School-and-Work Programs

A Study of Experience in 136 School Systems

BY

Caroline E. Legg

Carl A. Jessen

Maris M. Proffitt

Bulletin 1947, No. 9

Joint publication of FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY • Office of Education and U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR • Division of Labor Standards

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY . . . . Watson B. Miller, *Administrator*
Office of Education . . . . . John W. Studebaker, *Commissioner*

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

THE TRANSITION of boys and girls from school life to work is frequently an abrupt process. Too often the world of education and the world of employment have held themselves too far apart to help the young person who is ready to enter employment make an easy transition from the status of student to that of worker. Wartime conditions created a new interest in school-and-work programs (1) for educators because the realities of employment were brought closer to the school, and (2) for those concerned with the protection of young workers because of the necessity for safeguarding the interests of these young people while on the job.

Late in 1944 the U. S. Office of Education and the Children's Bureau began making plans for a joint study of school-and-work programs in American high schools. Both of these agencies had previously made studies of wartime school programs which combined school attendance with paid employment. The studies made by the Office of Education had been focused mainly on the educational part of these school-and-work programs; the Children's Bureau studies had been centered principally on the work features. It seemed desirable, therefore, to make a cooperative study which would be concerned with the welfare of the youth as to both his schooling and his work. The present study is the result of this plan.

The study is not comprehensive in the sense of including all types of programs which involve combined school attendance and employment. In order to keep it within manageable proportions it was decided to limit the inquiries to those programs which involved release from school time in order that the student might work for pay. Part-time vocational programs and work during non-school hours or vacations are not included.

School-and-work programs, under which high-school boys and girls are released from some school time to take part-time jobs, gained sudden popularity during the war as a means of meeting demands of employers for young workers and the desire of students to become wage earners, as well as to help in the war effort. In this report the wartime experiences of 136 school systems with such programs are examined, the operation of the programs described, and their strengths and weaknesses analyzed. On the basis of the findings several suggestions are made for the use of school administrators considering establishment of school-and-work programs in the future. One is that these programs must be justified

on the basis of true educational value to the students; no amount of money earned or of assistance in the world's work in peacetime can justify the interruption or undue curtailment of the education of youth in the United States. Another is that school supervision must be relied on to conserve the health and strength of students undertaking this double program and to protect them from hazardous or unhealthful employment. The final suggestion is that to be successful a school-and-work program must rest on a foundation of genuine value to industry and to the community.

The Children's Bureau participation in this study was undertaken through its Industrial Division. Following the transfer of the Children's Bureau, except for the Industrial Division, to the Federal Security Agency on July 16, 1946, the Industrial Division became the Child Labor and Youth Employment Branch of the Division of Labor Standards in the U. S. Department of Labor, and as such has carried through to completion the project undertaken jointly with the U. S. Office of Education.

The cooperation of the agencies and the staff members assigned to the study has been excellent and effective. Most inspirational of all has been the whole-hearted assistance given to the project by school officials and others who have supplied the information upon which the report is based. To all of these, our thanks for their help.

The authors of this report are Caroline E. Legg, of the Research Section of the Child Labor and Youth Employment Branch of the Division of Labor Standards, U. S. Department of Labor; and Carl A. Jessen and Marie M. Proffitt, both of the Division of Secondary Education, U. S. Office of Education. The planning and field work of the study were participated in by all three authors and by Elizabeth S. Johnson and Louise Q. Blodgett of the Research Section of the Child Labor and Youth Employment Branch. The contribution of this Branch was under the general direction of Beatrice McConnell, Assistant Director of the Division of Labor Standards and in charge of the program of the Branch.

WILLIAM L. CONNOLLY,
Director
Division of Labor Standards, U. S. Department of Labor

JOHN W. STUDEBAKER,
Commissioner
U. S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency

SCHOOL-AND-WORK PROGRAMS

I. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

THE ENORMOUS manpower demands during the war years resulted in a vast increase in the number of high-school students working for pay. The large majority of these students worked before and after school hours, on Saturdays, and during vacations. Some were registered in "cooperative programs" in which their employment was scheduled by the school as part of their training for a specialized vocation, the type of program offered under State plans in accordance with the national vocational education acts, commonly known as the Smith-Hughes and George-Deen Acts. Others were released from school for part of each school day in order that they might report for employment, sometimes as part of a planned program of the school and sometimes not so planned.

Work outside of school hours and cooperative work-study programs of a vocational character are probably the two most significant methods by which high-school students secure work experience. Both patterns of student work are well represented in educational and employment practice and literature in these fields is replete with illustrations. Therefore, in this survey the U. S. Office of Education and the Children's Bureau have centered their attention upon the third procedure, a more recent venture in secondary education, namely, release from school for part of the usual school day in order to facilitate employment for pay.

The release plan is not characterized by the close coordination between study and work found in cooperative programs; this is partly because these students generally are not employed on jobs of which they expect to make careers. The release-from-school plan, on the other hand, does not have the detached characteristics of outside-of-school-hours employment under which the school program goes on more or less unaffected by the student's employment. A school-and-work program involving released time is primarily an attempt by the school to help the student who desires to work, and as far as possible to make his employment and school schedule fit together in a workable way.

In many schools the release plan was evolved largely for the purpose of retaining in school, for at least part of the time, students who otherwise would have withdrawn altogether to go to work. Some school administrators felt themselves impelled by wartime circumstances to adopt such a plan; others embraced the

745722—47——2

school-and-work plan as an opportunity to bring work experience into the lives of young people. The release-from-school plan provided certain lessons and developed certain values, together with techniques and procedures, which many educators feel should not be lost. The urgent manpower needs of the war have disappeared, but there is still the need for finding ways in which students can have a supervised and gradual introduction into employment before complete severance from school.

It is the intention in this report to canvass the experiences in different regions having the release plan, and to study the school's participation in the control of school and work activities in order to make known both the advantages and disadvantages in school-and-work arrangements other than those under established cooperative programs. It is believed that these programs have certain features and procedures of value for schools or school systems, and for employer, labor, and community groups concerned with this phase of youth employment.

II. NATURE AND EXTENT OF THE STUDY

Letters of inquiry on the subject of school-and-work programs in secondary schools were sent in the spring of 1945 to superintendents of school systems in each of the 92 cities of the United States having a population of 100,000 or more according to the 1940 census. State superintendents of education were informed about the mail inquiry and at the same time were asked to suggest names of smaller cities, towns, and rural communities in their States that had developed significant school-and-work programs. As a result of this canvass names of 202 communities were added to the original list of larger cities, and a total mailing list of 294 school systems in 40 States was developed.

Replies to these letters of inquiry were received from school officials in 55 of the cities of 100,000 or more population, and in 110 of the smaller cities and towns, a total of 165 school systems in 37 States.

Analysis of these returns revealed that 133 communities, including 48 of the 92 cities of 100,000 or more population (87 percent of the 55 that replied to the inquiry), had to a greater or lesser extent during the war years either shortened their regular school sessions or provided for program adjustment usually with release from one or more class periods for certain high-school pupils who desired to work; that 26 communities had made no provision for extra work time for students, except in connection with cooperative programs operated under the national vocational education acts, with which this study is not dealing. The other 6 were not

classified because information was incomplete. (A copy of the letter of inquiry appears on page 58.)

In addition to the mail inquiry a more intensive study was made by representatives of the Children's Bureau and the Office of Education through visits to 12 cities, 9 of which were among those replying to the letters. The selection of cities was made with the purpose of obtaining, by means of a limited number of visits, as broad a representation as possible of different kinds of programs of varying sizes throughout the country. The 12 cities included in this more intensive part of the survey were Torrington, Conn.; East Orange and Newark, N. J.; Toledo, Ohio; Indianapolis, Ind.; Greeneville and Knoxville, Tenn.; Madison, Wis.; Kansas City, Mo.; Salt Lake City, Utah; and San Diego and Ventura, Calif. The total number of school systems, therefore, on which school-and-work data for this report were obtained was 136. They were distributed by States as follows:

Alabama	2	Kentucky	2	Oklahoma	3
Arizona	5	Louisiana	2	Pennsylvania	4
Arkansas	3	Maine	3	Rhode Island	7
California	10	Massachusetts	4	South Dakota	3
Colorado	2	Michigan	7	Tennessee	7
Connecticut	3	Minnesota	5	Texas	2
Delaware	1	Mississippi	2	Utah	1
Florida	4	Missouri	1	Vermont	2
Georgia	2	New Hampshire	1	Washington	6
Idaho	1	New Jersey	7	West Virginia	2
Illinois	3	New York	8	Wisconsin	3
Indiana	6	North Dakota	2		
Iowa	4	Ohio	6		

The popularity of school-and-work programs in California was quite apparent from the returns from cities in that State. Interest also appeared quite widespread in New York, Michigan, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Indiana, Ohio, and Washington.

The data obtained by letter were on the whole quite complete, but because the amount of detailed information on specific aspects of school-and-work programs varied greatly, it is not possible to make statements of a statistical nature in regard to participation, procedures in placement, supervision on the job and at school, school credit, and other phases of such work programs for every city in the study. However, there were enough adequate answers to many of the questions asked on these subjects, and enough additional comments made by school administrators, to use them at least for showing certain practices and trends.

A classification of the 136 communities according to whether or not they had supervised school-and-work programs was impossible on the basis of data obtained through this study. Programs

which grew unplanned because of the war usually had some elements of supervision, although the city school system itself in many cases would probably not have considered that it had a supervised program or that it had the situation under satisfactory control. Indeed, this picture of partial or spotty supervision and control was probably more common than a planned approach to supervision among the 136 communities with which this report is concerned. However, these were communities where the schools actually did something about a difficult situation and it is to their credit that they attempted, as best they could, to gear to the accelerations of a nation at war and at the same time keep educational standards from floundering.

III. PURPOSES OF SCHOOL-AND-WORK PROGRAMS

From the standpoint of school officials

The purposes of school administrators in setting up school-and-work programs were many and varied. They may be summed up as follows:

1. *To meet the wartime labor situation.*—The most commonly stated reason for maintaining any kind of program of release from school for work was the war emergency with its unprecedented need for labor. High-school principals everywhere were faced with overwhelming demands for their pupils to be given time off for a job. Thousands of pupils left school altogether; like any epidemic once started, the idea of work swept through the schools from one would-be worker to another. By the second year of the war it had gained such proportions that work came to be thought of in many places as a more or less accepted part of the school program. Something had to be done about it. If shortening the classroom schedule could serve to keep some youngsters in school, because it meant that they could accept certain part-time jobs, it was usually deemed the sensible thing to do, for the emergency at least. In several cities development of school-and-work arrangements for high-school students was part of a broad back-to-school drive.

2. *To furnish exploratory experience in the occupational world.*—Concurrently in the minds of many school administrators was the idea that this part-time work of the students was offering some excellent opportunities for exploration in the field of vocations, and even if not along lines that would be selected for careers, was furnishing certain social experiences in preparation for adult life. Thus a more substantial purpose for carrying on a school-and-work program grew out of, and even along with, the primary reason for its sudden bursting forth on the educational horizon.

3. *To keep students in school.*—At the same time it was recognized that for many pupils the chance to earn money while still attending school not only meant that they could continue their education but added to their sense of well-being because they could have clothes as good as those of the other students and be self-sufficient in many other particulars.

4. *To help unadjusted students.*—Not infrequently part-time work provided a wholesome emotional outlet for certain unadjusted pupils. Instances were cited in several places of better scholarship and much improved personalities when unstable or dissatisfied boys and girls were allowed to take on as part of their school-supervised program some job carefully selected by the school counselor.

5. *To help control conditions outside school hours.*—In one large city the superintendent expressly stated that school-and-work programs were largely an attempt to regulate the long hours of work after school that had become prevalent during the war with detrimental effect on the health and on the scholastic standing of pupils.

In a few places inadequate school facilities made a shortened session necessary, especially where the pupils went to school in shifts and certain hours were overlapping. The recourse to part-time release for work was quite a natural development under such circumstances.

From the standpoint of the students

Interviews with student workers in the schools visited and reports of school officials, both verbal and written, indicated that the reasons for students participating in school-and-work programs largely paralleled the reasons that school administrators gave for developing the programs. Indeed the motivation of students usually was a combination of factors that, briefly, were as follows:

1. *To render a patriotic service.*—In response to the need of our Government and of many industries for workers to man production lines and necessary civilian services during the war crisis, many youth—both boys and girls—arranged in cooperation with the schools to give part of the school day to work as a means of adding to the manpower of the Nation. Many of this group were motivated by this patriotic purpose—it was "the thing to do" at the time; they expected to return to their full-time school schedule when the war was over.

2. *To earn money.*—Many young boys and girls whose chances for becoming economically independent lagged far behind their physical and social maturity were attracted into employment in order that they might have money for satisfactions that could otherwise not have been realized. Others wanted work that they might continue in school; some were even saving for college. Even in this period of exceptional prosperity, instances were cited by more than one school principal of pupils who were faced with the alternatives of school and work, or no school at all. Several of the young workers interviewed were contributing to the support of younger brothers and sisters; one tenth-grade girl, bereft of family, was caring for children and doing housework in return for a home and small wages.

3. *To substitute employment for study during part of the school day.*—Many youth had a burning desire to do a man's work and to participate in adult activities which could not be satisfied through a full-time school program. This was especially true for those who expected to go to work on or before completion of high school, for those who learned better by having some concrete experiences, and for those whose interests were largely in manipulative work rather than in abstract symbols and characters.

4. *To pave the way for a full-time job later on.*—The opportunity for employment on a part-time basis was sometimes accompanied by an expressed or implied understanding that a youth released from school to work part time would, if satisfactory, be kept on in full-time work when he had completed school and was seeking a full-time job.

IV. TYPES OF ARRANGEMENTS FOR RELEASING STUDENTS FOR WORK

Variety of programs

The variety in the types of programs developed in the 136 schools and school systems supplying reports usable in this study indicates the wide range of resourcefulness with which educators have approached the problems of students who are released from school part time to go to work. Types of arrangements, as the term is here used, refer principally to the ways in which the schools worked out schedules for dividing the student's time between the classroom and the job. Variety in programs from the standpoint of supervision over the student's work program is discussed later.

Cooperative programs not reimbursed from Federal funds

At the outset a word ought to be said about nonreimbursed cooperative programs. Earlier in this bulletin it was made clear

that this study would avoid duplication by not including analysis of vocational cooperative programs. Among the 136 school systems covered by the survey it appears, however, that more than a dozen had programs in which employment on a job was used for the purpose of bringing specific and concrete learning experiences along vocational lines into the lives of the participating students. Since they were not operated under the vocational education acts they are mentioned here. They have their best illustrations in commercial courses, especially in secretarial and office practice classes and in various kinds of shop courses. They were almost always limited to seniors in high school and frequently were in operation for one semester or less. Close correlation between study and work was achieved through having the commercial teacher or the shop teacher follow closely the progress of the students both in school and on the job. The time schedule for such programs was frequently arranged so that the student had the morning in school and the afternoon at work. Sometimes the arrangement was reversed with work in the morning and school in the afternoon. In one city alternate weeks were spent in school and at work in connection with commercial courses.

Shortened school session for all

The simplest type of arrangement for providing opportunity for students to work part time was one under which the whole school operated on an abbreviated schedule. Several of the school systems studied followed this plan and dismissed at, or about, 1 o'clock. Occasionally a school operated on a two-shift basis, with one session in the morning and one in the afternoon, each being shorter than a customary school day.

Some of these schools had followed the practice of having short sessions for many years before the wartime emergency. Others during the war adopted it because of the shortage of school facilities, particularly in war-born communities. Whatever the reason, the short session did make it possible for pupils to accept employment in addition to attending school. Moreover, because of their hours, these schools were not being requested repeatedly to adjust the school programs of pupils to permit employment.

This arrangement for a shortened session for the school as a whole is here mentioned because of its relationship to part-time employment of some of the students during a time of the day when they are usually thought of as being in school. However, there is little representation in the following pages of practices of school systems where a general shortening of the school day was the only type of adjustment made for facilitating part-time employment of the students.

Special school schedules for groups of working students

Another type of arrangement was found in schools that developed adjusted school schedules for working students. By this is meant that working students as a group had school schedules of different length and occasionally in different hours from those of nonworking students; sometimes it meant that working students were registered in classes separate from nonworking students, sometimes not. Most frequent representative of this type was the 4–4 plan, followed especially in California, under which working students usually spent 4 hours in school and 4 hours at work each day; an alternative was 5 hours in school and 3 hours at work. Usually in these schools there was a different daily schedule, longer and in different hours, for nonworking students. One school had an abbreviated session especially for working students; another gave working students an option between attending school in the morning or the afternoon, the other half of the day being spent in employment.

At least half a dozen school systems had some early morning classes for working students, thus making earlier dismissal possible for them without loss of school time; in two cities these classes began as early as 7 o'clock. One school system had a "unit roster" plan under which working students were rostered together for their school work; this made it possible to adjust the schedule on a group basis. Another school permitted release for work one-half of every day for one-quarter of the school year. In still another school pupils were dismissed from the commercial curricula during the latter half of their senior year when the work was a practical continuation of the lessons taught in their classes.

Differing school schedule for each working student

By far the largest number of schools reported that the adjustment was an individual one made with each student in conformity with his school and job needs. The plan differed from the 4–4 plan, and other plans for group treatment, in that the student might have a wide variety of combinations of hours in school and at work, the school providing the same session for both working and nonworking students; adjustments were made within that schedule, but not by adding to the school day through early morning periods, "zero" periods, or any similar group provision.

Nearly two-thirds of the 136 schools reported that they operated on such an individual basis. Eight indicated that the number of subjects the student was allowed to carry in school was determined by the number of hours he was employed outside of school. In one city system this relationship was worked out according to the following plan:

Daily school load	Daily work load (hours)
Home room + 5 periods (4 or 5 subjects)	4
Home room + 4 periods (3 subjects)	6
Home room + 3 periods (2 subjects)	8

In this school credit was granted for work experience. In another school system which did not allow credit for work experience, a student might be employed for half of each school day, attending school the other half of the day; he was limited to two subjects in school (three if he was an unusually capable student); the resulting retardation might be eliminated later by attendance in summer school or in evening school.

Another school stipulated that a pupil might take three school subjects in the morning or afternoon and earn the additional needed credit through work done in the remaining half day. Still another school followed the principle that a student who worked an 8-hour shift would be in school not more than four periods and would be permitted to register for only three subjects. One school has since 1940 permitted its seniors to secure one-fourth of their last-year credit in work experience on an approved job.

The large majority of these schools, however, had not worked out such definite plans for balancing school and work, but had left the arrangements to individual determination, each student being allowed such combined school and work load as seemed advisable. In most cases the guidance service made the final arrangement although this was not inevitably the case; and certainly it should not be concluded that only in this classification did the guidance service operate closely with the school-and-work program. School administrators generally showed a disposition to rely heavily on the guidance service for many of the decisions regarding all phases of school-and-work programs.

Naturally the time of release was most frequently the last period or two of the school day. This was especially true in cases where the assignment for the last period was in the study hall or where the schedule could be adjusted so that study time or optional subjects came at the end of the day. Some schools permitted working students to be excused for one or more periods in the morning and a few made arrangements for work excuses within the school day.

Release for seasonal work

Finally, there was a type of release from school which operated for a relatively short period of time. Its most frequent illustration was found in release during the Christmas rush for work in stores and in the post office; and, in rural regions, release for farm work in connection with the planting and harvesting of crops. More

than one-fourth of the 136 schools included in the analysis reported that pupils were released for seasonal work. Others may have provided for similar releases but did not specifically report on them.

Most of the schools found it desirable to place definite restrictions on releases of this kind. While the vocational distributive occupations classes often found the opportunity for Christmas work in stores useful as learning experience, no such claim could be made for the large majority of students who were employed in stores and by the post office during the Christmas period. The reasons for employment were most often assistance in an emergency or an opportunity to make money. In several places, however, a week or more of special training under direction of distributive education teachers was required of applicants for store work at Christmas time.

Many schools limited the amount of time for which pupils were released. On a full-time basis few students were released for more than 1 or 2 weeks. On a part-time basis, often half-time, the period of excuse might be extended to as much as 4 weeks. Usually there was a scholarship requirement and in order that there might be a planned set-up rather than a general exodus, schools found it advisable to have an agreement with employers regarding seasonal labor recruited in the schools.

Crossing of classification lines

In any attempt to classify the mass of arrangements which go under the name of school-and-work programs one inevitably encounters difficulty. The variety and combinations in the arrangements are so great that one is at times uncertain about where each may most appropriately be classified.

Another feature about the classification here attempted is likely to cause confusion if not properly understood—the classifications are not mutually exclusive. One school might have several of the arrangements and consequently be counted in more than one place. This is especially true concerning the last group discussed, the seasonal work group. Many of the schools reporting release for seasonal work also reported plans under which pupils were released for work at other times and under other conditions during the year. The school system referred to on page 8 as following a plan of "unit rostering" of students also reported that it had an alternative plan, namely, "individual rostering." Several of the schools having nonreimbursed cooperative classes also had other methods by which pupils were released to work. The classification is made on the basis of types of arrangements rather than schools having the arrangements.

V. POPULARITY OF SCHOOL-AND-WORK PROGRAMS

Number of students participating

The figures given on school-and-work programs and the number of participants, except where otherwise indicated, were for the spring session of 1945,[1] that is, before the end of the war. Part-time employment of school boys and girls was still at a high level in most places, although in some it had fallen off slightly after V-E Day, May 8, 1945.

For a total of 91 cities and towns information was available on the extent of the school-and-work programs, or more exactly on the numbers of students who were said to have been released from one or more periods of the normal school day for purposes of work. Whether the figures given applied to a specific date or were a cumulative total for the school year, and whether they included seasonal workers released for brief periods on a full-time basis, was not always clear. A wide range, therefore, was allowed in the groupings given below which indicate the extent of the programs in the 91 communities reporting.

Number of participants	*Communities*
Under 100	60
100 to 300	10
300 to 500	6
500 to 1,000	6
1,000 to 5,000	7
5,000 or more	2

The two cities shown as having enrollments of 5,000 or more in their school-work programs were Los Angeles and Detroit. Others having more than 1,000 were Oakland and San Francisco, Calif.; Indianapolis, Ind.; New York City; Philadelphia, Pa.; Salt Lake City, Utah; and Tulsa, Okla. Three Ohio cities—Dayton, Toledo and Youngstown—also Kansas City, Mo.; Richmond, Ind.; and San Diego, Calif.—each had between 500 and 1,000 students on their program. Well over the 300 mark also were Birmingham, Ala.; Sacramento, Calif.; Duluth and Minneapolis, Minn.; Buffalo, N. Y.; and Seattle, Wash. Undoubtedly a number of other large cities would have fallen into some of the above classifications, but lack of data kept them from being included in this particular tabulation.

The 12 cities chosen for visits included 5 of those reporting 500 or more participants—Indianapolis, Salt Lake City, San Diego,

[1] Questionnaires were sent out in May 1945 and practically all of the replies were received before the end of the summer.

Toledo, and Kansas City; 6 of those with fewer than 100 participants—East Orange, Greeneville, Knoxville, Madison, Torrington, and Ventura; and 1 city—Newark—with an undetermined, but presumably quite large, number of students released for work.

Of the above 12 cities, Newark, East Orange, and Torrington were visited in the late spring, and the other 9 in the fall of 1945 after school schedules were well organized for the new school year. Particular attention was paid, in the fall visits, to obtaining data for both the spring and fall sessions. In every instance the number of pupils on school-and-work programs had decidedly decreased from the previous school year. Several school administrators said that the program had been cut to about one-half of its former proportions. This was especially true in communities where students had been called to work in war industries, and where these industries suddenly closed down after V-J Day. San Diego's school-and-work program was particularly affected by the shutting down of most of the aircraft plants where many school boys had been employed on the 4–4 plan. Part-time jobs of any kind were scarce there at the time of the visit in November; they were beginning to decrease rapidly in most of the other western and midwestern cities visited toward the end of 1945.

Proportion of high-school enrollment affected

While the numbers of participants in some school-and-work programs were substantial during the last year of the war they should be considered in relation to the total high-school enrollment in each community if a fair picture is to be obtained of the real place they occupied in the total school program of the various cities. Sufficient information was obtained from 55 communities in 25 States to show these relationships. For example, in 25, or almost half of these communities, less than 5 percent of the high-school students were reported to be released from any school time or to have schedules especially adjusted for purposes of work; in 18 cities between 5 and 10 percent had special school-and-work arrangements; in 12 cities, 10 percent or more were included in such arrangements.

As the numbers of these programs decreased after the end of the war the proportions of the total high-school enrollment working under shortened hours or adjusted schedules unquestionably decreased. Therefore, as a new factor to be dealt with in connection with school administration, the school-release plan is probably being narrowed down to a relatively small group of students in any one school system at the present time.

VI. KINDS OF WORK UNDERTAKEN BY STUDENTS

Large variety of jobs

For what kind of jobs did high-school students exchange some of their school time? If a census could have been taken of all the part-time jobs held in connection with school-and-work programs during the last few years, the list of occupations would have covered a wide range. The study showed that almost every field of industry that had any kind of openings for young persons was represented. Jobs for boys ranged from farm work and day labor to technical and semi-skilled work in airplane factories and shipyards; and for girls, from housework and child care to sales and clerical work in stores and offices, and even technical jobs in laboratories.

Work in war plants

In some of the large manufacturing centers where there were heavy demands for workers in war production plants, the older student workers, those 16 and over, were used extensively. The aircraft companies of the west coast particularly utilized workers on the 4–4 plan, a method whereby the schools and industry arranged for the students' time on equal shares. In manufacturing cities all over the country students worked under similar arrangements in plants making war products of various types. With the end of the war most factory jobs of the emergency type stopped abruptly, at least for the part-time school workers, and within a few months there was noted a definite trend back toward store work and service jobs, the more usual fields of employment for school youth.

Retail selling

Retail trade, all during the war, was one of the biggest and most continuous recruiters of part-time labor among high-school students and was still seeking them to a large extent during the early part of the reconversion period when several of the cities of the survey were being visited. Stores usually were in need of extra salespeople as early in the afternoon as 1 or 2 o'clock, which was before the schools closed in many places. The result was that hundreds of boys and girls in many cities were asking for a period or two off the latter part of the school day to work at a neighborhood grocery store or market; to sell or handle stock at a 5- and 10-cent store, or at a drygoods, shoe, clothing, or hardware store; to sell rolls over a bakery counter or help behind the scenes, where they were made; to dispense sodas at the corner drug store; or, if a girl, to sell cosmetics; and, if a boy, to run errands and deliver prescriptions.

Service jobs

Restaurant work was a frequent part-time occupation for students of both sexes, the boys usually serving as kitchen helpers and bus boys, and the girls as waitresses, counter girls, and sandwich makers. Some of the jobs connected with food preparation and service were in hospitals; many were in cafeterias and in coffee shops of hotels; others were in the busy noontime lunchrooms of department stores and 5- and 10-cent stores; and still others in the ordinary downtown type of café.

The study also showed that boys quite frequently worked on school-released time as messengers, delivery boys, gas-station attendants, truck drivers, helpers in creameries, janitors, laborers and freight handlers around railroad yards and warehouses, and in many other kinds of routine work. In a few places some students were excused early from school to usher in theaters, or to set pins in bowling alleys, although it was usually because of the particular student's urgent need for money that the school principal gave consent to such types of employment on school time.

Jobs with vocational content

In the more carefully planned and supervised programs some boys were found to be following also such pursuits as learners or helpers in the various skilled trades—electrical, auto repair, radio repair, printing, and building. These jobs were often stepping stones to careers. Helpful, also, in a vocational way, were some of the girls' jobs in the commercial field, as stenographer, typist, bookkeeper, file clerk, office-machine operator; and, in the communication industry, as telephone operator in a large exchange where student workers were given the same training as full-time employees. For students who were specializing in foods and home economics certain jobs in the better-class restaurants or in diet kitchens of hospitals, and even in private households offered some practical training for future careers. For certain other students part-time library work offered a form of vocational orientation.

Job studies in cities visited

Job studies of cross sections of the students on school-and-work programs in two of the cities visited—136 in San Diego and 230 in Salt Lake City—showed that in both places, in the fall of 1945, the largest single occupational group among the boys was that of stock boys in retail stores—19 and 17 percent, respectively. In San Diego, also in Ventura, Calif., the most frequently found occupation for girls in the school-and-work programs was that of telephone operator, about one-third of the group in each city being thus engaged at the time of visit in the fall. In Salt Lake City two-thirds of the girls worked in stores, principally as sales girls

in 5- and 10-cent stores. The next most common occupation for girls on these programs was, in San Diego, restaurant work; in Salt Lake City, clerical and office work.

Occupational trends in other places

Correspondence with the many communities not visited tended to show similar trends as far as the predominance of trade and service occupations was concerned. One school superintendent said that three-fourths of their school-and-work pupils had jobs in stores; another superintendent reported 38 percent in store jobs as salesclerks and stock boys; and 17 percent in various service industries as domestic workers, child caretakers, and restaurant workers. In cities or towns where there were special types of manufacturing, some of the older high-school students, just as in the cities visited, were reported to have been excused early for jobs in factories of various types—textile and knitting mills, machine shops, electrical industries, etc.—but the data indicated relatively small proportions in other than war plants. In places where information was available on the status of school-and-work programs in the fall of 1945 there were comments to the effect that there had been a decided falling off in all part-time work opportunities, particularly in factories.

Local conditions and standards as determinants

The types of jobs in which students were found at work were largely determined by employer demands and the character of the industrial and commercial development of the particular community in which they lived. They were also determined to a considerable degree by what the school counselor felt was suitable work, due regard usually being given to the legal standards under child-labor laws. A subsequent section discusses compliance with child-labor laws as findings in this study. Many schools were reported to refuse to permit release from school time for work in certain types of establishments, such as bowling alleys and places serving liquor, even though employment in these places was not illegal in the community. In a few cities where school credit was a feature of the school-and-work program definite standards were set up as to types of occupations that would be approved for credit. Findings on how jobs were approved when school credit was to be allowed is discussed in a later section on the granting of credit by the school. However, the occupations and places of work in which students were employed in connection with school-and-work programs did not seem to differ much from the kinds of jobs young people of their ages worked at full time, in vacations, or outside of school hours.

VII. CONTROLS EXERCISED BY THE SCHOOLS

Extent of school responsibility

Of special interest in the present study are the manner and degree of participation by the school in arranging for the student's employment and guiding him throughout his school-and-work experiences.

Now that the schools are being looked to more and more to carry responsibility for fostering the best all-round educational development of young people through high school, or at least as long as they remain in school, it may appropriately be asked whether the schools can and do exercise comparable responsibility for the welfare of working students during the time they may be temporarily released from the school's immediate supervision.

It has already been suggested that the degree and character of a school's control over the work experiences of its students varies from one locality to another, depending on the purpose in releasing students, and on the philosophy of its administrators and teaching personnel regarding the educational values in work and regarding the responsibility that the school should assume in arranging for work experience as a part of its own program. The need, however, for a definite plan of supervision and administration for the satisfactory operation of a school-and-work program was recognized by school officials in many places, both those replying to the mail inquiry and those interviewed in the cities visited. Such comments as the following were made:

- If the schools are to adopt the work-experience plan extensively it will require much more supervision than we have been able to give it in the past.
- We feel keenly the need for developing effective techniques and procedures in the area of student part-time employment.
- The work-experience program should be thoroughly controlled and carefully coordinated.

Convinced that the needed direction of a school-and-work program could not be achieved without a school staff especially qualified and responsible for carrying out the placement and follow-up features, several of the larger city school systems had employed coordinators for this purpose. Many smaller cities made special arrangements for giving staff leadership to the program through the existing guidance department or teacher counselors.

At the time of visit to the 12 cities, no school had a person on its staff who was giving undivided attention to the school-and-work program, although during the previous years several of those cities had had full-time coordinators who endeavored to carry most of the

responsibilities laid upon them. There were never enough coordinators, however, to do a satisfactory job. In a number of California cities quite extensive programs with full-time coordinators had been in operation for several years during the war and, according to all reports, a continuation of the same general policies was being planned although on a modified scale. School superintendents in a few other large cities of the country said they expected to continue their school-and-work programs on the same general principles with full-time coordinators and improved techniques in counseling, placing, and supervising. Altogether, however, among all the school systems included in the study, the number with well-developed plans of control over school-and-work programs in the fall of 1945 was apparently small.

Methods of control

The school's means of control are many. First is its responsibility for selecting or approving a student for participation in the school-and-work program. Decisions must be made in the matters of age, health, parents' consent, and the desirability from the standpoint of the student's best interest of his undertaking a work program at all; and, in case he is approved, the apportionment of time between school and job activities. All of these factors must be taken into consideration if a program is to rest on a sound guidance basis.

A good placement program, whether operated wholly by the school or in cooperation with other agencies, is of great assistance in placing a student according to his interests and abilities and in seeing to it that the safeguards of child-labor laws are observed. Through close relations with an employer and the showing of an interest in the progress of a student on the job, the school can also do much to promote good working conditions and help both student and employer in any problems of adjustment.

To make the most of educational possibilities in the combined school-and-work program, scholarship at school must be watched and experience on the job utilized in the classroom. Whether or not school credit is to be granted for work experience is also a matter which the school must decide. The setting up of rules for obtaining credit is a device through which some schools find they can exercise considerable control over the work situation.

Selection of students

Selection of students for inclusion in any kind of controlled school-and-work program is usually recognized as one of the most important aspects to be considered in the setting up and the continuing of such a program. During the course of the study edu-

745725—47——4

cators in many cities expressed themselves as convinced that in selecting students for participation in part-time work programs careful consideration should be given to individual needs and abilities. It is not surprising that their ideas could be carried out only in part, however, during the hectic war years when "work experience" so suddenly thrust itself upon the horizon as a new and little-tested educational concept. Vast numbers of work-minded boys and girls had to be satisfied, or else, many claimed, they would have left school altogether. Whether or not all of them would have been lost to the schools is perhaps a question. The fact remains, however, that many of them did drop out of school. The fact is, also, that many schools pressed by industry to release students for work, made hurried arrangements to tie in at least a section of the student body with the war manpower program. With inadequate and overworked staffs they accomplished difficult conversion tasks—conversion of school curricula and of time schedules to fit in with the hours that students were asked to work. It is no wonder in the rush and confusion of the times that there were frequent violations of some of the principles that in a good school-and-work program would govern the selection of jobs for persons and persons for jobs.

One of the chief difficulties reported was that many applicants desiring to enter the school-and-work program already had jobs and they just wanted to get to work earlier, or they had the promise of a job if they could begin at a certain hour before school-closing time. Still others sought an early dismissal not to go immediately to a job, but to lengthen their working hours and still keep their combined school-and-work day within an 8-hour limit. This was often the case in California cities, where by State law the combined school-and-work day for minors under 18 may not exceed 8 hours. During the war period when jobs of all kinds were plentiful the schools undoubtedly accepted on school-and-work programs many students who would not have applied in normal times and others who would have been refused if good selective policies and procedures had been in operation.

Conditions under which pupils were permitted to be excused early or have their schedules otherwise adjusted for purposes of work varied in different cities, and sometimes even in different schools in the same city. It was true that in most places applicants were required to have satisfactory scholarship, to produce evidence that they had jobs, and to show that their parents consented to their change of program. In some places, also, students had to be of a certain age or grade before they were allowed to participate in such a program. On the other hand, in very few of the places visited was any special attention given to the health

of the student, the suitability of the particular job to the individual, the conditions on the job such as hours and wages, the educational possibilities in the work, and the relation of the work to the studies being pursued by the student.

The question of age

A minimum age of 16 was set by some school systems for participation in school-and-work programs, or for any release from regular school time for work. This was true in 24 of 59 communities that answered the question as to whether pupils under 16 were accepted on the programs. Sometimes release for work was granted on a basis of grade, as to seniors and juniors only. Fifteen-year-olds who happened to be juniors could then be included among those eligible. Other cities had lower minimum-age standards. In one community a 15-year-old must have completed the eighth grade to be eligible for early dismissal for work —not much of a restricting standard, since the majority of boys and girls complete this grade at an earlier age.

It was apparent from reports from more than half of these 59 communities that pupils from 14 years upward had participated in various school-and-work plans, although in at least a dozen of these places the numbers under 16 were few. In one city, however, as high as one-fourth of the released students were under 16 even at the time the schools were visited in December 1945. It was thought that one reason for this large proportion was the fact that jobs of the less lucrative type were still available, that is, the kinds at which the younger boys and girls had been employed all along, while the war jobs that 16- and 17-year-old youth had held had suddenly evaporated and these older youth had not quite made up their minds to take the jobs that paid what some called "only coolie wages."

In certain cities of States where there is a legal minimum age of 16 for employment during school hours there was a reluctance to allow pupils under 16 to take any time off from school for purposes of work. In certain other cities of the same States the school and certificating officials deemed that the spirit of the law was not broken if they allowed some of these younger pupils to substitute work for one or more study hours, or even for a school subject now and then, their contention being that in the case of these particular boys or girls the value obtained from the work experience was equal to or greater than that obtained from an hour in the classroom.

Considerations of health

The question of health is so generally recognized as one of major

importance in connection with the decision of a young person to go to work that more than half of all the States (25 and the District of Columbia) have made a medical examination one of the legal requirements for obtaining a work permit, at least for children under 16 years. Among the 9 States visited in this study such examinations were mandatory for all minors under 18 in Indiana, New Jersey, and Ohio, and for minors under 16 in California, Missouri, and Tennessee. In the first 3 States practically all of the students in school-work programs had this kind of protection, while in the latter 3 States only a small proportion had it since the majority of students in these programs were over, rather than under, 16.

As a result of the law in New Jersey, an outstanding system had been set up in Newark for checking health of those young people who accepted part-time jobs on work permits. The physicians of the school health department made the physical examinations for work permits at the schools where they had access to the students' medical histories and the knowledge of the school nurse.

It was observed also in a city visited in another State that in accordance with State laws, physical examinations were given for all work permit applicants up to 18, which included all on the school-and-work program. Here as in most places, however, no subsequent examinations were given to determine whether or not the student's increased activities were in any way affecting his health.

In Torrington, Conn., without backing of a State law, the local school authorities insisted on periodic health check-ups for all employed boys and girls in addition to the annual school medical examination. Each applicant for a job was required to see the school nurse and if any questionable conditions were found on the health record (cumulative over the years in attendance in the city), the prospective employer and the parents were consulted and then a decision was made as to the advisability of the student's taking that particular job. Periodic check-ups were made by the school nurse all during the course of the student's employment.

In still another of the cities visited, where under State law physical examinations were optional with the officer issuing work permits, it was said that they were required in cases where there was any doubt as to the student's ability to carry a school-and-work program, or where need of a physical check-up was indicated. An effort was made to keep all workers in the physical education classes and to allow no excuses except in special circumstances, because, as it was observed by one of the teachers, "they comprise the best antidote the school can offer to job-weary students."

Parental consent

None of the schools visited was willing to assume the entire responsibility for decision in the matter of shortening any student's school day for work. It was therefore a rule in those 12 cities, and in 38 out of 40 that volunteered information on this subject in their replies to the questionnaires, that any applicant desiring a change or curtailment in his school program in order to take on a part-time job would have to obtain the written approval of his parents. In many cities parents' consent is a requisite under the State child-labor law for obtaining a work permit, particularly for minors under 16, so that this step was a part of the routine procedure in going to work anyway. For persons 16 and over in the 17 States where work permits are required up to 18, and in the 1 State where they are required up to 17, consent of parents is legally required in only 6 States. However, in other States special rulings requiring the consent of parents were usually made by the school authorities themselves to cover students of any age because they recognized the need for cooperation of the home in an action so vitally affecting the young person's future.

Counseling and approval of jobs

All high schools in the 12 cities visited, and apparently in most of those studied through correspondence, had some form of counseling service vested in some such person as dean of boys, dean of girls, vice principal, director of guidance, or class adviser. A student desiring a change of schedule in order to work was practically always referred to the school counselor where together they could discuss the advisability of the student's taking a job that would encroach upon time normally allotted to school. The applicant's scholastic standing was usually checked and passing marks required in all subjects before he would be considered eligible for early dismissal or a change of program.

In most places some attention also was given to the suitability of the job chosen by the youngster, particularly if credit was desired. In answer to the question as to whether the school approved the student's job, 74 of 108 school officials replying said "yes," 13 others said they approved it in certain cases, and 21 said the schools took no responsibility in the matter, except sometimes to give advice. One city superintendent wrote that the matter of determining the suitability of the work for the student in question was left entirely to the parents. In several other cities the matter was left to the United States Employment Service or other placement agency.

From observation of school-and-work programs in several cities,

and from some of the correspondence with others, it would seem that "approval" of jobs by the school meant various things. It might mean a counselor's saying "yes" to a student's request without any real knowledge of what the prospective job involved, except what the student himself told him or what he knew about the employer from reputation; or it might mean that a favorable decision had been made only after careful consideration of the suitability of the job for the particular individual, a conclusion based on (1) first-hand knowledge of environment and working conditions obtained through personal visits by a school counselor or coordinator on the employer in question; and on (2) an understanding of the student's interests, abilities, and needs.

In schools where there were highly organized programs with regularly employed coordinators who acted as liaison officers between the schools and industry, it was usually to one of these persons that an applicant was referred for advice on the type of job that was most suitable. In fact in some school programs it was a rule that the counselor would clear with the coordinator before giving any advice to a student on his work program. In rearranging the school and study schedule, however, the counselor alone was responsible.

Placement

The placing of students on part-time jobs during the war years consumed much of the time of school counselors in many cities, according to all reports. In some of the larger school systems the volume of business had become so large that regular placement offices were maintained. As a resource for part-time youth labor the schools held first place. As employers became better acquainted with counselors in the schools they acquired the habit of calling those who had already sent them satisfactory workers. A veritable clientele of employers was built up in almost every school placement office before the close of the war.

In the late fall of 1945 the situation was reversed. Then it was the students clamoring for jobs who were besieging the school placement offices daily. A large proportion of young job seekers had previously been able to find their own jobs, but now they needed help. The schools were still receiving some requests from employers for student labor, but they were principally for work in stores, restaurants, amusements, and private homes.

In 3 of the cities visited, and in several others sending written reports, the school placement office was run in close cooperation with the United States Employment Service and there was formal clearance between the two offices on all placements. Sometimes the United States Employment Service had branch offices in the

high schools and was responsible not only for placement but also for follow-up. Often, however, the city school placement office offered the only specialized service for students wanting part-time jobs. Apparently young people were not using the public employment offices to any great extent, except when a definite cooperative relationship with the schools was maintained.

Where coordinators were employed in the better organized school-and-work programs the placing of students in suitable jobs was usually one of their important functions. They had first, however, to investigate and approve the working conditions in places requesting student labor. This meant checking on the type of work to be performed, hazards involved, hours of work, pay, sanitary conditions and moral environment, and the making of agreements with the employer as to his part in carrying out a work program designed to have educational values.

Agreements with employers

From the reports submitted by letter, and also from those obtained first hand through visits, it would seem that only a few schools had worked out definite agreements with employer groups regarding the conditions under which students would be released to them for part-time work during school hours. Informal understandings were more common than written agreements. Several schools reported that they had held conferences with representatives of industry and business groups and then prepared statements as to the conditions under which students would be made available for part-time work.

In Toledo, for example, the superintendent of schools said that the pupil personnel department met several times a year with the personnel managers of the larger industrial plants of the city and checked over the whole student employment situation. The employers furnished the school with reports on the types of jobs the students had, and the schools, in turn, furnished the employers with information as to the quality of school work the students were doing. If a student failed in either field his work certificate was likely to be revoked. Largely through the efforts of these personnel managers, this superintendent said, many hundreds of students who had been working in the summer on full-time certificates were brought back to high school in the fall of 1944. On the other hand, there were large numbers of students working for private individuals and small industrial plants in the city where cooperative agreements were not so easily made. Over such work there was little or no control by the school.

Newark furnishes another illustration of an understanding between school and industry that was reached after special meetings

of school officials with representative employers to work out plans for a back-to-school drive and for cooperation in the matter of part-time employment of high-school boys and girls. It was agreed, informally, that these business concerns, in return for the school's efforts to adjust pupil programs to permit work, would limit student employment to not more than 4 hours a day, or to such an amount that the combined school and work day would not exceed 8 hours.

Use of work permits under child-labor laws

Observation of practices in school offices in connection with the carrying out of the provisions of State and Federal child-labor laws was limited to those in cities actually visited.

In 6 of the 9 States included in this part of the survey, work permits are required by law for minors under 18 years of age. These States are California, Indiana, New Jersey, Ohio, Utah, and Wisconsin. Eight of the 12 cities visited were in these States. Work permits, or their equivalent in a school-leaving certificate, are required for minors under 16 in the other 3 States (Connecticut, Missouri, and Tennessee) where 1 city in each State was visited. In 2 of these States (Connecticut and Tennessee) age certificates are required for those between 16 and 18; in Missouri, age certificates are issued on request, but are not mandatory, for minors 16 and over.

School officials in every city appeared sensitive to the requirements of the law regarding work permits. Part of the expected procedure for induction in a school-and-work program of any type was the obtaining of a work permit, or a certificate of age, if the State law required it. Sometimes the permits and certificates were issued through the various school counselors' offices as well as at the central office; sometimes they were issued only at the central office. Not always, when the latter method was followed, had means been worked out so that the school principal or counselor was informed as to whether the student had obtained the work permit or had started on the job for which he had presented an employer's promise of employment when he applied for release from school. Furthermore, without some definite system for checking on the student's employment status at intervals throughout the year, there was always danger that the student might change his job without the counselor's approval and without getting a new work permit, particularly if the employers were lax in these matters. That such things did happen was the testimony of attendance and other officials in more than one place. Those conducting the study found through interviews with students that some were working on school-released time without permits, as, for example,

a 15-year-old boy who was employed as nailer in a washboard factory—employment that is illegal under the law of the State where he resided as well as under the child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Pupil personnel cards, which most counselors maintained for ready reference, usually had a place for noting date of issuance of work permit and extra space for comments, for example, changes in jobs. On the card used in one of the schools visited the student was asked to sign a statement to the effect that he would notify the counselor "by the end of the next school day" if he quit or was let out of his job. In the course of the visit a boy came into the office and on being questioned about his work said that he had quit the job for which he was certificated some time previously. His employer had not returned the permit, so the counselor was unaware of the situation. In the meantime the boy had been loafing during the period when he was excused from school for work. This school had evidently endeavored to throw about its employed students all possible protections, particularly seeing to the legality of the work, but the counselor was unable, because of an overloaded teaching schedule and lack of clerical assistance, to give sufficient time to follow-up of employed students and to put into operation some of the techniques already devised for safeguarding their interests.

Failure to get new work permits when needed, however, was said to be less common among the boys and girls who were participating in the school-and-work programs, particularly those working for credit, than among those working only outside of school hours who were subject to few if any checks from the school counselor's office. In each State visited those handling school-and-work programs attempted to comply with the work permit provisions of the child-labor laws.

Hours of work

Compliance with legal and other standards.—Probably the two most important factors in the setting of any limits to hours on the job—a job that almost invariably competed with school activities, home study, and recreation for the student's attention and energy—were: (1) the hour provisions of the State child-labor law; and (2) the operation of a plan that apportioned a definite number of hours each to school and to work, for example, the 4–4 plan which halved an 8-hour day between the two activities.

In 4 States visited there are laws restricting the number of hours that school children may work. In 3 of them such restrictions are in addition to those that set daily and weekly limits to hours

of work for minors regardless of school attendance. Only in California, however, does the law restricting combined hours of school and work apply up to 18 years of age; here the combined hours are limited to 8 per day. In New Jersey there is a similar law for those under 16. In Ohio combined hours of school and work for minors under 16 are limited to 9 a day. Although in Wisconsin the law does not limit the combined hours of school and work, it prohibits minors under 16 from employment for more than 24 hours a week. There is no question that these legal restrictions on working hours of school boys and girls had a salutary effect when applied to school-and-work programs. However, many questions have arisen as to how to compute "school" time for those who are excused for purposes of work from part of their normal school day, a day that varies from less than 5 to more than 6 hours in different schools.

In the California cities visited it was rather general to have either a 4–4 program which meant 4 hours in school and 4 hours at work, or a 5–3 program which meant 5 hours in school and 3 at work. The decision between the two kinds of programs was made according to the individual's school schedule, his job demands, and what he was physically able to undertake. There seemed to be no uniform practice in regard to inclusion of lunch time and time between classes as school time. In one school where the school day extended over 6½ hours (from 8:20 a.m. to 2:50 p.m.), time in school was reckoned by actual hours and minutes in classes. For instance, 6 class periods of 50 minutes each, 300 minutes altogether, were considered as constituting a 5-hour day. If a student went to school all day, and was permitted to work 3 hours, then his over-all time at school and work was really 9½ hours. On the other hand some students who were released at 12 noon, that is, at the end of the fourth period, were considered as having spent 4 hours in school, although actually a little short of it both in class time and in over-all time, and they were allowed to work only 4 hours. Under such circumstances students on the 4–4 plan might have a shorter over-all day than those on the 5–3 plan. In certain other schools, however, 5 hours in school meant 5 hours actually on the grounds, and dismissal was approved only for jobs of 3 hours or less.

In the other 3 States mentioned (New Jersey, Ohio, and Wisconsin), it was only children under 16 that were affected; they comprised a relatively small percentage of students in school-and-work programs in Newark and Toledo, and practically none in East Orange and Madison. School officials in these cities usually saw to it when placing or approving jobs for such young students that they would not be expected to work more than 4 hours on any school day, but without a follow-up on placement there could

not be full assurance that the employer complied with this standard. In one city some of the school officials had been trying to put into operation certain hour standards beyond those provided in the law, for example, making the maximum of 4 hours of work outside of school applicable to those over 16 as well as under, but lack of personnel in the several school offices was a handicap in putting such standards into effect. Information obtained from the schools here indicated that some 15-year-old children were being released from at least one period for purposes of employment, but without an adequate check on the number of hours they would be expected to work.

With the exception of Connecticut, it was in States having no special legal regulations of working hours of school children that students in school-and-work programs were more likely to be found employed for an excessive number of hours. A strict 4–4 plan was adhered to in Torrington, Conn., and here only students of 16 years and over were employed.

Observations in 2 cities.—In 1 of the cities visited the local school-and-work program was operated theoretically on a 4–4 and 5–3 basis, with the idea that the combined school and work day should not exceed 8 hours. This principle undoubtedly protected many of the boys and girls from an over-load of school-and-work hours. However, a first-hand review of 230 work permits of students working on school-released time in the fall of 1945 showed that more than one-fourth (28 percent) of these students were engaged for work that would demand 5 hours or more of time on school days, and that more than half (54 percent) would have a combined school-and-work week of more than 48 hours, including work done over the week end. The following table shows more specifically the length of the combined school-and-work week for the whole group as indicated by work permit records:

Combined weekly hours of school and work	Total		Boys		Girls	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Total	230	100.0	146	100.0	84	100.0
38 hours or less	2	0.9	1	0.7	1	1.2
Over 38 through 43	21	9.1	14	9.6	7	8.3
Over 43 through 48	83	36.1	49	33.5	34	40.5
Over 48 through 53	92	40.0	54	37.0	38	45.2
Over 53 through 58	23	10.0	19	13.0	4	4.8
Over 58 through 63	8	3.5	8	5.5	—	—
Over 63	1	.4	1	.7	—	—

In another of the cities visited it was stated that counselors, as far as possible, held to the standard of not more than 4 hours of

work in combination with 4 hours of school. Lack of legal restraints on working hours of school children and of an adequate follow-up on part of the school made it difficult to live up to this standard at all times. An example of long hours was noted in the case of a 16-year-old boy in the junior grade. His school history card showed him working from 35 to 38 hours a week as a stock boy in a food store. He was excused from school at the end of the fifth class period, about 2:15 p.m., and reported for work at 2:30. On the first 4 days of the week he worked until 9 p.m.; on Friday he quit at 6 p.m., on Saturday he worked around the clock from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. with some time off for meals, the amount probably irregular. Combined hours of school and work for this lad were well over 60 per week, possibly as much as 65.

On the other hand a freshman girl of 15 worked 3 hours a day—from 1:30 to 4:30 p.m. on school days and from 9 to 12 on Saturdays—as an office girl in a downtown office, or a total of 18 hours a week, the maximum recommended for students of this age if they worked at all. In order to get to her job on time, she was excused at the end of her fourth class period at 1:20 p.m. Her combined weekly hours of school and work were about 43—a program she was said to carry without apparent harm to her health. Surely her hours were more reasonable than those of the boy cited above.

Night work.—Employment at jobs lasting into the evening, if not wholly in the evening, was not uncommon with students on school-and-work programs. In fact, some of the most commonly held jobs in San Diego and in Ventura were evening ones with the telephone company. High-school girls worked as operators on 4-hour shifts, e.g., 4 to 8 p.m., 5 to 9 p.m., or 6 to 10 p.m., under special arrangements made between the schools and the company. The 6 to 10 shift was the most usual one. Ushers and usherettes in theaters of these cities more often than not worked their 3 or 4 hours after 6 p.m. Restaurant workers, grocery-store clerks, soda dispensers in drug stores, and child-care aides were among others who sometimes worked at night. The California child-labor law permits employment of minors 14 and under 18 until 10 p.m. Even though evening jobs such as the above did not begin until long after school closing time in the afternoon, students holding them on the school-and-work plan were excused early so that their combined hours at school and at work would not exceed 8, the maximum allowable under the State child-labor law.

In general, in States where boys under 16 and girls under 18 could not legally be employed after 6 or 7 p.m., definite efforts were made to see that students desiring to participate in school-and-work programs did not take jobs that would be likely to de-

mand later hours. On the other hand in a number of places wartime relaxations had been granted by State labor commissioners which permitted some departures from the provisions of the law in regard to young workers. It was found hard to go back at once, after the war, to the more strict standards, so instances were still found in the fall of 1945 where special privileges had been extended to some of these students to work beyond the legal time for their ages.

It was remarked by a school principal in an eastern city that students who had jobs were apt to work longer hours than they signed up for when getting their permits. During the war, at least, many establishments asked employees to work longer for overtime pay, and it was a real temptation to part-time student workers to stay on evenings in order to get this extra pay.

One of the common part-time jobs held by the students in a middle western city was an evening one with a factory that required miscellaneous clerical help. These students worked from 5 until 9 on 4 school days a week and 4 or 8 hours on Saturday. Friday night was purposely left free so that the many student workers would have a chance to enjoy the various school social activities that were usually held on that evening. Employment at these hours was legal in this State for all 16 and over, and none were employed unless they were 16. Comments as to the adverse effect on the health of some of the students employed in these night jobs were made by the school nurses in two of the schools visited. Both spoke of the bad eating habits occasioned by the hours of work. In order to be on the job at 5 o'clock these students had to leave home before the family dinner hour. Too many of them, one nurse said, just stopped at a hot dog or hamburger stand and ate in a hurry, sometimes topping off with an ice cream cone, or eating only ice cream until they got home at 9:30 or 10, when they had another snack, if not a regular meal.

Supervision on the job

One of the objectives in the study was to ascertain how and to what extent the schools assumed responsibility for following up individual students who were allowed to use some of their normal school time for work. Information on the matter of supervision or follow up of the individual students while working on the job was obtained, in varying amounts, from more than 100 of the cities and towns included in the study. In approximately one-third of the communities no attempt was made to follow up the part-time workers; in another third some degree of supervision was exercised over most of the workers, or at least over certain groups engaged in selected industries; in still another third of the com-

munities school officials stated that they did supervise on the job the students whom they dismissed early for work, but only half of the number, or less than 20, gave any details as to how they carried out their plans for follow-up. If further contact could have been made with the communities from which only a "yes" was received in reply to the question "does the school follow up the individual student while he is working on the job?" it is likely that some of these would have fallen into the class of those giving a limited amount of supervision.

In none of the 12 cities visited were the school authorities giving more than partial supervision over the job experiences of their released students. In 3 cities—Newark, Toledo, and Knoxville—no organized attempt was made at follow-up, because staff was not provided for such extra work.

In Torrington, where a 4–4 program was undertaken with the full cooperation of industry and the United States Employment Service, each participant was carefully selected and after placement was closely watched by the vocational counselor who headed up the whole program. This supervision, however, was primarily to see that the student did not physically overdo and that his scholarship did not suffer, rather than to help with adjustment on the job and see that maximum educational value was being derived from the work experience.

In one New Jersey high school 10 or 12 girls employed by different department stores under a cooperative retail selling program, and a similarly small group of boys who worked as apprentices at an electrical goods manufacturing company, were a few of its part-time student workers who had some supervision. The girls in the retail selling program were given specific training under a plan arranged jointly by the school and the three cooperating stores. The girls were carefully picked to begin with; their progress was watched by the store and reported on twice a year by the personnel director. The report forms drawn up by the guidance director of the school called for ratings of excellent, good, or fair on such attributes as appearance, cooperation, industry, initiative, responsibility, response to training, attendance, and punctuality. On some of the reports the space for comments was well filled with helpful observations on the students' general progress and their ability to profit by the training. The apprentice program for boys was equally well supervised. The boys worked in the afternoons of only 4 school days, 1 day being reserved for conferences at school with their teachers. Related subjects were taught and the guidance director at the school kept in close touch with the boys' work supervisor at the plant. The remaining 50 or so working students who were excused early from the same high school

had no checks made on them after going to work other than those made by the attendance department, and the check on scholarship, which was supposed to be kept up to the passing level if the students were to retain their privilege of early dismissal.

The school-and-work program in one of the cities visited in California had been built up with the idea that supervision on the job was an essential feature. In each high school a work-experience coordinator was appointed to carry out this part of the program as well as the counseling and placing features. The coordinator was supposed to obtain reports on the student's progress at work and watch through the school counselor his corresponding progress at school, especially in his related studies. Any difficulties that a student might have at work or any dissatisfaction on the part of the employer were the coordinator's special concern. This sort of program required regular visits to employers. The coordinators in all four of the schools visited, however, reported so much pressure of work inside the school that any outside follow-up of working students was practically impossible. The principal method of keeping track of the workers was by means of reports from the employers which, in most instances, were asked for over the telephone by the coordinator at the end of each semester. In one school the students themselves were required to make biweekly reports on their attendance at both school and work and the number of hours worked weekly. Record cards for all employed students were kept on file in each coordinator's office. These cards provided space for notations on visits or other contacts with employers, and were used principally as reference material when the counselor had conferences with the students.

Informal quarterly reports from employers were relied upon in another western city for information about the progress of students on their jobs. The employment counselor there was also the attendance coordinator, a position that took the major part of his time.

In two midwestern cities counselors theoretically responsible for supervising students released from a part of the school day for work were so confined in the school buildings with all manner of other duties that they seldom visited employers or observed the boys and girls on their jobs. No one was actually watching to see that students did not work too long hours or at tasks of too little worth to be substitutes for hours in school. Telephone calls were made to serve the purpose of visits. No doubt they were indispensable aids to each counselor, and for one, in particular, who frequently consulted with parents as well as employers, and thus became better acquainted with the personal needs and problems of his students.

In some places it was only students who were working for credit that received a degree of supervision through the school's contact with the employer.

It is recognized that some of the better-organized work-experience programs were probably in cities and towns not visited. Letters and reports from school officials in these communities, however, were analyzed for any information they had to give in regard to supervision of working students.

Practically all the California cities included in the study but not visited—Berkeley, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Oakland, Sacramento, and San Francisco—had, during the school year 1944–45, a system of employment coordinators who were responsible not only for advising and placing of students who wished to participate in school-and-work programs, but for following them closely after placement and during their whole period of employment, part of which was usually on school time. At the end of a specified period—every 10 weeks, or every semester—the coordinator evaluated each student's progress on the job as observed by him and by reports required regularly from the employer. These evaluations were based on ratings of such characteristics as regularity, punctuality, ability to follow instructions, weaknesses to be corrected, promotional possibilities, effectiveness as a worker. Particular attention was paid to these characteristics of performance if the student was seeking educational credit.

In some other cities the special services of coordinators were more or less confined to credit pupils. In Minneapolis a group of children under 16 were also closely supervised, many of that age being enrollees of junior high schools and participants in a special type of exploratory program. In Philadelphia it was estimated that during the school year 1944–45 about 70 percent of all pupils in the school-and-work program had been followed up in some way, if not by visits of counselors or other school representatives, then by telephone or correspondence. In smaller cities, and in some larger ones, coordinators were frequently employed on a part-time basis; sometimes faculty members, or directors of certain vocational courses, such as heads of commercial departments, were expected to keep track of the part-time workers in each school, often without having designated time set aside for this purpose.

One noticeable feature about the kind of follow-up given in many communities was that the emphasis seemed to be focused principally on the employer's reaction to the young person as a worker. This was evidenced by the fact that the only follow-up in numerous places consisted mainly in asking employers for reports on attendance and ratings on job performance for the students in

their employ. In reply to questions about the school's plans for follow-up, mention was less frequently made of the necessity of looking into the worker's personal welfare, the suitability of the job, and conditions that he faced in respect to wages, hours of work, safety, and the learning disciplines of the job. While some of a student worker's problems might be brought to light in conference with his school counselor, they could not always be acted upon there as they might have been at the place of employment and in talks with the employer.

Checking on scholarship

Whether or not a student worker was given some personal supervision by the school while he was on his job, he was almost sure to be checked on his school record by the school counselor, coordinator, or other designated official. The majority of the school people so fully recognized the importance of maintaining scholarship standards, even during a period when outside forces were strongly tending to break them down, that they singled out this angle of the problem for special comment. The views expressed were rather similar, as shown in the following excerpts from letters of local officials in widely scattered areas:

> The schools do not place the students or approve their jobs, but they check to see that they make passing grades in their school work or remain in school the full day.—ALABAMA
>
> Grades are checked at the end of each 6 weeks' period to see if the work is seriously affecting them.—ARIZONA
>
> The student must maintain his former grades in school.—CALIFORNIA
>
> If an F grade in any one subject is received during any one quarter, the pupil will be required immediately to return to a full-day school program and the work permit will be cancelled.—CALIFORNIA
>
> The school work of the pupil must be acceptable or the privilege is withdrawn.—INDIANA
>
> The pupil's grades are checked at the end of each grade period, and if there is a failing subject the privilege to leave early is withdrawn.—KENTUCKY
>
> We follow up the individual student while he is in the job to the extent of checking periodically to see that he is still working while being excused from school, and that his school work is being kept up satisfactorily.—NEW JERSEY
>
> The school does not follow up the individual student except to make sure that he keeps up in his studies while he is being released for work.—RHODE ISLAND
>
> All arrangements called for one study hall and a review of the pupils' grades every 5 weeks.—WASHINGTON

Similar statements of policy in reference to checking on scholarship and requiring a certain standard to be maintained were made by various school officials in the cities where visits were made. On the other hand, in one city where a passing mark was supposed to

be a requisite to such part-time employment, the dean of boys said that 22 of 38 released boys were then failing in one or more subjects, yet were allowed to remain on the program. The reaction there was that they would probably have failed anyway because they were not studious and they came from homes where things were difficult and where money was needed. No credit for work was given in this city, so there was probably less incentive for students to keep up to the mark.

In several communities, both among those visited and those heard from by letter, studies had been made of the school progress of students on part-time work programs, comparing marks before going to work and several months later. In one city the counselor who made the cross-section survey of 100 students who had been working from 6 to 18 months said he found no particular change in their marks before and after going to work. In the same city the principal in another school was quite emphatic in his opinion that work did affect scholarship, partly because there were more absences among the working students—absences due to sickness and fatigue from overdoing. The assistant principal in still another school of this city said that records showed almost without exception that school marks of the part-time workers suffered. It was this principal's policy not to refuse release for employment until a failing level was approached. The placement counselor in this same school felt that there was a direct relation between number of hours worked and the retention of interest in school. If the student worked 2 hours a day, school work did not suffer; if he worked 4 or more hours, the job soon became more important than the school and scholarship marks fell accordingly.

Directly opposite to these pronouncements were those made by school officials in another part of the country where school releases were permitted under a more definitely organized plan with supervision on the job and in school as features of major importance. Results of surveys there were most favorable in regard to the maintainance of scholarship standards by students in school-and-work programs.

Relating work to the educational program

The concept of school control over part-time work programs, as found in the course of the survey, usually meant supervision to make the program operate smoothly and to the advantage of the student in both his school and work relations. Control was largely concerned with such matters as counseling, placement, attendance at work and at school, and success in both ventures, and was carried out through visits to places of work, checking on job conditions and school records, and consulting with employers and

parents. Seldom was there any indication that school control included the relating of the experience gained on the job with the instruction given in the classroom. Again it must be borne in mind that we are here more specifically concerned with other than cooperative vocational programs. By their very nature cooperative programs call for a close coordination between study and work—it is that feature which makes them "cooperative."

The best illustrations of using the experience on the job to reinforce the instruction in school was found in commercial classes, especially in office-practice classes. Several schools reported that for a period ranging from a couple of months in the spring of the year to as much as 6 months, the seniors in the office-practice classes spent a considerable portion of their time doing work in downtown offices. The class discussions at such times were mainly concerned with applications to the job in hand of what had been learned in class and, conversely, with finding in the job experiences the concrete illustrations with which to reinforce the school instruction.

The success with relating instruction in office-practice classes to experience on the job is probably achieved for the same reasons it is successful in cooperative programs. The work is in an area which the pupils have, at least for the time being, selected for their careers, and the close application of both pupils and teachers to this one occupational objective forms a strong motive for bringing all possible forces to bear upon job as well as school success. Somewhat in similar vein is the report of the Philadelphia schools that the unit roster plan had proved more adaptable than the individual roster plan in relating job experience and school work.

The tying of work experience into instruction is easiest where the vocational objective of all pupils is uniform; it becomes more complicated when most of the pupils in a class section are working at different types of jobs; it is most difficult when working pupils and nonworking pupils are rostered together in the same class.

The small number of schools that reported on the relationship between work on the job and study in school indicates the difficulty of bringing about this integration. Some of the schools commented on this difficulty saying that they were not adequately staffed or that they lacked facilities. Some indicated that they were planning or that they hoped to develop plans for making use of the educational values inherent in work experience. Some suggested that they expected to reach this goal through expansion of the guidance services or appointment of a work coordinator or through bringing in visiting teachers. The experience of schools that have used these officers to improve their school-and-work programs attests to the importance of these methods. The

evidence is conclusive, however, that the person who must ultimately bring about this integration between work and study is not the counselor, not the visiting teacher, not even the work coordinator (unless he is also an instructor), but the regular classroom teacher. The fundamental problem, therefore, is to help teachers see how work experience—whether obtained through a job on school time or in other ways—can be used to advantage in social studies, in English, in mathematics, and in the various other subjects which the working pupil is taking. Teachers of shop and laboratory subjects have been somewhat accustomed to use manipulative experiences for lending concreteness and example to their instruction. For many teachers in the 5-period-a-week subjects, however, the reinforcement of instruction by drawing extensively upon out-of-school pupil experience is a remote concept. The work experience program can be a good vehicle for broadening the horizons of many such teachers.

One school official asked the following questions:

> Do teachers have a social philosophy which is adequate for understanding and relating the problems of work to instruction?
>
> Have teachers been sufficiently interested in the status of the worker?
>
> Do teachers have sufficient status and security to engage successfully in this type of instruction?

Another school official, a director of high-school counseling, pointed out the importance of follow-up of the working pupil by the school, the home, and the employer. Relative to getting the greatest values from work experience this official recommended:

> Cooperative supervision by the schools and industry to assist the student in growing in the job and in relating his school and job experiences.
>
> Faculty study to determine ways of enabling students to use in the school the values that they are discovering through their work experience.

In one midwestern city a group of school officials, as a section of a committee on evaluating and planning in vocational education, has been studying the implications of work experience and ways of interesting teachers in the subject. Part of the group's study plan was to obtain and list samples of work experiences of students, in and out of school, from kindergarten through high school, and get teachers to evaluate them from the standpoint of educational worth.

A junior high school in Philadelphia developed the following 7-point statement on "How Work Experience Is Used in School Experience":

> 1. Class work is planned to supply those knowledges which workers need.

2. Pupils describe their work to others in the class. Thus, they become familiar with many types of work.
3. Pupils are encouraged to discuss, in class, problems which they meet on the job. All join in making suggestions to solve the problem.
4. Pupils are encouraged to join in discussions by citing examples of things which they have observed in their own places of employment.
5. Pupils make up arithmetic problems of the type they need to perform at work.
6. When unfavorable reports are received from employers concerning some pupil, we try to find the reason and through conferences with the pupil try to bring about an improvement.
7. Oral and written compositions are based upon work experience. For example, several pupils have written a play, dealing with a work situation, which they plan to prepare to present in assembly.

The experience in learning and doing, in school and at work, may be related, also in several more general ways. In classes in social problems, civics, elementary economics, vocations, and similar subjects, the experiences of these working students can contribute concrete illustration to the study, by all students, of (1) labor laws and what they imply for young workers in such matters as work permits, daily and weekly hours of work, night work, wages, workmen's compensation; and (2) the labor movement and social-security programs. In classes in hygiene and physical education, or in connection with class work in vocational courses, the schools may draw upon the experiences and needs of working students to teach simple health and safety rules that will be directly useful to those students who are, or will soon be, facing health and accident risks in the world of work outside their classrooms.

Many teachers and counselors have given much individual guidance to their pupils in such matters, especially to those who sought their advice. In comparatively few of the schools studied, however, did it appear that such bits of knowledge about the working world were made even minor elements in the classroom instruction given the general run of high-school students, many of whom were working about as many hours as they were studying.

Granting of credit

Somewhat less than one-half of the 75 schools and school systems responding to the question about school credit stated that pupils might earn credit by working outside of school. It may be assumed that a few of the others did grant school credit for work experience, but neglected to report.

Many schools and school systems limited the fields in which work-experience credit could be granted. Several stipulated that the work must have educational value or that instruction related

to the job must be given. One school mentioned the following fields as suitable for work-experience credit: Agriculture, commerce, home economics, physical education, pre-nursing, and shop; in this school the work experience was tied in with instruction in such courses as agriculture, typewriting, stenography, accounting, office training, office machines, homemaking, foods, physical education, hygiene, home nursing, biology, chemistry, mechanical drawing, welding, metal work, automobile mechanics, electric shop, and wood shop. Another school specifically stated that ushering, setting up pins, passing advertising bills, delivering telegrams, or selling newspapers on the street would not be acceptable for work-experience credit. Another school gave mechanic's apprentice at a flying field as an example of a job readily approved for credit; this school would not approve for credit, experience gained as a dispenser of ice cream at the soda fountain of a drug store. Still another school listed work in plants (machine shops, electrical, chemistry, drafting), office occupations (clerical, secretarial, bookkeeping, filing clerk), distributive trades (store selling, filling station attendant), building trades, and several miscellaneous occupations (waitress, for example) as occupations for which work-experience credit might be earned. Whether or not one agrees with the practices cited it is apparent that the schools placing limitations upon the types of work for which credit is granted were attempting to hold to a principle, namely, that in order to be acceptable for school credit the occupations had to have some educational and training values for the pupils who engaged in them.

The more common practice, however, was to grant credit for successful work in any job previously approved by the school. Under such a system jobs that were objectionable because of their nature or working conditions were usually eliminated from consideration for credit, but any approved type of work, regardless of vocational content, might be considered as worthy of school credit if acceptably performed.

The amount of credit which might be allowed for work experience usually did not exceed 1 unit a year. Because of legal and regulatory provisions, and also the opinions of some educators, against the employment on school-and-work programs of those under 16, in many places the earning of work-experience credit was limited to the junior and senior years, and therefore 1 or 2 credits was the total possible in the whole high-school course. Some high schools set 2 units as the total credit allowable under any circumstances.

The number of hours of work required for a unit of credit varied from a low of 270 hours to a high of 900 clock-hours.

Under the 4-hours-at-school and 4-hours-at-work plan used by many schools the minimum for a unit of credit was frequently near this upper limit. Usually there was a requirement that the work must be spread over several months in the same job; most schools would not grant any credit unless the pupil finished out at least 1 semester on the job. Fully half of the schools granting credit regarded work experience on the job as equivalent to one subject, thus reducing the usual subject load in school by one-fourth; others expected working pupils to carry a normal load of school subjects and work experience in addition.

Schools that did not require one or more reports from the employer before granting credit were rare, indeed. A report at the end of the semester was usually required; often there was provision for within-semester reports or interviews between employer and school. The general insistence upon employer reports in part reflects the inadequate supervision which the schools could give to working pupils.

The forms for reports from employers usually made some sort of provision for reactions on the quality of the work and often also on the quantity. Other features frequently reported on were: Attendance and promptness, attitude, appearance, dependability, cooperation, and getting along with others. Sometimes the employers were merely asked for a statement on some such general subject as efficiency, job success, or general achievement.

Many schools had grave doubts about the advisability of allowing credit for work experience. This was evidenced by the fact that more than two-thirds of those reporting release of pupils from school for work either stated definitely that they did not grant credit for this work experience or were silent on the subject. This did not apply to work on a cooperative basis where the job was in line with the pupil's intended career and where instruction related to the job was given in the school. Most of those responding to the inquiry would probably agree that work experience gained in this manner was worthy of credit. As mentioned earlier, part-time cooperative courses that were reimbursed from Federal vocational funds were not specifically dealt with in the present study.

Several of the schools included in the study had given consideration to the granting of credit for work done on school-released time and had decided against such a practice. An illustration of this is the city of Chicago which operated through the war years an extensive school-and-work program. The school authorities studied and classified the work which was done by these pupils and found it to be almost entirely unskilled or semi-skilled in nature. On this basis the decision was reached not to cancel out any part of the full-time school program in order to give

credit for work experience. The values inherent in this work (exploratory, learning of work habits, social values) were recognized, however, and the schools accepted the fact that the emergency made work by pupils necessary; therefore, although not granting credit for work experience, the schools gave recognition to it by having it become a part of the pupil's personnel folder which follows him through the schools.

VIII. ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL-AND-WORK PROGRAMS

What some students thought

In 7 of the cities visited short interviews were held with a total of 42 high-school students who were participating in school-and-work programs in order to obtain their reactions to such programs. Their ages ranged from 15 to 19 years; the majority were seniors and most of the others were juniors, although all grades were represented from the ninth through the twelfth.

Most of these students spoke enthusiastically about the plan that had been made for them to combine school and work. Several said that the money was helping their families and thereby enabling them to stay in school. The possession of money that they had actually earned themselves was one of the chief satisfactions from participation in a work program. There was no question, however, that some of these young people who expressed real interest in the school-and-work plan, were deriving other than monetary satisfactions from their jobs. Some felt that they had found a kind of work that they wanted to follow after completion of high school; others found out that they did not want to continue in the same line. One boy who was taking a technical course said that his job at drafting and tracing in a metal-working factory helped him to understand some of his school subjects better. On the other hand some students found their work monotonous after the novelty wore off and they continued only for the money. For example, a boy who was nailing together parts of washboards in the same assembly process day after day said he stuck to his job because his grandparents, with whom he lived, were poor and the only money he had for spending purposes was what he earned on this job.

Some students had reservations, although enthusiastic about the program as a whole. One 17-year-old boy said that he felt a new sense of responsibility—that he did not "strain the family budget" quite so much, but did admit that he sometimes strained his own health; besides he hated to miss certain school activities, and he had developed a sort of conflict as to which should take

priority, these extracurricular school events or his job.

Some students had chosen to participate in a school-and-work program for only a few weeks or months—long enough to earn money for clothes and school expenses; later they had dropped the work in order to be able to take more part in senior activities.

Several of the students who were interviewed expressed no particular like or dislike for their programs. One girl, a senior, declared that hers had been too hard. She had been attending school 8:30 a.m. to 1:45 p.m. (excused from the last 45-minute period), had rushed to a 2 o'clock job, as file clerk in an office, each afternoon and worked until 6. On Saturday she worked 5 or 6 hours. After 4 months she gave up the job as requiring too much time along with study for her four school subjects—English, Spanish, History, and office-machine operating. After a rest of 3 months she was just starting a new job as stenographer for 2 hours—3 to 5 o'clock—on school days, and 4 hours on Saturday. She felt she would be able to carry this job without undue fatigue.

A senior girl in another city who felt that the double task of school and work was too hard was being excused at 12:30 p.m. daily to go to a store job in a city several miles away to work from 1:30 to 6 on 4 days a week, 1:30 to 9 on Wednesday, and all day Saturday. Combined school and work hours exceeded 52 weekly. Four school subjects—English, chemistry, problems of American democracy, and typing—absorbed practically all her time in school, only one period being free for study during the whole week. This girl said that she liked her school and she also liked her work, but her advice to other students was not to take so many studies if they must engage in a work program at the same time, or else take a less confining job.

Attitudes of school officials

School administrators responding to the letter of inquiry circulated in connection with the present study had attitudes toward school-and-work programs that ranged all the way from apathy and opposition to enthusiasm. Quite a number supplied general viewpoints concerning the whole principle of allowing pupils to be released from any part of their school time in order that they might work. The following statements—both pro and con—are selected from reports sent in by local school officials within the various States designated:

> Personally I do not believe releases from school to work necessary or desirable—RHODE ISLAND
>
> We have never had a demand for this type of program, nor have we ever felt the need for such a program.—ARKANSAS

In normal times we do not feel that the school should be called upon to act as a reservoir of labor for business and industry in a community.—MINNESOTA

In the light of our experience with the work program . . . . . , it is the writer's opinion that wherever proper facilities and equipment are available within the school system, it is not for the best interest of the pupil to arrange a work program in industry. One reason for making this statement is the tendency on the part of the employer to overlook the interest of the pupil and assign him to the type of work which has little educational value.—MASSACHUSETTS

I have been tremendously interested in a part-time work program, and submitted a plan to the Board of Education which they adopted 3 years ago. This program of releasing for part-time work was motivated by several factors, some of which were:

1. To be of service to local industry.
2. To make it possible for students to obtain work experience for the purpose of developing work habits.
3. To permit students to obtain an exploratory experience which might lead to a life career.—UTAH

The school-and-work program provides for releasing a portion of school time for approved employment. It is not, however, regarded as imperative that employment be in an occupation directly related to a course or subject taken in school. Learning the significance of work and how to work is looked upon as having a value for young people, perhaps of equal importance with the acquiring of skill in any one line.—PENNSYLVANIA

Our schools have adopted this program as an integral part of general education.—CALIFORNIA

I feel that this experience has given us a background which should result in the organization of a rather successful school-and-work program in the near future.—OHIO

It is our experience that unless a full-time director for such a program is employed, it is inadvisable to attempt such a program. We have given pupils credit for working in grocery stores, filling stations, and the like, but we do not consider it practical now to employ a director for such a program. In fact, we have had very little call for this program.—MISSISSIPPI

I feel that student work programs have tremendous value if they are properly understood and properly administered and supervised.—MINNESOTA

Only under exceptional circumstances have we released children from school for employment during the war as we have felt that the education of our youth should have only unavoidable interruptions.—LOUISIANA

Our school-and-work program was definitely an emergency program designed to assist in the manpower shortage. We are opposed to a work-and-study program unless it is made a definite part of the school program with school credit being involved and some definite tie-up between industry and education.—NEW YORK

In the light of our experience, we would say that the mixing of school work and adult work is a difficult matter. We are very conscious of the fact that school life must be preparatory to and closely related to the society of which it is a part. We are not at all in agree-

ment with the old cut and dried, specific, routinized, academic program of nope-too-distant preceding school eras. We have done what we could to adjust the school to the community life in which we live but we doubt whether the two mix very easily. Work experience is not real work experience until one's livelihood depends upon it. Moreover, it is difficult in a town of our size for anyone in the schools to pick work that the student will actually do outside of school or continue to do after graduation. For most students, I am convinced that we had better make school life as real and as beneficial as we can and adjust our schools so that they will give to each individual as nearly as possible the type of training that he or she needs.—IOWA

We discouraged students from going to school and working during school hours—perhaps we overdid it. Possibly we would have had more students in school if we had made a greater effort to assist those who wanted to work and who also had some desire to attend school.—OKLAHOMA

My philosophy with regard to employment of pupils while school is in session is first, that it must be limited very definitely to pupils with scholastic ability to carry the extra work; and, secondly, that the pupils be employed in work very closely allied to their school work.—PENNSYLVANIA

Work experience, as we have thought of it, has many purposes, some of which are more important to one individual than to another. Its main objective is not to provide labor, however. We think that work experience helps materially to close the gap between school and society. It also helps the student to make the adjustment between adolescence and adult life. It also provides for such worthwhile experiences as applying for a position and bargaining for wages.—WISCONSIN

It seems that there is need for a program to be worked out by the businessmen and the school that will be more in line with youths' educational needs.—COLORADO

I have seen many a boy buck up and get a new interest in school after taking on a half-time job.—CALIFORNIA

It is difficult to know what kinds of jobs have educational value and when a job ceases to be educational. Some jobs are "expanding" jobs. What is an expanding job for one student is not necessarily an expanding job for another student.—WISCONSIN

Opinions of employers and labor representatives

Some reactions of employers and organized labor toward school-and-work programs were obtained in interviews held with employment managers and labor representatives in the cities visited.

The general trend of opinions among the majority of employers interviewed was that school workers had helped out in the emergency, but when older workers were available, they really preferred them for most types of positions. Certain employers, however, saw values to be gained from using the part-time work of students, both from the standpoint of their own business and that of the students' training, and expressed themselves as glad to be partners in a cooperative relationship with the schools.

An official of a large insurance company stated that the work

of the students was satisfactory—it had met their manpower needs in a substantial way. He preferred them to older persons who were less adaptable and not satisfied with the elementary character of the work which the young people handled well and without complaint. Attendance of student workers was not so good as that of regular employees, however; the students were likely to stay away to attend games and other school events.

The personnel manager of a large telephone company expressed great satisfaction over the cooperative program carried on with the schools in the last few years, whereby girls of 16 years of age and over, carefully selected by school counselors, were sent to the telephone exchange to be trained as operators. Some of the girls who had started working part-time while students had been advanced to supervisors soon after becoming full-time workers.

The personnel director in another telephone company, on the other hand, said "while the students made a real contribution during the war, they should now be in school rather than at work. They do much better, on the whole, at 18. Those still in school have so many interests of a social nature, they are always wanting to 'get off,' and they stay off any day or evening they want to. They are not dependable at these ages. Another fault to be found with many of these young people is their inability to spell, or even read or speak, correctly. Still another difficulty in hiring these girls—they do not like evening work, and they have to take it because older workers with seniority rights get the daytime jobs."

The manager of a restaurant, which hired about 100 persons altogether, was favorable toward the 4–4 plan under which 12 girls were working. They were trained in various duties from being tray girls to helping in preparation of foods in the kitchen, serving food, and even cashiering and working in supervisory positions. The company expected to continue its cooperation with the schools.

The part-time work of the students in a large department store had been appreciated, during the emergency, but the store was going to raise the age for salespersons to 18, as those younger were "really too immature to be good salespersons," according to the employment manager.

"The young workers helped out a lot when needed, but they were not really desirable as regular employees until older." So said the personnel director in a large retail and mail-order house.

"School kids are unsatisfactory as bus boys. They do not pay attention to work, always fooling. We can't put up with that now that we can get adult help."—This was a remark of the employment manager of a large hotel.

A librarian who had hired many student workers said that there was, of course, some value in part-time library work in training for a career, but much of what the student workers did was routine. He felt there were some real worth-while aspects to it, however, in personal relationships that could be built up with other members of the staff during the period of service and could be followed up, as he and his staff had done, in the years afterward.

"We would prefer an 18-year age minimum as far as plant efficiency is concerned. Most of the part-time workers are school attendants and they have conflicting interests that sometimes make for absenteeism"—so said the personnel director of a company that manufactured greeting cards and hired many student workers.

While many employers have had intimate acquaintance with these school-and-work programs through their experience in hiring and supervising students in their plants, stores, and offices, organized labor has been more remotely connected with them. Some interest on the part of organized labor in the pros and cons of school-and-work programs has grown up through the organized teachers; some through labor groups as they have participated in back-to-school drives that recognized school-and-work arrangements where these seemed necessary to help hold in school young people who had reached the ages where, under child-labor and school-attendance laws, they could choose between work and school. Labor representatives consulted in the course of the visits seemed to have tolerated school-and-work programs as a wartime exigency that helped in meeting labor supply needs and in solving certain school-attendance problems, but they were skeptical of the future of these programs both from the point of view of meeting educational needs of youth and from the point of view of keeping job opportunities secure for full-time workers.

IX. GOOD AND BAD FEATURES OF SCHOOL-AND-WORK PROGRAMS

The following comments on school-and-work programs are based on information given by school officials in the 136 school systems studied regarding their experiences with various kinds of school-and-work arrangements. It is understood, of course, that not all comments and criticisms are applicable to all schools. Taken together, however, they represent a summary of observations on school-and-work programs as conducted during the war years, and what they seemed to mean in way of specific good and bad features.

Good features

Held many pupils in school who would under wartime conditions have dropped out of school altogether.

Provided a source of income for pupils in need of additional funds.

Provided an opportunity for some pupils to contribute to the war effort while continuing in school.

Emphasized the need for standards on hours and other working conditions of working students and for carefully developed and well-staffed school supervision over the arrangements.

Emphasized individual differences among pupils, both as to the combined school and work load which some pupils could carry and others could not carry, and as to kinds of work in which each could find educational value.

Stimulated the development of pupil personnel services and a recognition of their importance for educational purposes.

Led to more flexibility in school programs, both as to content and schedule.

Emphasized school-community and school-industry relationships for cooperative purposes in educational undertakings.

Stimulated schools to evaluate outside experience as to its suitability for the granting of school credit.

Bad features

Many students participated whose interests would have been better served by full-time school; many were too young.

School-and-work schedules deprived many pupils of the chance to participate in important school activities both during and after school hours.

Jobs were frequently routine in character and offered little in way of experience that could not have been gained by employment for shorter hours outside of school time.

Coordinating services were generally too limited for carrying a proper amount of supervision over working conditions and experience on the job.

Many pupils carried so heavy a school-and-work load as to endanger physical and mental health.

There was frequently too much night work and also too much interference with regular meals.

The relatively high earnings gave some pupils an exaggerated sense of the money value of their services.

Money values rather than life-adjustment values were too largely the motivating force that led students into school-and-work programs.

Provisions were inadequate for capitalizing upon the work experience of the pupil for class instruction.

X. THE FUTURE OF SCHOOL-AND-WORK PROGRAMS

Defining objectives

The great increase in school-and-work programs during the war was a part of a general movement from school to employment as indicated by the drop of a million and a quarter in high-school

enrollment and an even greater increase in the employment of youth of high-school age. During the war the general public was rather ready to accept the idea frequently expressed that this movement was a patriotic effort on the part of boys and girls to do their bit to win the war by furnishing manpower. There is no way of analyzing the situation so as to determine definitely (1) to what extent patriotism was the motivating force in the minds of youth, which led them, with public approval, into employment in such large numbers; and (2) to what extent the motivating force was that these youths found conditions outside school more attractive than conditions inside school. If the latter were the case they could, owing to wartime conditions, easily follow their desire to drop out of school and go to work without a feeling of social embarrassment and with a feeling of happiness in anticipation of satisfactions that could be realized with an earned income. With the passing of war conditions, however, patriotism was eliminated as a reason for leaving school for work even on a part-time basis.

Looking to the future, school-and-work programs as a part of secondary-school curricula and planning will need to be tested in the crucible of educational value, and in terms of the investment of time and effort in comparison with other educational ventures, both for the pupils and the schools. School-and-work programs of the future should be considered with reference to the needs of pupils and the potential resources for organizing and supervising a program. Specifically the questions as to the future are: (1) What contribution will a given school-and-work program in a given community make to desirable educational goals? (2) Will it make that contribution more effectively and economically for both the pupil and the school than will any other type of program? (3) Are jobs available of the kind that make the educational objectives realizable? (4) Are such jobs available in sufficient numbers without displacing adult workers or disrupting wage and other employment standards?

Added to these questions might be asked a related one: Should the school's interest in work experience be broadened to provide leadership and assistance to students interested in out-of-school and vacation work where substitution of work for school is not involved? It is not to be assumed, as is sometimes proposed, that all school boys and girls of employable age and with such characteristics as to benefit by work should participate in a part-time school-work program that is based on the school-release idea. It is to be remembered that such boys and girls have Saturdays, holidays, and vacation periods available for acquiring the values inherent in work experience.

The findings on good and bad features of school-and-work programs present a challenge to many schools either to improve the educational aspects of these programs or to curtail the programs sharply. During peacetime, any such program can be justified only in terms of the contribution it makes to the education of the students, taking into consideration the time and money the school spends in the administration of the program and the time and effort that the students invest in it. Care should be exercised by school officials not to permit themselves, inadvertently or unthinkingly, to be induced to maintain such a program as a means of ridding the school part of the time of students for whom the school should assume responsibility all of the time, but for whom it has failed to provide adequate and proper educational opportunities.

The purpose here is to list factors, revealed by experience, that condition the answers to the question whether a particular school should have a school-and-work program, and, if so, on what scale and with what kind of administration. The success of a program, from an educational standpoint, will depend largely on the soundness of the principles and policies followed in reference to these factors.

Selecting students who will profit from work

The following discussion touches on some of the individual differences in personality that have a bearing on a student's readiness for work—differences that apply to work outside school time as well as to work during school hours. Especially pertinent are differences in mental competence, emotional stability, social maturity, and personal interests. Consideration of these differences is just as essential to successful placement of students on school-and-work programs as it is in connection with full-time school schedules. In organizing a school-and-work program no exception should be made to the principle that learning experiences are to be provided in accordance with an individual's needs and capacities.

Mental competence.—The degree of ability an individual possesses to manipulate abstract symbols, as in reading and in performing mathematical calculations, to think in abstract terms rather than resorting to concrete experience, to learn through observation rather than through performance, to follow directions rather than proceeding according to trial and error, is a conditioning factor in determining when in the life of the individual he can learn more through work than through an equivalent investment of time and effort in study, the kind and amount of work experience he should have, and when and how it might well be in paid employment.

Emotional stability.—Emotional stability is an important item to be considered in planning a part-time work program for any pupil. The degree of self-control that an adolescent has over his emotions is an important measure for reliability on a job. An emotionally stable youth with a lower mental competence, rather than a bright adolescent who is less emotionally stable, is favored for making satisfactory progress in adjustment to work conditions. Production work and business will not stop and wait, as schools are sometimes forced to do, for the passing of a temper tantrum, a desire to indulge in horseplay, a period of sulking, or any form of habit that is hostile to cooperative efforts on a job or to individual work that should be free from interference. Emotionally unstable adolescents, in most cases, will benefit more by remaining full time under the protective and developmental influence of the school. To place a young person in a job where he is likely to fail is a disservice likely to increase his maladjustment.

Social maturity.—A certain degree of social maturity is also needed before a young person can satisfactorily adjust to the new kinds of situations and people that he will meet in a world so different from the one he has been accustomed to in school. Social maturity adequate and proper for participation in the work part of a school-and-work program includes the ability to understand the conversation of workers on the job, to determine the advisability of participating in it or of refraining from it, to behave in a business-like way at all times, and to know the elemental principles of employer-employee relationships.

Personal interest.—Personal interest is another factor, and one of prime importance to be considered. Intelligent interest is the mainspring for motivating learning. Care needs to be exercised, however, to judge between an interest born of a desire to engage in constructive activities and to learn through concrete experiences connected with them, and, in contrast, an interest arising out of and ending in a play motive. For example, interest in activities connected with nature study may well be the origin of a motivating force for work in science. On the other hand, an interest in the mere operation of an electric toy is not necessarily indicative of a motivating force for the study of electricity. While it is essential that a student, before he is released from school to work part time, have a real interest in his work experience, it does not necessarily follow that every student having such an interest should engage in a school-and-work program. The student's relative interest in study in school and in working in gainful employment is only one guide in determining whether his best opportunity for educational progress lies in a full-time school program or in a combination school-and-work program.

Establishing standards and procedures for selection of students

In addition to the broad criteria discussed above in terms of individual development, it is important to establish minimum standards and hold to definite types of procedures in the operation of school-and-work programs if school personnel are not to be enmeshed in theories and left without a clear policy guide.

Age.—A definite minimum age for acceptance in a school-and-work program is highly desirable. Sixteen years is recommended as the minimum age at which pupils are likely to be mature enough to carry successfully a program that combines school and work; this also is the legal minimum standard in several States for employment during school hours. Sixteen is the required minimum age under the child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act and is nationally recommended as a goal for State child-labor laws. Observance of a 16-year minimum (a higher one than prevailed in many places during the war) will help eliminate some of the undesirable features of school-and-work programs and will enable the school to concentrate its efforts in this field on the 16- and 17-year-old students, an age group that is everywhere challenging secondary schools to provide an education that will be meaningful for each and every individual.

Health.—Definite standards and procedures for finding out whether a minor is fit physically for a proposed job and a proposed schedule of school and work are important, both to prevent injury to health and to avoid imposing a too heavy burden on the student. A medical examination is a necessary prerequisite for entrance upon a part-time work program. Follow-up examinations at stated intervals are highly desirable, especially in the cases of students employed at work that involves particular strains.

Choosing suitable jobs

Much of the success of a school-and-work program lies in the choice of work to which the student is assigned. There are many factors in the job field to be considered before any boy or girl should be released from part of the usual school day for purposes of work.

Learning value.—In order that the student may be learning at all times, the job chosen should have in it the elements of variety and a continual need for mental application geared to the student's ability to profit by it. Educational values in the job cannot easily be created by the school, no matter how much attention is paid to this part of a school-and-work program, if the job is too limited in its possibilities, the environment stultifying or injurious,

or if the period on the job extends beyond the point where the student receives a stimulus from the work of its contacts. The amount and kind of stimulus that can be deemed satisfactory varies, of course, with the individual's temperament, and with his mental and physical capacities.

Many real learning values, on the other hand, may be found in jobs where the student is motivated initially by the desire to earn money. The counselor or coordinator can do a real service for such young people by pointing out the various learning possibilities in their jobs, and helping them to watch their own progress and take pride in the mastering of each step.

Working conditions.—Where a school-and-work program is decided upon, not only should the environment and the occupational content of a job suit the individual student's interests and abilities, but it should be a safe one from physical and moral standpoints. Observance of legal provisions for protection of young workers is basic in outlining the standards that should be met in regard to working conditions. Some additional standards for voluntary adherence and for guidance in making placements and overseeing students on the job will also be needed. Consultation with employers and with labor and community groups will be helpful in setting up these standards. Written agreements between schools and employers as to what working conditions will be acceptable may be useful to both parties.

Some conditions of work that need special checking before a student is assigned to a job on a school-and-work program are as follows:

(1) *Environment should be wholesome.*—There are usually numerous work places in a community that especially seek the services of young boys and girls, but because they are likely to be surrounded with harmful influences should be eliminated from any list of possible jobs for use on a school-and-work program. Certain types of jobs are recognized in State and Federal laws as being physically hazardous or morally unsafe for young people to engage in. Counselors should be familiar with such laws and should acquaint themselves with local ordinances, if any, concerning employment in such places as bowling alleys, skating rinks, theaters, and places selling or serving alcoholic liquors.

(2) *Hours of work should not be too long.*—The generally accepted maximum standard of combined school and work for minors 16 and 17 years of age is 8 hours in any 1 day and 48 hours a week; or as far as the job alone is concerned, 4 hours a day or 24 a week. For many individuals these hours would be too long. Night work should be discouraged. Legal limitation of daily and weekly hours of work, as well as prohibition of employment during specified night hours, for minors attending school is a strong support to good practice.

(3) *Travel time to and from the job* and convenience of transportation between the place of work, the school, and the home are factors that should be considered in arranging a schedule of school and work.

(4) *Adequate time needs to be allowed for lunch between school and the job*, especially if the student is to begin work early in the afternoon. Some consideration should also be given to the timing of the job so that meals with the family are interfered with as little as possible.

(5) *Time to attend popular school events*, such as games, dances, and special group activities, should be provided for, if possible, in scheduling the school-and-work week.

(6) *Wages of part-time student workers* should be commensurate with those of any others employed at comparable work. School boys and girls should never be a source of cheap labor supply. While underpaid child labor may not have been so special a problem in the war years when manpower was scarce, there is great danger, as adult labor becomes plentiful, that the young worker will be sought at low wage rates.

Employer interest and supervision.—The cooperation and interest of the employer in the school's objective for the student, and his provision for close and understanding supervision on the job, are highly essential if the student is to gain from his work experience what is intended. Interest in the student and an understanding of the reasons for his being in the employ of the firm will work to the good of both student and employer.

Operational controls of the program

For the purpose of organizing a school-and-work program and of keeping it functioning satisfactorily it is necessary to have a set of controls and a pattern of services within the school that will operate in the interest of the working students and in harmony with legal regulations, as well as establish helpful relationships with parent, employer, labor, and other groups in the community.

Pupil personnel service.—Any school undertaking a school-and-work program will find a good pupil personnel service indispensable. Its resources are necessary for (1) determining the need of a particular pupil for work experience in relation to other opportunities the school offers or can offer; (2) counseling with the pupil relative to the kind and amount of work he should undertake; (3) advising him as to desirable opportunities in the particular field of his choice; and (4) establishing contact with him at intervals throughout his period of employment. The pupil should be assured that the school is ready to help him in this as

in every other phase of his school activities. Such a school service is not the sole responsibility of one or a few specialized guidance persons; each and all staff members who have any direct responsibility for the pupil's education and welfare can give valuable assistance to the counselor in making decisions as to the kind of program best suited to an individual, and they can help the student personally in many ways.

Cooperation with parents.—Before any student is permitted to substitute a job for a portion of his school time, parents should be advised as to what the venture will mean in the way of changed habits, changed hours, and in some cases, a loss in certain classes or extracurricular activities. Their understanding and their sympathy with the school's objectives for the student in the way of experience and development, and sometimes in the way of school credit, will contribute to the success of the project; their consent to the student's plan, preferably in writing, is essential.

Assistance in obtaining work permits.—Obtaining a work permit or an age certificate as required under the particular law of the State in which the student resides is an indispensable aid to checking the legality of the proposed employment. Whether or not the technical details of placement and the issuing of work permits are functions of any part of the school staff, certainly advice to the student as to where to obtain his permit, and assistance at any stage of the process, are functions of those administering a school-and-work program. Moreover, the school will need to make a final check to see that the permit actually has been obtained before permitting the student to be released from school.

Supervision on the job.—If the school is arranging for a student to work on school time, it will need to do all it can to make the job experience profitable in learning. This means it must extend its interest in the student to his place of employment, to the objective facts about his working environment and supervision, to the student's performance on the job, and to the student's reaction to his contacts with supervisors and other workers. School systems that have assigned qualified coordinators for this purpose have had the best success. The coordinator can assist the student in adjusting to his job, and can help the employer to understand the needs of the student and the aims of the school. Also, by reports written and verbal, he can interpret to the guidance and teaching staff the experience of the student on his job and help him to make it a part of his educational experience, at the same time pointing out its limitations. It is helpful, too, if the coordinator, visiting teacher, or other person working in such a capacity, knows the parents, because through them he can be-

come better acquainted with the personal needs of the students in his charge. It is well, also, if he can become familiar with community resources and find out how they can contribute to the social and recreational needs of the young people who because of their work are deprived of some of the social and co-curricular activities of the regular full-time school program.

School use of work experience

It is assumed that the purpose of a work program on released school time is to expand the learning experiences of the student and, consequently, contribute to his life adjustment. Experience indicates that this assumption is a sound basis upon which to build such programs. It is pointed out, however, that in the light of experience the educational values of school-and-work programs of the type considered in this study are largely potential, and may not be more than partially realized unless plans are made and carried out by the school for the specific purpose of realizing all the educational values possible to be derived from a pupil's work experience. Futhermore, pioneering work still needs to be done in finding ways of using work experience to enrich a broad curriculum without, unintentionally perhaps, narrowing school studies into a work focus.

School-and-work plans will need to provide for assisting the employer in making work an educational experience for the student, helping the student discover what he can learn from his work and his working environment and, last but not least, making use of work experiences of pupils for classroom instruction. Work experience under the plan suggested will provide a rich body of material for discussion and evaluation as a part of the regular instruction in such areas as the social studies and science. Illustrations derived from work experience will serve also to motivate learning because of their recent origin in realities of life outside of school and in adult life, where so many students have an immediate and absorbing interest.

Credit for work experience

The question of credit for work experience needs to be considered on the individual pupil basis in relation to the job in which he is employed. The amount of credit, if any, will depend not only upon the potential value of the job experience to the pupil's education and life adjustment, but also on the arrangement the school has for insuring that the pupil will realize this value. In instances where this can be done it may be as educationally sound to grant school credit for employment experience as it is to grant credit for school experience. The problems involved in

determining whether or not experience on a job has educational values, and if so, the amount of such values, and under what conditions the job may cease to have educational values for a given pupil, are continuous ones in any plan for granting credit. A sound program for granting credit for work experience will, consequently, require development of criteria as to circumstances under which school credit is justifiable and additional school services for evaluating such experience.

Elimination of exemptions to school attendance

In order to have a proper foundation upon which to build educationally sound school-and-work programs it will be necessary to establish provisions that will remove from State compulsory-school-attendance laws the excuses of economic necessity and of regular employment as reasons for granting exemptions to school attendance for certain children.

In numerous States the laws, instead of compelling parents to send their children to school, contain sweeping exemptions permitting children under 16 to work. Under such conditions the chances of operating a good school-and-work program are narrowed, because some of the children most likely to benefit from it probably dropped out of school before they were 16.

Illustrative of exceptions which are made to the operation of compulsory-school-attendance laws in various States are the following:

Children 14 years of age or over and legally and regularly employed.—ALABAMA

Children whose services are needed to support widowed mothers.—ARKANSAS

A child 14 or over whose help is necessary for its own or parents' support.—COLORADO

Children 15 or over whose help is necessary for their own or parents' support.—IDAHO

Children 14 years of age or over and necessarily and lawfully employed.—ILLINOIS

Children between 14 and 16 years of age if they have completed the eighth grade and hold a lawful employment certificate.—INDIANA

Children 14 years of age or over and regularly employed.—IOWA

Children 14 and over who have completed the sixth grade and whose services are essential to the support of their parents or themselves.—MICHIGAN

Cases where the services or earnings of the child or youth, being of the age of 14 years, are necessary for his own support or of those actually dependent upon him.—NEBRASKA

Along with upward revision of school-attendance laws, is also needed a specific provision in child-labor laws that employers may not employ children under 16 to work during school hours.

Meeting students' financial needs

To place school-and-work programs on a sound educational footing, it is important that students participate on the basis of their educational needs and not according to the financial needs of their families. Economic need that endangers a young person's free and full participation in all high-school activities should be met through the wise and adequate use of public assistance and student-aid funds and not by trimming down the young person's school program to permit wage-earning purely for money's sake. Development of a school-and-work program with an educational objective should therefore be preceded or accompanied by an adequate program of public assistance to families and the development of a program of student aid.

Permanent values

In keeping with the democratic principle which dictated their establishment and which is continually operating, secondary schools are increasingly reaching out to bring into the lives of youth the experiences of every kind which have educational value. Consequently there have been introduced as parts of the training programs for young boys and girls numerous experiences and procedures which under the more traditional and conventional ideals of earlier generations would have been ruled out as unfit material for the education of youth. Examples of such services are school camps, school-work camps during vacation time, employment under school guidance on nonschool days and during nonschool periods, and various other outside-of-school experiences that may be utilized by the school for supplementing and advancing its instructional programs.

School-and-work programs can be one part of this total effort to broaden school services so as to attract more youth, to hold longer those already in school, and to provide more effective and varied learning experiences for all. School-and-work programs are one of many fronts on which schools can cooperate with employers, labor organizations, and other community groups. The school-and-work programs as developed to date are, for most school systems employing them, frankly experimental, having been introduced under the stress of manpower shortage during the war. With the tremendous wartime motivation removed, many in charge of these programs believe that for large numbers of these working pupils the slogan should be "back to full-time school."

Many school administrators and teachers believe, however, that the school-and-work programs showed promise of permanent educational value for many individual students, and that they should

not be thrown aside or forgotten. They want to retain those educational opportunities by providing jobs for those types of pupils who secured broader and more vital training through the school-and-work program than they seemed able to get through a full-time school program. They want to explore further what kinds of jobs have educational value for what types of young people. Those educators are aggressively urging the earmarking by employers of a certain quota of jobs for pupils who would work part time under supervision while they are still attending school. What scope for operation the plan may have in the future, and what obstructions it may meet in periods of reduced employment remain to be seen. If a school-and-work program is to survive it must prove its value to student worker, employer, and community.

To the student worker it must provide an experience of such a nature that the working conditions will be safe beyond question and the educational values cannot be doubted.

To the employer it must supply help that, while inexperienced, is nevertheless useful and reliable.

To the community it must be a means of advancing understanding and cooperation among school people, workers, and employers.

LETTER OF INQUIRY ADDRESSED TO SCHOOL OFFICIALS CONCERNING SCHOOL-AND-WORK PROGRAMS

Federal Security Agency
U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION
Washington 25, D. C.

May 25, 1945

Dear Sir:

Scattered and miscellaneous reports from various sources indicate a large increase during the present war period in the practice of releasing high-school students to work part time during school hours. The implications that this practice may have for the development of high-school programs during peacetime seem to point to the need for a special study of it. For example, it is believed that the analysis of current experience can be helpful in clarifying the elements that make for success in a school-work program for high-school students. It is, of course, obvious that such a study can be made only with the cooperation of individual school systems. In the belief that the resulting service to education justifies our asking schools to cooperate by furnishing the necessary information, the United States Office of Education and the Children's Bureau have decided to undertake a joint study of school-work programs. The Children's Bureau is interested primarily in the employment features of school-work programs; the Office of Education in the educational features. Both agencies are interested in the youth who divides his time between school and work.

As information is already available on school-work programs for students training for a specialized vocation, they are not to receive consideration in this inquiry. We shall appreciate receiving from you information on all other kinds of arrangements in your school system for students who attend day-school part time and work part time during school hours.

Information is needed on the kinds of arrangements which the school makes permitting or sponsoring employment during school time. For example,

Does the school merely make an arrangement in the student's program to permit release from school for employment?

Does the school place the student or approve the student's job as suitable for releasing him from school time?

Does the school follow up the individual student while he is working on the job?

The *purpose* or purposes for which each kind of arrangement in your school system is being conducted is also of particular interest to us. For example, Is it to make labor available to meet wartime needs? Is it to enable students to earn money as an encouragement to continue in school? Is it to provide as part of the school program work (1) an exploratory experience preliminary to selection of a life career or, (2) a social experience in preparation for adult life? Or are there other purposes?

Can you give us the total number of students enrolled in the last four years of high school and also the number of such students released part time from school for employment? It would also be helpful if you could show the number of released students under 16 years, the number 16 years of age and over, and the number participating in each type of arrangement you may have for releasing pupils for work part time.

Any additional information that will help to give a picture of the *character* of your school-work programs will be appreciated, for example, the types of jobs in which the students are working, school credit for work experience, schedule of work and school hours, supervision of employment conditions, and plans for relating work experience to instruction in specific ways.

In the light of your experience will you also indicate the elements and techniques which you believe are most essential in the organization and operation of a successful school-work program together with any pitfalls to be avoided?

Additional copies of this inquiry are available in case you wish to send it, or wish us to send it, to individual high schools.

Sincerely yours,

(S) J. W. STUDEBAKER,
Commissioner.

☆U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1947—745782