) and by 28 percent of job finders. (3) Large firms were more likely to use ES and more likely to list a greater percentage of orders and openings than were small firms. The market for ES services was relatively stable. Eighty-five percent of ES-using employers considered their most recent use as typical. Eighty-five percent of ES-using job-seekers were repeat users and would use it again in the same way. (4) ES penetration of the employer community did not appear to be tied to high placement rates. Smaller ES offices and those with low levels of job listings had higher placement rates. (5) ES nonusers, both employers and job-seekers, simply did not need the ES. Their recruitment/jobseeking methods were satisfactory. Their attitudes toward the ES were neutral to favorable. (6) The major complaint against the ES involved the referral/matching process. Employers filled only one opening out of three listed with the ES through ES referral and hired only one ES referral out of three. Of jobseekers, using the ES one-third did not keep the referral appointment and an additional one-fourth found the job filled at the time of their appointment. (7) The Dictionary of Occupational Titles seemed to present problems to both employers and jobseekers.

Continued . . .

*Prices subject to change

FILE: 3-000-01
Placement Services

CAMEL Associates, Inc.
Philadelphia, Pa.

David A. Miller, Project Manager

For more information: Bonnie Coe, (202) 376-7360
Ben Taylor, (202) 376-7249

ORD Order Form

(see monograph order form on next page)

INSTRUCTIONS: 1) Check (✓) for each report you wish to order; 2) check (✓) all the boxes that apply to your planned usage of the report; 3) fill in your name and address and 4) fold, seal and mail (No postage is required).

Please send checked items:

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-------|
| Training or Technical Assistance | For Planned Programs | Background Information | Other |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-------|

- ()
- ()
- ()
- ()
- ()
- ()
- ()
- ()
- ()
- ()
- ()
- ()
- ()
- ()
- ()

| PLANNED USE | CONTRACT/GRANT NUMBER | SUBJECT |
|-------------|-----------------------|--|
| | 42-25-72-10 | Health Manpower Employment |
| | 51-11-72-04 | Youth in the WIN Program |
| | 51-25-73-03 | Impact of Work Tests |
| | 21-11-74-28 | Role of Newspaper Help Wanted Ads and Public Employment. |
| | | Service Job Listings |
| | 21-11-75-19 | Back on the Street - From Prison to Poverty |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

SEND TO: (Please print, this is your mail label.)

name & title _____

address _____

ORD Monograph Order Form

(see order form on previous page for reports not in the monograph series)

INSTRUCTIONS: 1) Check (✓) for each monograph you wish to order; 2) fill in your name and address; and 3) fold, seal and mail. (No postage is required).

Please send items checked

| MONOGRAPH NUMBER | TITLE |
|------------------|--|
| () 43 | Recruitment, Job Search & The U.S. Employment Service |
| () 44 | The Implementation of CETA in Ohio |
| () 47 | Improving Employment Opportunities for Female Black Teenagers in New York City |
| () 49 | What Has Been Learned From The WIN Program |
| () 50 | Rural Oriented R&D Projects |
| () | |
| () | |
| () | |
| () | |
| () | |
| () | |
| () | |
| () | |
| () | |
| () | |
| () | |
| () | |
| () | |
| () | |
| () | |

SEND TO: (Please print, this is your mail label.)

name & title _____
 address _____

ZIP