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The purpose of this study was to determine whether training educable mentally retarded youth in job-seeking skills, including principles and practices advocated for completing applications for employment, had an effect on the ability of subjects to complete composite applications for employment and on job-seeking behavior.

It was hypothesized that the trained subjects would be able to complete applications for employment significantly better, in terms of judged quality, than untrained subjects. It was further hypothesized that the trained subjects would be better able to seek and get jobs of a higher quality than the untrained subjects.

A training program was developed through a review of counseling and guidance textbooks advocating various procedures of job-seeking. A brief informational presentation was developed for educable mentally retarded subjects. A composite application for employment form was developed. This involved two surveys of employers in Onondaga County and tabulation of items found in the total of 182 applications collected.
One hundred fifty-eight educable mentally retarded subjects were selected from six area schools with classes for the mentally retarded. Each subject was asked to complete the composite application and rank selected job-seeking techniques. Subjects were then randomly assigned to an experimental group or to a control group. The 68 experimental subjects were individually given training on how to seek jobs, including information about completing applications for employment. Review of their previously completed composite applications was combined with discussion of the principles and practices of job-seeking advocated by authors of guidance and counseling textbooks. The 90 members of the control group were returned to their classrooms after ranking the selected techniques of job-seeking.

At least one month later, 129 of the subjects were readministered the composite application in a simulated employment interview. The before and after applications were randomized and presented to six experts for judging. The experts rated the applications on the applicant's chances of job-seeking success in Onondaga County.
Significant differences were found for the experimental group before and after training, but were not found for the control group. It was concluded that the first hypothesis was confirmed.

A follow-up, which reached 138 subjects, was undertaken after at least a four month interval after the retest. The majority of the subjects had sought work during this time, either after permanently leaving school, or for summer part time positions. Several variables relating to job-seeking or vocational success were used to compare the experimental and the control groups. The experimental group earned significantly more money per hour and worked significantly more hours per job than the control group. Other variables, including the number of subjects working, the number of jobs held, the classification of jobs obtained by occupational type, the number of subjects who looked for work, and the length of time in months jobs were held were not significantly different. The second hypothesis was partially confirmed.
Comparisons were also made to determine whether previously established demographic factors had an influence on the vocational success of the experimental or control groups. Age and sex were found to be significant in their influence on vocational success. Intelligence was not found to be significant.

Data were presented about the perceptions of educable mentally retarded youth of the value of a selected listing of job-seeking techniques.

Implications of the study were discussed. It was advocated that the training program be implemented only as part of a more comprehensive program for educable mentally retarded youth in special classes by vocational counselors. It was also advocated that this research design be used for evaluating similar training programs.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Work for twentieth century American youth is important. Work is an attractive and positive goal for the vast majority of young people in our country. One step in the quest for meaningful work is finding a job. Success or failure in taking this step may have consequences of great magnitude, especially for beginning job-seekers.

Although their vocational goals are similar to those held by other young people,\(^1\) the mentally retarded may have problems in seeking jobs because they have learned less about how to seek employment. The mentally retarded compose about three percent of the population of our country\(^2,3\), and they learn at a slower rate than do other persons.

\(^1\)Herbert Rusalem and Julius S. Cohen, "Occupational Prestige Rankings by Institutionalized and Non-Institutionalized Retarded Students," \textit{Personnel and Guidance Journal}, XLII, No. 10 (June, 1964), 981-86.


Specifically, the mentally retarded may be hampered in job-seeking efforts by a lack of knowledge about interviewing and by requirements of completing application forms. Some educable mentally retarded individuals are prepared for job-seeking by special instruction ranging from comprehensive programs to lectures by employers or representatives of community agencies. School programs occasionally use easily accessible application forms and practice interviews as training devices for students about to seek employment. The vast majority of mentally retarded persons, however, are not prepared with the skills necessary to locate and apply for employment.¹

Many guidance and counseling textbooks advocate that certain principles and techniques in job-seeking be followed. Instruction in techniques of job-seeking in accord with these principles is presumably desirable but little evidence that such instruction is used can be found. Most importantly, schools and training programs elsewhere have failed to determine whether such instruction influences the subsequent performance of job-seekers ¹

applications or 2) in actually getting a job.

It is the purpose of this study to investigate these variables for educable mentally retarded youth. More precisely, topics investigated include: whether brief specific training in how to complete applications produces significant differences, as judged by experts, in quality of applications completed; and whether brief specific training in job-seeking skills produces significant differences in ability to obtain employment and/or in the quality of jobs obtained.

Background and Significance

The majority of the mentally retarded are capable of employment and of adjustment to the community\(^1,2\). Goldstein, in summarizing research from numerous studies, was led to conclude that:


... the pervading pessimism of professional and lay people was unwarranted. The successful adjustment of the large majority of adult retardates in their communities opened institutional gates and stimulated training programs in state institutions and in public school special classes.¹

The U.S. Department of Labor, in supporting this view, estimated that quantitatively 85 to 90 percent of the mentally retarded could, with adequate help, work productively.²

On the other hand, it is evident that transition from school to employment, especially for mentally retarded youth, is difficult.³ These individuals are fully capable of working, and actively seek work in most instances. A lack of opportunity for work due to the relatively small number of unskilled, semi-skilled and service jobs available soon discourages some of them. The President's Task Force on Manpower Conservation, for example, found that mental rejectees from the military had a rate of unemployment of 28 percent, and noted that, in addition, another 5 percent


²U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training, op.cit., p. 5.

were no longer even attempting to look for jobs.\textsuperscript{1} High unemployment induces retarded persons to seek help. Help, however, is frequently not forthcoming. Smith\textsuperscript{2}, for example, found that most employment service counselors admitted having a lack of knowledge about and unsuccessful counseling experiences with the mentally retarded.

Even with economic expansion, it is clearly evident that future trends will demand more skills, more education, and more training. Clague and Greenberg, two labor market statisticians who projected available information and labor market trends diachronically, concluded that:

There will be fewer and fewer job opportunities for the unskilled. Many workers with some skill will need to be retrained for different jobs and a higher proportion of workers will need the higher educational attainment required for employment in white-collar occupations.\textsuperscript{3}


As higher skill levels are needed, training programs must make sure that job-seeking skills permit attainment of appropriate job levels.

The greater skill levels needed in the future, both for work and for seeking work, will depend upon more and better educational and vocational training. Habilitation of mentally retarded youth through special education, or rehabilitation through vocationally oriented training programs requires coordinated and articulated approaches. The objectives of special education for the mentally retarded are, or ideally should be, closely allied to a program of vocational rehabilitation.

Johnson has stated that one objective of a special educational program for the mentally retarded is economic independence. Generally, economic independence is attained through vocational achievement, which in turn, can be accomplished only through the process of getting a job. He added that little vocational training for specific jobs should be done within schools because the "large majority of the mentally handicapped capable of employment and

consequent economic independence will earn their living in unskilled and semi-skilled jobs requiring little in the way of specific training."\(^1\) Many mentally retarded persons find job-seeking, as well as vocational training, a recurrent problem due to the lack of stability of the labor market at unskilled, semi-skilled and service levels.

Douglas, who agreed that the responsibility of the school is to provide basic rather than specific vocational skills, added that the development of awareness about this entire world or work is extremely important for the retarded.\(^2\) Familiarity with work must include an understanding of what work is, why it is desirable, and why it is necessary.\(^3\) It must also include development of the skills needed to locate and apply for jobs, and maintain satisfactory performance on the job.\(^4\)

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 195.
\(^2\)Marcella E. Douglas, "Some Concrete Contributions to Occupational Education in the Academic Classroom," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, XLVIII, No. 3 (1944), 288-91.
\(^3\)Bert MacLeech and Pearl MacLeech, "Preparing the Mentally Retarded for Adult Responsibilities," Paper presented at the National American Association of Mental Deficiency Convention, Portland, Oregon, May 1963 (Mimeographed).
The role of vocational rehabilitation involves directing the broad skills and abilities of the retarded into more specific channels. This narrowing of the range of future directions is frequently accomplished with the help of special educators.¹ It should take into account pertinent labor-market information, individual differences, and the training resources available.² Among the activities in which vocational rehabilitation agencies and special education can profitably cooperate are training in how to obtain jobs, actual work experience, evaluation of training programs and prediction of future outcomes.³

One step in the process of transition from school to job, then, is that of obtaining a job. Preparation is vital before job-seeking takes place and before repeated failures, long periods of unemployment, and a lack of competent helping resources in the community curb enthusiasm.


for work for mental retardates. Both the educational system and vocational rehabilitation agencies have responsibilities in this task. The school should prepare the individual for work. The rehabilitation agency should actually help the individual get a job and provide follow-up to assure success.

Rehabilitation personnel and educators, including guidance and counseling staff, classroom teachers, and work-study coordinators, have been advocated and assigned responsibility for instructing young persons in the techniques of applying for jobs. Regardless of the position of the instructor, concrete and tangible steps must lead from school to an occupational position. One such step involves the development of the skills needed to seek employment.

These skills are numerous, and most are complex. Relatively few have been explored by empirical approaches. Interviewing is definitely one important aspect, but factors influencing interviewing success have not been sufficiently investigated at this time to permit use of this variable. Another part of the process of seeking employment concerns application blanks used by employers. Application blanks and instructions about procedures for completing them have the potential of being standardized more readily than does interviewing behavior.

Employment applications are forms on which applicants for jobs record information about themselves. Applications are often used during interviews to record data and then remain with the employer as a written representation of the job-seeker after interviews. The employment application is used by virtually all large, most medium, and many small employers. The potential of applications to influence hiring practices of employers appears sizeable.

Applications for employment have been used frequently by employers as an aid in selecting employees.
Correlations between items on applications and later job performance have been reported for many occupations. 1, 2, 3 A system of weighting items appearing on applications for employment has been developed. This provides employers with a statistically valuable method to choose employees. 4

On the other hand, educators have shown interest in instructing clients about the techniques, including the application for employment, assumed to be significant in getting jobs. 5 Educators are also demonstrating an interest in following young people into their adult vocational life to help insure an appropriate role in a suitable occupation. Such follow-ups can be used in evaluating particular training programs.

1 Robert W. Scollay, "Validation of Personal History Items Against a Salary Increase Criteria," Personnel Psychology, IX (Spring, 1956), 325-36.


5 Ray A. Ziegler, The Oregon Pilot Project in Teaching Creative Job Search Techniques to the Unemployed and/or Underemployed (Portland, Ore.: Oregon Bureau of Labor, 1962).
The purpose of the present study was to ascertain the value of instructing mentally retarded pupils in job-seeking skills, and more specifically, the skills required to complete applications for employment. Educators or vocational counselors who train job-seekers in techniques of obtaining employment, can use the results of this study in planning and implementing programs designed to help educable mentally retarded youth find, or learn to find, jobs. The intensive investigation of particular factors which may affect the abilities of educable mentally retarded youth to get jobs will permit educational programs to focus on and modify significant, rather than non-significant, variables. This concentration on significant variables involved in the learning of vocationally relevant behavior will be of special importance for those persons with limited abilities to learn, such as the educable mentally retarded.

It is important to note that this study was done during a period of low unemployment. Nationally, in March, 1966 the civilian labor force numbered 75,060,000.
Of these persons, 72,023,000 were employed and 3,037,000 were unemployed. Unemployment was at the relatively low rate of about 4.0 percent.¹ Both nationally and locally the unemployment rate continued to drop during the summer of 1966. By fall 1966, the Employment Service Review revealed that:

Nonfarm wage and salary employment in the Syracuse area was at a record high of 213,900 in October, an increase of 10,000 over the year earlier, with machinery producing industries leading the rise in factory jobs. The area's unemployment rate dropped to 2.0 percent in October, reflecting a tight job market. Unfilled openings at local public employment offices totaled 2,300 at the beginning of the month, a rise of more than 60 percent over a year earlier.²

This study was done during a period of optimal employment. Unemployment was neither a national problem nor a local problem during summer 1966.


Conceptual Framework

This study can be viewed as a transfer of training experiment. Transfer of training can be defined as the spread of previous learning to new situations. Several studies have demonstrated that more transfer to new situations takes place when generalizations rather than specifics have been learned. Johnson, using assembly tasks involving motor-sensory coordination and manual dexterity, found that retarded children transferred learned principles readily and did not appear to need specific training. Katz instructed two groups of pupils in scientific principles. One group learned by rote memory and the other group learned by developing understanding. The group instructed in the understanding of principles was significantly better able to apply the knowledge to

---

2. G. Orville Johnson, Comparative Studies of Some Learning Characteristics in Mentally Retarded and Normal Children of the Same Mental Age (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Research Institute, 1958).
the solution of new problems. Bryant\(^1\) instructed retardates in sorting cards in a study of transference of positive versus negative learning. One of his tentative conclusions was that specific learning was inferior to more general approaches.

In the present study, an attempt was made to teach principles of job-seeking that could be used for specific situations. Through previous completion of an application for employment, the principles were related to a specific performance in the instructional period. Specific skills were reinforced when performance was in accord with the principles, or were taught if lacking or not in agreement. It was anticipated that a retest a month later, using a similar simulated employment interview and application for employment, would constitute a test of the transfer of training for both specific and general knowledge. It was further anticipated that the results of actual job-seeking would reflect a transfer of training of general knowledge only.

\(^1\)P.E. Bryant, "The Transfer of Sorting Concepts by Moderately Retarded Children," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, 70X, No. 2 (September, 1965), 291-300.
A similar conceptual problem involved the relationship of verbal communication to actual performance in behavioral situations. Changing attitudes through verbal means can be accomplished, but later attempts to discern behavioral changes have conspicuously failed.\textsuperscript{1,2,3,4}

The present study sought to provide some tangential evidence concerning this topic. If performance on written applications differed with training, then differences should be found in behavior related to getting jobs. If these latter differences were found, then verbal communication was related to both verbal (written) changes and behavioral changes. However, if behavioral changes were not found, then verbal communication could be assumed to be ineffective in producing noticeable differences in behavior.

\textsuperscript{1}Neal Maccoby et al., 'Critical Periods' in Seeking and Accepting Information (Stanford, Calif.: Paris-Stafford Studies in Communication, Institute for Communication Research, 1962).

\textsuperscript{2}E. Fleishmann, et al., Leadership and Supervision in Industry: An Evaluation of a Supervisory Training Program (Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1955).


\textsuperscript{4}Leon Festinger, "Behavioral Support for Opinion Change," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXVIII, No. 3 (Fall, 1964), 404-17.
Hypotheses and Questions

Two hypotheses guided this study. These were that:

$H_1$: There would be significant differences favoring educable mentally retarded youth with training in job-seeking skills, including completion of applications for employment, as opposed to educable mentally retarded youth without such training, in terms of the quality, as judged by experts, of completed composite application forms.

$H_2$: There would be significant differences favoring educable mentally retarded youth having had training in job-seeking skills, including completion of applications for employment, as opposed to educable mentally retarded youth without such training, in terms of several variables relating to job-seeking and vocational success, as measured by a follow-up after at least a four-month time period.

In addition to the above hypotheses, an attempt was made to answer the following questions:

1. What is the typical content of the application for employment?
2. How frequently do various items appear on the application for employment?

3. How do educators or counselors compare with vocationally successful and unsuccessful educable mentally retarded youth, both before and after experience at seeking jobs, in ranking various means of seeking jobs?

**Definition of Terms**

_Educable mentally retarded_ (EMR) refers to youth with intelligence quotients (IQs) ranging from 50 through 75 as measured by an individually administered psychological examination and who have been placed in a special class for the educable mentally retarded because of retardation.

_Employment_ refers to at least one hour of work for pay or profit or fifteen hours of unpaid work in a family enterprise during a given week, unless the individual was on vacation, ill, on strike, or prevented from working because of factors such as weather or personal reasons, if the person did not seek work elsewhere.¹

Unemployment refers to the situation of people not at work but engaged in actively seeking a job, unless unable to actively seek a job due to temporary illness, or waiting to return to a job from which they were laid off, or under the impression there was not work available in their customary line, or hired to start a new job within thirty days.\(^1\)

Applications for employment are forms other than recognized psychological tests, used by employers to gather information concerning job-seekers preliminary to actual employment.

Job refers to a group of similar positions in a single plant, business or organization in which one or more persons may be employed.\(^2\)

Position refers to a group of tasks performed by one person, and there are as many positions as there are employed persons in an organization.\(^3\)

Occupation refers to a group of similar jobs found in many organizations.\(^4\)

\(^{1}\)Ibid.
\(^{3}\)Ibid.
\(^{4}\)Ibid.
Job Level refers to classification of positions made on the basis of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles.¹,²

Vocational Success refers to attainment of one or more jobs during the period of this study, by a subject in the study.


CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The first purpose of this review is to discuss some of the factors operating in the transition of youth, particularly mentally retarded youth, from school or an unemployed status to a working career. The second purpose of this review is to discuss vocational guidance, particularly those guidance activities which have been applied in programs for the mentally retarded. The third topic concerns one item of interest to practitioners of vocational guidance, the application for employment. The role of the application for employment within the context of other methods, techniques, or items used in job-seeking composes the fourth topic of interest. A summary concludes this chapter.

Transition to Work

The transition from a state of unemployment or from the educational system to holding a job is a critical step for the individual job-seeker. This transition is also vital for employers, the economy, and those community and
state agencies involved with facilitating this change. Under highly industrialized conditions, the individual without a job rarely knows how to go about getting the most suitable position.\(^1\) Because of this and because the importance of work in our culture is great, vocational guidance and counseling services have developed prolificaly. Many local, state and national agencies are involved in helping potential workers find jobs.

Statistics from the U.S. Department of Labor\(^2\) help to substantiate the importance of a job for most Americans. Of the total population 14 years of age and older, excepting those in institutions, 57.4 percent were in the labor force in 1964. For males, 76.6 percent were included, while 37.4 percent of females were in the labor force. While the overall unemployment rate for 1964 was 5.2 percent, and amounted to 3,876,000 persons, some groups were more frequently unemployed than others. The problem of unemployment is not evenly distributed for all workers. The young,
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the old, the unskilled, the undereducated or uneducated, and the physically, mentally or emotionally disabled suffer more frequent and more lasting unemployment and underemployment. Age, race, type of industry, geographical region and occupational grouping all help to determine whether or not a particular individual is employed or unemployed.¹

The major study of the transition of young people to jobs, when intelligence is considered, is that of Wolfbein.² He hypothesized that young people suffer proportionately more unemployment because:

- they are at the beginning of their career development, have the least job seniority, engage in considerable moving around and job changing, and generally lack any considerable background of work experience and skill development.³

Labor market factors, automation, and employer biases are other factors of discrimination against hiring the young.

Wolfbein's study was a seven community survey of 10,000 youths who left, either prior to completion of or upon graduation from, high school. After these young people

1Ibid., pp. 197-245.
3Seymour L. Wolfbein, op.cit., p. 100.
began looking for jobs, 70 percent of the boys and 80 percent of the girls found jobs within a month. Female graduates readily obtained jobs in clerical fields, while female drop-outs more frequently worked as sales clerks or in service occupations. More males who did not graduate went into unskilled occupations than did graduates. Statistically 37 percent of drop-outs as compared with 28 percent of the graduates entered unskilled occupations.

In addition to skill differences, earnings also discriminated between graduates and drop-outs.¹ The most significant factor, however, was the degree of unemployment encountered. Wolfbein stated:

In some areas... the boy dropouts were averaging triple the amount of unemployment since leaving school than the boy graduates. While the boy graduates averaged from about 5 percent to 8 percent of the time since leaving school as unemployed workers, the corresponding proportions ranged from 13 percent to 20 percent among the dropouts.²

While data were still being collected, Wolfbein published information, as presented in Table 1, about the IQ's of the dropouts as compared with the graduates. It is of interest to note that 31 percent of the dropouts had IQ's

¹Ibid., p. 102.
²Ibid., p. 103.
of less than 85 while only 10 percent of the graduates had IQ's in a similar range. Low intelligence, academic problems and vocational problems are interrelated, according to his data. Wolfbein\textsuperscript{1} added that differences between

\textbf{TABLE 1}

\textbf{INTELLIGENCE TEST SCORES OF STUDENTS STUDIED BY WOLFBEIN\textsuperscript{2}}

(Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IQ</th>
<th>High School Graduates</th>
<th>Dropouts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 85</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-89</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-109</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 and over</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

graduates and dropouts may be understated by latitudinal and cross-sectional approaches, such as he used, and that some differences become apparent only when studied longitudinally. An expanded version of Wolfbein's report has been published by the U.S. Department of Labor.\textsuperscript{3} Pertinent additional information added that the principal reason for leaving

\textsuperscript{1}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 99.

\textsuperscript{2}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 104.

school was dissatisfaction with the school, while two relatively minor reasons included economic need and, for females, early marriage. With respect to the occupational success of the graduates as compared with the dropouts, the first jobs held, the jobs held at the time of the follow-up interview and earnings all demonstrated that the graduates were performing more successfully. Graduates had less unemployment, and less unaccounted for time. Graduates were significantly more successful in beginning their vocational careers at a higher entry job level than dropouts. In terms of methods of getting jobs, the dropouts relied more frequently on friends and relatives, as contrasted with the personal application method favored by graduates. The U.S. Department of Labor concluded that:

> It is evident from an evaluation of all the survey data on work history that dropouts had from two to three times as much unemployment, on the average, as did graduates, whether unemployment was measured on the basis of total amount of those currently in the labor force, average unemployment rates for those ever in the labor force, or rates of unemployment for those in the labor force at a given point in time.¹

The mentally retarded, along with high school dropouts, face similar situations in competing with high school graduates

¹Ibid., p. 38.
for jobs. Many follow-up studies have demonstrated that 
retarded persons can and do find employment and succeed in 
particular jobs. However, many other studies have found that 
mentally retarded youth face more problems and obstacles than 
do normals in seeking and holding jobs.

The U.S. Department of Labor\textsuperscript{1} surveyed 1067 boys and 
girls who were previously in special classes for the mentally 
retarded in seven cities. Of these retardates, it was found 
that 94 percent had been employed following termination of 
school. Unfortunately, information on vocational problems 
such as the time period spent by these young people on search-
ing for jobs is not available.

Carpenter\textsuperscript{2} followed 207 "subnormal" girls for a year 
after graduation from special classes in Detroit, Michigan. 
She found that 181 girls were employed, and 26 were unemployed. 
Most successful employment situations were factory and lunch 
rooms. The girls rarely obtained clerical jobs and they had 
high turnover rates for laundry room work.

\textsuperscript{1}U.S. Department of Labor, Employment of Mentally 
Deficient Boys and Girls, Publication No. 210 (Washington; 

\textsuperscript{2}Mary S. Carpenter, A Study of the Occupations of 
207 Subnormal Girls After Leaving School, Special Studies 
No. 2 (Ann Arbor, Mich.: School of Education, University 
of Michigan, 1925).
Mullen\textsuperscript{1} reported on 208 mentally retarded youth who left special education classrooms over a five year period. The group was young, with a median age of 19, and most members had little work experience or skill. She noted that these youth frequently had other handicaps in addition to the primary disability of mental retardation. Yet in her follow-up, Mullen ascertained that about 85 percent of the group had found employment. Labor market statistics for the surrounding labor market, Chicago, revealed that unemployment was three times greater for persons who had been in special class as compared with the general population. Still, the mentally retarded individuals were able to find many different jobs. Most made a good adjustment to the community.

Other favorable reports are many. Fairbanks\textsuperscript{2} reported on the adjustment of special class pupils 17 years after graduation. She noted a 95 percent employment rate for 122 retardates (72 males, 50 females) and a 96 percent employment rate for 90 controls (39 males, 51 females). McKeon\textsuperscript{3} reported

\textsuperscript{2}Ruth F. Fairbanks, "The Subnormal Child--Seventeen Years Later." \textit{Mental Hygiene}, XVII (1933), 177-208.
on 210 boys leaving special classes. He found 36 percent employed and 54 percent on active duty with the military. Collman and Newlyn reported practically no failure in work for 106 normal and 200 mentally dull former students. Phelps found only 11 percent unemployment in a group of 105 male and 58 female graduates of special classes.

Findings, when comparison with normal groups is made, reveal less favorable results. Baller, during the depths of the depression, found 20 percent of 206 retardates (126 males, 80 females) gainfully employed, 71 percent having or having had temporary employment. An equal number of controls had 50 percent gainfully employed and 44 percent having or having had temporary employment. Lee, Hegge and Voelker, in comparing 200 regular class mentally retarded with 200 special class mentally retarded students, and a control group of 100 normals, noted that vocational and social

---

3 W.R. Baller, "A Study of the Present Social Status of a Group of Adults Who, When They Were in Elementary Schools, Were classified as Mentally Deficient," Genetic Psychology, XVIII (1936), 165-244.
adjustment was significantly in favor of the normals.

Kennedy\textsuperscript{1} found a 75 percent rate of employment for 256 retardates as opposed to a 66 percent rate of employment for a 129 subject control group. Many of the controls were still in school and 30 percent of them had temporary employment. Her surprising findings, therefore, appear to be an artifact of definition, for when temporary employment was added, the retardates had an 85 percent rate of employment while the controls had a 96 percent rate of employment.

Disregarding the frequency of success, the types of jobs obtained have been found to vary with IQ groupings. Kennedy\textsuperscript{2} found that male mentally retarded individuals were employed in semi-skilled, unskilled, skilled, personal service, clerical sales, and agricultural positions, while females were employed in semi-skilled, unskilled, skilled, personal service, and domestic jobs. Keys and Nathan\textsuperscript{3} found that, of 610 special class children, only one in eight males and one in fourteen females took positions at a level above

\textsuperscript{1}Ruby Jo Kennedy, \textit{The Social Adjustment of Morons in a Connecticut City} (Hartford, Conn.: Mansfield-Southbury Training Schools, Social Service Department, 1948).

\textsuperscript{2}Ibid.

the unskilled labor classification. In other studies,\textsuperscript{1,2} a tendency has been noted for the mentally retarded to engage in unskilled, semi-skilled and service occupations.

Table 2 summarizes information from three divergent sources,\textsuperscript{3,4,5} about the types of occupations held by mentally retarded persons who have undergone rehabilitation services. Service and unskilled occupations clearly comprise more than half of the jobs held by mentally retarded workers. These two categories of occupations are minor sources of employment for normal youth attending or having attended high school.\textsuperscript{6}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1}H.P. Thomas, "The Employment History of Auxiliary Pupils Between Sixteen and Twenty-One Years of Age in Springfield, Massachusetts, Journal of Psycho-Asthenia, XXXIII (1928), 132-48.
  \item \textsuperscript{3}William A. Fraenkel, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 78.
  \item \textsuperscript{4}The University of the State of New York, The State Education Department, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, Facts in Brief: No. 5, Persons with Mental Retardation (Albany, N.Y.: Author, 1963), p. 9.
  \item \textsuperscript{6}U.S. Department of Labor, Statistical Tables on Manpower, A Reprint from the Manpower Report of the President, March, 1965.
\end{itemize}
While many studies have demonstrated that the vocational success of educable mentally retarded youth is not affected by their intelligence, these studies have neglected the context of "normals." It is evident that, when comparisons are made with normals, mentally retarded youth are significantly impaired in their vocational life. This impairment becomes noticeable when consideration is made of the quality and quantity of jobs obtained by the retarded. As recognition of this problem has increased, solutions, such as vocational guidance, have been sought.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical, Sales and Kindred</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Workers and Homemakers</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vocational Guidance**

Vocational guidance is an important factor in solving the problems of job-seekers, particularly those unable to make the transition from school to work readily. One of the major early studies supporting this assertion was a survey of Maryland youth by Bell.\(^1\)

Bell studied 13,528 representative young people aged 16 to 24 in Maryland and found several striking problems.

---

For all the youth in the study, the average period of time it took to make the transition from school to employment was a year. The time it took, on the average, for a dropout after leaving school to find employment was about three and one-half years. In addition to the lack of jobs caused by depressed economic conditions across the nation, the incidence of blind-alley jobs, jobs with long hours and low pay, and jobs likely to be eliminated in the near future was very high. He concluded that:

Guidance is one of youth's most pressing necessities. Under present conditions only a small minority of youth are receiving anything that could be called adequate vocational guidance. The increasing complexity and tempo of modern life demands a more effective system for the induction of youth into appropriate channels of employment than now exist.  

However, early experiments demonstrating the value of vocational guidance for youth were often not conclusive.  

Several more recent studies with normal youth have sought to validate the importance of counseling or other guidance activities. Rothney, for example, divided 870 students into two random groups, providing counseling for

---

1 Ibid., Forward.


only one group and followed the 690 graduates from high school for five years after the experiment. He noted several differences in behavior between the two groups, including different vocational aspirations, greater consistency of vocational choice, and more progress in employment after leaving school for the experimental group. However, these differences, although evident, were very slight and his conclusion was that counseling as it is done with the heterogeneous population in secondary schools has little relationship to the post-high school activities of youth and young adults.\(^1\)

Other studies, however, have demonstrated significant gains for experimental groups subjected to vocational guidance procedures. Rosengarten\(^2\) used 52 experimental and 53 control subjects for a special program of vocational guidance activities during the subject's senior year in high school. The activities were based on techniques described by Hoppock.\(^3\) These techniques included:

1. Survey of beginning jobs.
2. Follow-up.
3. Visits.
4. Group conferences.

---


\(^{3}\) Robert Hoppock, *op.cit.*
5. Self-Measurement.
7. Practice on application blanks and practice job interviews.
8. Study of an occupation.
9. Motion pictures.
10. Work experience.

Rosengarten found a significant difference favoring the experimental group in average earnings on jobs held by the subjects. The experimental group was also employed for longer periods of time, was happier on the job, and achieved better employer ratings.

Another study is that of Cuony and Hoppock.\(^1\) In 1950-1951, Cuony taught a course entitled "Job Finding and Job Orientation" to high school seniors. These students were compared a year later with a matched control group. It was found that for the 70 students involved, the half in the experimental group liked their jobs and thought less about changing jobs and/or occupations. Further, financial returns were significantly superior. In 1955-1956, students were evaluated again by Cuony and Hoppock and the benefits of

the course were found to be not only maintained, but actually increased.¹

With regard to the mentally retarded, many attempts have been made to determine the value of special programs or classes. Bobroff² studied two groups of former special class students, one of which was a self-contained special class, called the Special B program in Detroit. The other group was in special classes for academic work and in vocational classes with other students. Bobroff noted that males in the self-contained class were inferior in academic achievement and lower in mean IQ than the regular vocational and special academic class. However, in a follow-up, more of the self-contained group had skilled jobs, and more earned $3.00 per hour and up. Because the design did not match, randomize, or otherwise equate the two groups, explanations for these unexpected findings could be numerous.

Studies of the advantages or disadvantages of special classes for the mentally retarded are frequently poorly designed and executed and results are often inconclusive or


²A. Bobroff, "Economic Adjustment of 121 Adults Formerly Students in Classes for Mental Retardates," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LX (1956), 525-35.
confusing. Porter and Milazzo\(^1\) studied the social and vocational success of two matched groups of retarded youths. One group had been in a special class, while the other group had only been in regular grades in public schools. Their conclusions, reached through personal interviews with the subjects, were that the special class group was better adjusted. However, because there were only 12 students in each group, the study was hardly definitive.

Carriker\(^2\) compared two groups of educable mentally retarded students, of which the subjects in one group had been in special classes for at least a year. The groups were comparable in mean IQ, number of months since leaving school, and socio-economic status of their families. Carriker found that 69 percent of the regular grade students were self-supporting as compared with 57 percent of the special class students. His results, then are contrary to those of Porter and Milazzo. A survey of research in this area, however, could continue almost indefinitely, and remain

---


\(^2\)W.R. Carriker, "A Comparison of Post-School Adjustments of Regular and Special Class Retarded Individuals Served in Lincoln and Omaha, Nebraska, Public Schools" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, The University of Nebraska Teachers College, 1957).
relatively inconclusive.\textsuperscript{1,2}

Disregarding the controversial provisioning of special class programming efforts, one major theme evident throughout the literature is a lack of knowledge about vocations common to educable mentally retarded youth about to leave school. Erdman\textsuperscript{3} found that the vocational choices of mentally retarded youth were unrealistic. Gorelick's\textsuperscript{4} study, a pilot project, demonstrated that 81 percent of her sample of 36 educable mentally-retarded youth were unrealistic in their vocational aspirations, while 53 percent were unrealistic in vocational planning.

In agreement with this, McFall recently interviewed fifty educable mentally retarded public school dropouts. This sample was traced from an original 78 students who had


\textsuperscript{4}Molly Gorelick, \textit{An Assessment of Vocational Realism in Educable Mentally Retarded Adolescents}, Research Project Proposal (Los Angeles: Guidance Center, Exceptional Children's Foundation, No date). (Mimeographed)
left school upon reading the legal permissible age for leaving. Her conclusion is pertinent:

Results of the survey showed that there is a need for providing the educable mentally retarded with a more extensive program. It appears that many of them might have become better adjusted working members of the community had they been prepared with occupational information, vocational knowledge, on the job training, and aid in obtaining suitable work, with continued counseling until they had adjusted to their situations.

The investigation further indicated a need for (a) an acceptance of this responsibility by the school, since it is the basic institution for the education of all children; (b) utilization of community resources and its agencies on a cooperative basis; (3) competent evaluation, counseling, and guidance which give consideration to the total development of the child for the purpose of producing wholesome, effective and competent citizens who will better understand themselves and be capable of aiming for realistic goals; and (d) the organization of an occupational education program which works concurrently with an effective academic program to assure optimum development of the educable mentally retarded who will also acquire a greater degree of maturity.1

As applied to the mentally retarded, vocational guidance attempts to promote vocational success to the fullest extent possible.

This objective necessitates both a wide array of services such as those spelled out by the President's Panel

1Thelma M. McFall, op.cit., p. 634.
on Mental Retardation and a close examination of each step to assure its value to the objectives. Hopefully, the provisioning of services will be accompanied by investigations of their worth.

**Applications for Employment**

Studies of application forms by educators have not been proportional to the importance attached to applications by employers and personnel men in industry nor to the problems applications present to potential workers. Yet applications represent an essential step in locating, applying for, and entering jobs. Instruction in how to cope with such forms could be rapidly implemented, either in conjunction with provision of a broad range of services, or alone.

Several studies have explored the content of the application form. Kelly surveyed thirty firms and found seventeen using some type of application blank. From these, plus eight other unspecified applications, he grouped the questions found into three categories depending on the frequency of appearance. The listing did not provide

---

information about the sources of the blanks beyond stating that they were from various parts of the United States and from firms employing 1000 or more people. From a logical viewpoint, the content of these applications was unsuitable. Kelly commented that:

there was ample evidence that answers to many of the questions on the more complicated blanks were not considered of much value. It is plain that a considerable number of the questions... could be of no possible significance to most firms.¹

Lyons and Martin² published a listing of questions based on a "review of more than two hundred application blanks of national organizations in all types of business." The data included a series of questions that appeared on at least 20 percent of the applications. Both these reports fail to mention for whom the applications were appropriate, to what areas of the nation they applied, and to what level of jobs they were relevant.

Everett,³ in an impressionistic fashion, reviewed the art of constructing and using application blanks.

¹Ibid., p. 62.
Rather than present specific questions, he reported a classification system under which different types of questions could be arrayed. He included a discussion of trends in how to design an application for employment questionnaire. The lack of empirical data did not destroy the usefulness of his report for personnel managers attempting to develop new forms; but the article cannot contribute to an attempt to develop an instrument such as a composite application form.

Castel\(^1\) described a composite application blank based on a personal collection of blanks. He assembled those items that appeared most frequently, but provided no data regarding his methodology, and no information, excepting the application blank for his results. He pointed out the usefulness of the application for employment as a teaching device and advocated that "a whole lesson in job awareness and character assets . . . be made from the use of an application form . . ."\(^2\)

Classes dealing with occupations have used employment applications as training devices.\(^3,4\) Generally the

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
applications used have been those readily available, and not necessarily those typically found by the applicant seeking a job. Two approaches to training are used: a composite form incorporating most of the frequently appearing questions in one blank, or use of a wide variety of actual or facsimile applications for practice. Following the first approach, Lavalli and Runge\textsuperscript{1} prepared a tablet of composite employment applications, and exercises, tips, and general information about obtaining a job. No data, however, were presented concerning the source of the questions. The relationship of the application to particular communities was not defined. The relationship of the application to the application's used by employers was not made clear. The tablet did include two samples of applications, a listing of words frequently used on applications for employment, and space for students to list information that might impress an interviewer.

Following the second approach, the Special Service Supply Company\textsuperscript{2} developed a booklet with several facsimiles

\textsuperscript{1}Alice Lavalli and Lillian Runge, "Doorways to Employment," L-R Learning Aids, Detroit, Mich., No Date.

of applications for employment. They advise that each student work on several to learn how best to complete such forms.

One factor perhaps distantly related to applications is legibility of handwriting. Two studies were located which investigated the relationship of handwriting to the application process. Sonnemann and Kernan\(^1\) attempted analysis of handwriting as it appeared on application blanks. They attempted to use present employees' old application blanks from the time when original application was made, and then had raters judge these applications "blindly," or without other information. They also attempted to match old samples of handwriting with present samples. In addition to finding that handwriting was remarkably consistent and reliable, they concluded that

these "blind" evaluations proved to be significantly related to actual performance and success on the job.\(^2\)

Moed\(^3\) reported a study conducted at the Cerebral Palsy Evaluation Project of the Institute for the Crippled and Disabled. He determined that for 110 clients, ability

---


\(^2\)Ibid., p. 14.

to write legibly was a factor in winding employment. A follow-up study was conducted with 105 clients in which it was discovered that "Of all the personal factors listed earlier, handwriting had the highest statistical relationship with employment." While seriousness of involvement was undoubtedly a factor, the legibility of handwriting would affect the application process, and thereby the employment application.

Techniques for the Job-Seeker

There are many methods of applying for jobs. Many pamphlets, articles, and books provide advice to the job-seeker. There are some research reports, but even this literature is limited by the failure to account for branching and combining of methods of job-seeking. Clearly, getting a job involves learning about it, preparing to apply, the actual applying for the job, decision making by the personnel manager, and other possible steps.

This literature is frequently used by teachers and guidance specialists to advise students, including mental retardates. Few of the materials have any empirical basis.
It is indeed unfortunate that young job-seekers, or job-seekers in general, have had to be guided by such materials, while employers have refined their selection methods, and indeed, have even evolved techniques for scientific selection.¹

A brief review of the literature describing advice about methods and techniques of job seeking will disclose the typical content of such information. Norris, et al.,² advocated that job-seekers rely on parents or other relatives, friends, the school, their own efforts, newspaper advertisements, and public and private employment agencies. Brewer and Landy³ called for the state employment service, help wanted advertisements, private employment agencies, friends, and others. Bedford and Steelhead⁴ advocated personal applications, friends and relatives, newspaper advertisements,

¹George W. England, op.cit.
application by mail, school employment bureaus, and public employment agencies. Humphreys and Traxler\(^1\) advocated school's placement services, public employment services, private employment agencies, other local placement bureaus, local civic organizations, relatives and friends, civil service exams, help wanted advertisements, and others. Kleiner\(^2\) in his list of tips for guidance counselors, included direct visits, direct mail, telephone solicitations, work experience programs, help wanted advertisements and trade connections of shop teachers, among other methods.

Studies in a more serious vein are several. Landy\(^3\) found that schools provided help in getting a job for 4 percent of youth, friends or relatives provided help for 34 percent, actual employment by a friend or relative was provided for 17 percent, personal applying brought 33.4 percent a job, and commercial employment agencies and


\(^3\)Edward Landy, "Principals Offered Follow-Up Program," *Occupations*, XIX, No. 4 (January, 1941), 266-72.
newspaper advertisements resulted in jobs for 2.6 percent. His data are based on a follow-up study of a sample of 1000 youth.

Other studies have reported on different techniques used in various follow-up surveys. This information is valuable not only for the perspective available concerning the importance of the application for employment, but as a means of how job-seekers approach their problem of locating a job. These studies neglect the use of several techniques to locate a single job, and thereby the full significance of particular techniques is often unexplored. However, these studies are useful as a base to understanding the problem and as a foundation for a perspective.

Reynolds and Shister, in two surveys of how women learn about new jobs, found that friends and relatives and random application at various plants provided most of the news about jobs. Wilcock and Franke interviewed workers in two cities and asked how they planned to locate new jobs. It was found that the state employment service, direct application at plants, and reading want ads were perceived as


extremely important. How these workers heard about new jobs, which they then actually got, was quite different.

In the two cities surveyed before workers were discharged, 76 and 59 percent of workers surveyed stated they would use the state employment service. Only 4, 5, 3, 4, and 9 percent of the workers in five cities surveyed later, including the original two cities, had found jobs through this resource. Of 77 and 85 percent of workers who planned to apply directly to companies when discharged, 40 and 31 percent respectively in the same cities found jobs by using this method. Supporting these data, three other cities surveyed later provided similar results. In contrast, the importance of friends and relatives was not noted in the survey before plant shutdowns, but later appeared as the most important technique of getting jobs.

Sheppard and Bellitsky\(^1\) studied 450 blue-collar and 80 white-collar workers who had been employed in Erie, Pennsylvania. All of the workers were unemployed at some time during 1963 or early 1964 and had registered with the Employment Service. This study is, therefore, biased toward

the Employment Service. In late summer and early fall 1964, interviews were conducted to determine how these workers sought jobs.

Because all the job-seekers in the study registered at the state employment service, it is to be expected that the employment service would constitute a sizeable percentage of the total. This was confirmed. While the method of directly applying at a company gate provided the second most important way of finding a job for the semi-skilled workers, the unskilled workers used their friends and relatives more frequently.

When blue-collar workers were asked to evaluate several methods or sources used in job-finding, they rated direct application as best, with the state employment service close behind. Friends and relatives and newspaper ads were also popular. It was evident that friends and relatives were rated as more important as skill level decreased.

In terms of how effective various methods of applying actually were, the techniques by which blue-collar workers found new jobs were listed. Following the use of friends
and relatives as means of finding new jobs, the direct application methods and the state employment service trailed in distant second and third place. For blue-collar workers, then, friends and relatives were used first by 10 percent of the workers in the study. Friends and relatives constituted 11 percent of the ratings for the best way to find a job. But in actual results, this single source provided the information needed to get a job for 56 percent of the workers in the study. Clearly, more studies are needed to clarify this surprising finding.

The application for employment is but one step in the complex and polyphasic process of job-seeking. Advice is frequently given, but little research has been done on this process. Among trends in the research, friends and relatives are noted as important sources of information about jobs, particularly for lower skill level jobs. Information is also obtained by direct application at company gates and employment services. Yet once information about openings is gathered, completing applications and going through interviews at plants or factories remains necessary.
It is interesting to note that perceptions of workers about ways to locate jobs are often at considerable variance with results of actual job-seeking. This variance demonstrates that perceptions are relatively independent of results, and presumably this leads to inefficient job-seeking approaches.

Summary

Most people work, including the vast majority of the mentally retarded. Special programs to facilitate obtaining a job are many, and are apparently needed. One method of creating more effective job-seeking behavior involves training in various aspects of how to find a job. This review focused on the application for employment, a step in the process of job-seeking. Since the application for employment is but one method of job-seeking, the review discussed several studies which examined the broader context of how job-seekers sought and/or got jobs.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

Overview

No single factor accounts for success in the vocational adjustment of the mentally retarded. The former assumption that intelligence quotients determined vocational success has been found wanting. Many studies have reached the conclusion that a wide variety of factors determine vocational outcome for the mentally retarded, as well as for other groups of job-seekers.

Granted this situation, two approaches to the study of these variables are available. The first method is comprehensive and extensive in attempting to chart and discover the importance of each of the many variables which may be predictive of vocational outcome. Yet studies such as that of Bower and Switzer\(^1\) have not been able to provide many fruitful new leads by following this model.

\(^1\)Bower and Switzer, op.cit.
An alternative approach has been formulated by Goldstein.\(^1\) His contention is that longitudinal approaches to measure the impact of training are needed. Such programs must include detailed descriptions of the subject matter, the implementation of the training program, the trainees, and results or evaluations. These descriptions must be adequate to permit application of findings in similar settings. In summary:

\[\ldots\] research on such programs must encompass such dynamic factors as selection for training, a precise description of the training program and applied methods, placement procedures and practices, and an objective system of evaluation. It is only through the comprehensive study of such variables that research will enhance knowledge and make a contribution to the functional and service agencies in our midst.\(^2\)

Following Goldstein's outline, several methodological steps were taken in the study. First, instructions on job-seeking skills, including how to complete application forms, were developed. Second, a composite application form was devised, using applications collected from two

\(^1\)Herbert Goldstein, ”Methodological Problems in Research in the Educational Programs for the Treatment and Habilitation of the Mentally Retarded,” *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LXIV, No. 2 (September, 1959), 341-45.

\(^2\)Ibid., pp. 343-45.
surveys of employers. Third, this composite form and the instructions were used in testing, training, and later retesting educable mentally retarded youth in job-seeking techniques. Fourth, a follow-up sought to determine whether the training had an effect on job-seeking and vocational success. Fifth, data were gathered regarding the use of various methods of job-seeking, including the application for employment.

Chapter III follows the above five-part outline. More traditional topics such as experimental design, selection of subjects, and instrumentation will be discussed under these five headings.

Instructions

Appropriate techniques for getting jobs, as well as for completing application blanks, have been stated repeatedly in the literature. Advocates of such training programs phrase their advice in moralistic, cause and
effect, and philosophical styles. \(^1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9\)

While a more complete listing has been included in the bibliography, the cited references are representative of resources used to develop a listing of principles and practices for completing applications. This summary of commonly given rules (see Appendix B) broadly deals

\(^1\) Bedford and Steelhead, *op.cit.*, p. 113.
\(^9\) Humphreys and Traxler, *op.cit.*, pp. 332-34.
with how to complete applications to get jobs. Training provided to the experimental group in this investigation was based on these principles.

The principles as listed are divided into three parts based on activities that should be performed prior to, during, and after completion of applications. For the trained subjects, these principles were explained as being techniques valuable for use when contacting employers. Performance in the simulated employment interview and on the previously administered composite application was reviewed in terms of the principles with the subject. Reinforcement was given through positively worded statements for performance in accord with the principles. When performance was at variance with the principles, the subject was told and shown alternative ways of proceeding.

In addition to this procedure, that behavior during the interview which was not in accord with principles for employment interviewing as described in the above cited textbooks, was negatively reinforced. For example, insisting upon a handshake rather than waiting
for the interviewer to extend his hand, "clammy" handshakes, unkempt or "sloppy" dress, indistinct or mumbled speech, and poor posture were noted and it was indicated to the pupil that most employers regarded these actions as negative behaviors. Alternative behaviors were elicited, insofar as possible, and then reinforced during the training session.

Questions were encouraged throughout this period and were answered fully. Finally, questions were asked of the subject to assure that he or she was familiar with the principles and practices of job-seeking and how to complete applications.

The Composite Application

Mail surveys were made of manufacturing and non-manufacturing firms in Onondaga County, New York. This county, including the city of Syracuse, is fairly typical of New York State, as well as the United States, in composition of labor force, occupations and industries.¹ The first survey was made of manufacturing firms as listed by

the Manufacturers’ Association of Syracuse.¹ A second survey of non-manufacturing firms was based on data listed by the New York State Department of Labor.²

Initially, one hundred forty-eight manufacturing firms were contacted by mail for the purpose of requesting copies of their applications for employment. Specifically requested were those applications used for unskilled, semi-skilled or service types of occupations.

Table 3 presents the number of firms and their size. In most cases the employment figures refer to the employment as of May, 1963.

TABLE 3

SIZES AND RESPONSES TO A SURVEY TO OBTAIN APPLICATIONS FOR EMPLOYMENT OF MANUFACTURING FIRMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
<th>Number of Firms</th>
<th>Firms Contacted</th>
<th>Firms Replying</th>
<th>Firms Replying With Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 1-49</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 50-199</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 200-499</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 500-999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 1000-1999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 2000-up</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²Angelo Massa, Private Communication, New York State Department of Labor (Syracuse, N.Y.: March, 1965).
A total return of 61 percent was recorded. However, 7 percent of the replies were letters from employers stating they did not use applications for employment, resulting in a net return of 54 percent. As expected, larger firms responded more frequently (a chi-square of 18.56 was significant at the .05 level). Six applications were unidentified and the size of the firm was therefore unknown. These six applications are listed in Tables 3 and 4 as "unknown."

Ten general categories of specific items of information were developed. These categories included over two hundred specific questions, each of which was tabulated for frequency of incidence. Table 4 gives the tabulation for the ten general categories by size of firm and by total frequency (as indicated by presence of one or more specific questions within the particular category).

To find out if the frequency of appearance of a category was related to size of firms, a chi-square test was made. A chi-square of 1.15 was not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, it appears that firms do not
differ in the general categories, as listed, of applications when size of firm is a criterion.

**TABLE 4**

**FREQUENCY OF ITEM CATEGORIES TABULATED BY SIZE OF FIRM AND BY TOTAL FREQUENCY OF APPEARANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>DEF</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Data</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment History</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Data</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Data</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Data</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer's Comments</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Preferences</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military History</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobbies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A second survey was made of non-manufacturing industries. Table 5 lists the non-manufacturing industries employing over 50 people by type. It should be noted that this listing includes a total of 209 firms, based on Employment Service data. Unfortunately, erroneous duplication in the list accounted for 21 firms. Of the 188 firms
actually surveyed, 102 responded with applications. This represented a return of 54.2 percent.

**TABLE 5**

NON-MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES EMPLOYING OVER 50 PEOPLE IN ONONDAGA COUNTY, BY TYPES (EXCLUDING FEDERAL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Firm</th>
<th>Number of Firms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, communication, utilities</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service and miscellaneous</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>209</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the listing provided by the initial tabulation as a base, the items on the applications from non-manufacturing firms were tabulated.

The results of the two tabulations of applications were compared by correlating the number of times each specific item was found on the two sets of data. This correlation, using the Pearson product-moment correlation, was .9085. In view of this agreement, the items were
assumed to be fairly constant and therefore were used to construct a composite blank. This composite form was titled the GREGORY COMPOSITE APPLICATION FOR EMPLOYMENT (GCAFE), and can be found in Appendix A.

While the content of the application was determined in this fashion, the format and the order in which questions appeared were arbitrary. The format was developed by the investigator, basing lay-out and order on subjective impressions received from personally reviewing, studying, and cataloging applications used in the study.

Table 6 provides a listing of the specific items most frequently found on the applications. Only those items which occur in 25 percent or more of the applications have been included. The frequency with which the particular item was found is included to the right of the item. This listing provided the basic data needed from which a composite application was constructed.
TABLE 6
FREQUENCIES OF OCCURRENCE OF SPECIFIC ITEMS
ON APPLICATION BLANKS COLLECTED
FROM TWO SURVEYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Item (General Category)</th>
<th>Survey 1, Manufacturing</th>
<th>Survey 2, Non-Manufacturing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name (Personal)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present address (Personal)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone number (Personal)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs held (Employ History)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates of Employment (Employ History)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security Number (Personal)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married (Family)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single (Family)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Application (Personal)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Work Done (Employ History)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason Left Former Jobs (Employ History)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Date (Personal)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (Personal)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (Personal)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Earnings (Employ History)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature (Personal)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or University (Education)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Item (General Category)</td>
<td>Survey 1, Manufacturing</td>
<td>Survey 2, Non-Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed (Family)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School (Education)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School (Education)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced (Family)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Citizenship (Personal)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children (Family)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (Personal)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated (Family)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When in School (Education)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did You Graduate? (Education)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person to Notify in Emergency (Personal)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names of References (References)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address of References (References)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major School Subjects (Education)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives Employed by Company (Personal)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address to Notify in Emergency (Personal)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment with this Company (Employment History)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch of Service (Military)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Item</td>
<td>Survey 1, Manufacturing</td>
<td>Survey 2, Non-Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Salary (Work Preference)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Dependents (Family)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer's Name (Interview)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabilities (Medical)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership of Home (Personal)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation of References (References)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Schools (Education)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor School Subjects (Education)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages Desired or Agreed To (Interview)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Discharge (Military)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments (blank space) (Interview)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Wanted (Work Preference)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (Personal)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Reserve or Nat. Guard (Military)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent of Home (Personal)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees Received (Education)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color of Lair (Personal)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color of Eyes (Personal)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Item (General Category)</td>
<td>Survey 1, Manufacturing</td>
<td>Survey 2, Non-Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board at Home (Personal)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates of Service (Military)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hired or Not Hired (Interview)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing (Medical)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Could Start Work (Work Preference)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Former Employee, When (Employ History)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe Work Wanted (Work Preference)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations Belong To (Hobbies)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to Relatives Here (Family)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Known (References)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of Eyes (Medical)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Organizations (Hobbies)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Address (Personal)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership of Car (Personal)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Problems (Medical)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Languages (Education)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain Own Qualifications (Work Preference)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs Held by Relatives Here (Family)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages of Children (Family)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Testing, Training, and Retesting

The procedure followed involved a test, training for those randomly selected and a retest for all a month later. A followup was conducted after a minimum of four months.

The sample was drawn from special classes in six schools, and included 158 subjects. Although some would claim that the population of special classes is not homogeneous and that research should be designed accordingly, it is evident to educators that the special class represents a functional unit.

These classes included 168 pupils. Of these, ten pupils were eliminated from the study because of prolonged absence, because of refusal to be interviewed, or because placement in the special class was based on presence of a physical disability.

The 158 subjects obtained had a mean age of 16.8 years at the beginning of the study. Of this total, 68 were randomly selected to be in the experimental group, leaving 90 assigned to the control group. The mean age
of the 68 experimental subjects was 16.993 years, and the mean age of the 90 controls was 16.667 years. This difference was tested for significance. A t test was equal to 1.136 and was not significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Intelligence test scores, including the Stanford-Binet, the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, and the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children which had been administered within a two year time period were available for only 142 of the 158 subjects. The mean IQ score for the 62 experimental subjects for whom data were available, was 68.17. The mean score for 80 of the 90 control subjects was 68.30. This data is presented in Table 8.

These differences were tested for significance. A t test was equal to .099 and was not significant at the
TABLE 8
MEAN IQ SCORES OF EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL SUBJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean IQ</td>
<td>68.17</td>
<td>68.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the .05 level of confidence. It was concluded that both the age and the IQ of the two groups were similar.

There were 101 male and 57 female subjects. These were distributed in the experimental and control groups as described in Table 9.

TABLE 9
NUMBER OF EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL SUBJECTS, BY SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were 43 males in the experimental group and 58 in the control group. There were 25 females in the experimental and 32 females in the control group.
To check for significant differences in the sex composition of the experimental and the control groups, a chi-square test was run. Chi-square of .024 was not significant at the .05 level of confidence. Thus it was concluded that the experimental and control groups were not significantly different in the composition of subjects by sex.

Testing was done individually by administering the composite application during a simulated employment interview. Each subject was asked to complete the application to the best of his ability.

Investigation of the effect of instruction proceeded on two levels: first, a retest on the composite application provided one level of evaluation while actual performance in job-seeking behavior provided another. Approximately one month following the testing and training for the experimental group, the subjects were given an opportunity to repeat their performance on the same, individually administered, composite application.
The applications completed initially and during the retest were presented to a group of experts who rated their quality. These experts included vocational counselors actively helping retarded young persons in Onondaga County to get jobs. Instructions were given (Appendix D) asking them to select applications which they felt were representative of employable youth. Each application chosen was assigned a point. The total number of points per application were analyzed with the variables of age, sex, and training or lack of training. Chi-square tests were used to compare the applications for these examined variables, as discussed in Chapter IV.

**Follow-Up**

Testing, training, and retesting were completed by May, 1966. Following a lapse until October 1966, the subjects had ample opportunity to search for jobs. Of the 158 subjects available, the majority sought employment for the summer, for part-time work while remaining in school, or for full-time employment. The follow-up was completed from November, 1966 through March, 1967. Of a total of
158 subjects in the study, 138 were followed up by interviews. Each subject was interviewed about his or her success in seeking employment.

The interview schedule for the follow-up (Appendix E) was used to gather data about the experimental and control groups for the following variables:

1. Number of subjects who looked for work,
2. Number of successful job-seekers,
3. Number of jobs held by subjects,
4. Classification of jobs obtained, by occupational type.
5. Number of hours worked per job,
6. Length of time jobs were held in months,
7. Amount of money earned per job,
8. Hourly wages earned,
9. Comparison of job-seeking success by age,
10. Comparison of job-seeking success by IQ,
11. Comparison of job-seeking success by sex,
12. Number of years in regular classes by job-seeking success,
13. Number of years in special classes by job-seeking success,
14. How successful job-seekers found jobs,
15. Job-seeking success and completion of applications.

Additional comparisons were made for the entire group of subjects, disregarding the experimental and control group differentiations, to explore the relationship of certain variables to job-seeking success, including:

1. Comparison of job-seeking success by age,
2. Comparison of job-seeking success by IQ,
3. Comparison of job-seeking success by sex.

Comparisons were made by chi-square analyses, by *t*-tests, or by visual inspection.

**Methods of Job-Seeking**

To determine those methods of job-seeking perceived as most helpful, a listing of several methods was compiled. Three basic resources were people, places, and techniques to get jobs. For the first category, people that might help a job-seeker locate a job include parents, relatives
other than parents, guidance counselors, teachers, and friends. For the second category, places to go might include help wanted ads over the radio or in fronts of stores; help wanted ads in newspapers; private employment agencies; groups or organizations such as unions, churches, the Urban League, NAACP, and Manufacturers' Association; and the State Employment Service. The third category, techniques to get jobs, includes filling out applications and going through interviews. A form was constructed for ranking of these items (Appendix C). Items found on the form were listed in random order.

This instrument was administered to all educable mentally retarded subjects during their initial simulated employment interview. It was also administered during the follow-up interview. Special class teachers and guidance counselors were asked to respond to the same instrument with the instructions, "How do you think mentally retarded youth will answer?"

Responses were analyzed to determine how effective certain techniques of job-seeking were when use of the
techniques was compared with successful use. Sheppard and Belitsky\(^1\) developed an index to measure the effectiveness of job-seeking techniques. The index provides a measure of the best techniques to get jobs. This index, the Index of Effectiveness, can be obtained by dividing the number of persons citing a particular technique by which they actually obtained their job, by the number of persons who used the particular technique. Effectiveness of the technique is indicated in decimal values where 1.00 indicates perfect effectiveness. The closer the Index approaches to 1.00, the more effective the technique is in actually producing jobs.

It is then possible, after establishing the Index of Effectiveness, to test the reality of perceptions of various techniques. Comparison of the Index with job-seekers' perceptions of effective ways to find jobs can reveal whether a technique is realistically or accurately perceived. Sheppard and Belitsky found, by making such comparisons, that the larger the resulting ratio, whether plus or minus, the less realistic the method. For example,

\(^1\)Sheppard and Belitsky, *op.cit.*
they noted that friends and relatives were effective in helping job-seekers locate jobs. The Index of Effectiveness demonstrated that this "method" was objectively valuable. However, unskilled workers underestimated the value of friends and relatives by 50 percent when a comparison was made of perceptions and the Index of Effectiveness. The average over- or under-estimates thus provide a measure of how realistic the workers are in estimating the worth of a particular technique.

This methodology devised by Sheppard and Belitsky was used for the data collected in the present study. The subjects were asked how they obtained jobs, how they actually looked for work, and what methods they thought would be valuable to find jobs. The resulting data were analyzed to provide an Index of Effectiveness and a measure of realism. This information is presented in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether training educable mentally retarded youth in job-seeking skills, including principles and practices advocated for completing applications for employment, had an effect on their ability to complete a composite application form and/or on actual job-seeking behavior.

Chapter IV presents the results of the study in four sections. The first section presents data comparing the experimental and the control groups on their performance on the test and the retest with the composite application blank. Comparisons are made of the groups on the initial tests, on the retests, and on the difference between the test and retest. The second section presents data comparing the experimental and the control groups on their performance in actual job-seeking and vocational success. This includes the series of variables previously listed in Chapter III.
The third section presents data comparing the successful job-seekers with the unsuccessful job-seekers. This includes comparisons of IQ, age, and sex differences. The fourth section will present data concerning the perceptions, use of, and successful use of various selected techniques of job-seeking by the subjects.

**Ability to Complete Applications**

The first hypothesis was that:

\[ H_1 \text{ there would be significant differences favoring educable mentally retarded youth with specific training in completion of applications for employment as opposed to: educable mentally retarded youth without such training, in terms of the quality, as judged by experts, of completed composite application forms.} \]

This section examines performance of educable mentally retarded youth before and after, with (experimental) or without (control) training in how to apply for jobs. Performance was rated by six experts who judged the quality of the applications. Each of the experts was a vocational counselor and was familiar with the Syracuse and Onondaga County labor market.
The total number of applications collected was 287. The test applications included 158, and 129 applications were collected for the retest. These applications were randomly mixed and were presented to each of the six experts in the same random order. The experts were given instructions (Appendix D) outlining their role. The resulting data was analyzed with contingency tables and chi-square analyses. The .05 level of confidence was selected for acceptance of the hypotheses in the predicted direction, or for rejection of the null hypotheses when no directional prediction was made.

To insure a sufficient number for each cell in the contingency tables, it was necessary to group the applications into those positively chosen (three or more experts reacted favorably) and those negatively chosen (two or fewer experts reacted favorably). Those applications chosen by three or more experts were placed on the favorable side of a dichotomy, while those chosen by less than half the experts were placed on the unfavorable side.
The following information can be divided into three sections. First, comparisons of the initially collected applications only are made. Second, comparisons of the retest applications only are made. Third, a comparison is made between pre-test and post-test applications.

The 158 applications collected initially were divided by their being positively (N = 86) or negatively (N = 72) judged. Then a further division was made by sex (Table 10) and by experimental or control status (Table 11). This was done to determine whether or not there were significant differences in the quality of applications completed prior to selection for training. Because no difference was predicted, a two-tailed test was used.

Of 102 applications completed by males, 58 were judged positively as indicated in Table 10. Of 56 applications completed by females, 28 were positively judged. A two-tailed chi-square test was equal to .68 and was not significant at the .05 level of confidence. Therefore positive or negative judgment was not found to be related to sex.
TABLE 10
COMPARISON OF COMPOSITE APPLICATIONS
COMPLETED BEFORE TRAINING, BY SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgment</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = .68 \text{ (Not Significant)} \]

Of 68 applications completed by the experimental group, 40 were judged positively as indicated in Table 11. Of 90 applications completed by the control group, 46 were judged positively. To determine whether positive or negative judgment was related in any way to selection for training, a chi-square test was made. Chi-square was equal to .93, and at the .05 level of confidence, was not significant. There were no significant differences in judged quality of applications completed prior to selection for the experimental or the control groups.

Post-training or retest comparisons are presented by sex (Table 12) and by experimental versus control status (Table 13). Only 129 of the original group of 158 subjects
TABLE 11
COMPARISON OF COMPOSITE APPLICATIONS
COMPLETED BEFORE TRAINING, BY
EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL
STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgment</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = .93$ (Not Significant)

TABLE 12
COMPARISON OF COMPOSITE APPLICATIONS
COMPLETED AFTER TRAINING, BY
SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgment</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = .26$ (Not Significant)

TABLE 13
COMPARISON OF COMPOSITE APPLICATIONS
COMPLETED AFTER TRAINING, BY
EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL
STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgment</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 7.16$ (Significant at .05 level)
were retested with the composite application blank. The remaining 29 subjects had left school, had a prolonged absence from school, or were otherwise unavailable. Of the 129 applications, 81 were judged positively and 58 were judged negatively.

In Table 12, 82 applications were completed by males and 47 by females. For the males, 50 applications were positively judged, and for the females, 31 applications were positively judged. No relationship was predicted for this comparison, and therefore a two-tailed test was made. Chi-square was equal to .26 and was not significant at the .05 level of confidence. It was concluded that there was no significant relationship between quality of applications completed after training and sex.

For Table 13, a prediction was made that the experimental group would produce more positively judged applications. Therefore a one-tailed chi-square test was used. Chi-square equaled 7.16 and was significant at the .05 level of confidence. It was evident that applications completed by the experimental group were judged more
positively than were those completed by the control group.

The third set of tables presented are those comparing the initial performance on the composite applications with the retest performance. Table 14 gives data for the experimental sample. Prior to training, 40 of 68 completed applications were judged positively. After training, 45 of 60 applications were judged positively. The prediction was made that the experimental sample would demonstrate more positive results after training. Chi-square was equal to 3.74 and was not significant at the .05 level of confidence. However, as chi-square is significant at 3.8, this result was in the predicted direction.

**TABLE 14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgment</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 3.74 \) (Not Significant)
Table 15 presents data for the control sample. Initially, 46 of 90 completed applications were judged positively. After training, 36 of 69 applications were judged positively. The prediction was made that the control sample would not change. Therefore a two-tailed test was used. Chi-square was equal to .02 and was not significant at the .05 level of confidence.

In summary, it can be concluded that the training did have an effect on the experimental group. This effect was significant when a comparison was made with the control group, and was in the predicted direction when comparison was made between the pre- and post-test for the experimental group. There was no significant difference in performance for the control group or for male and female groupings.

TABLE 15
COMPARISON OF COMPOSITE APPLICATIONS COMPLETED BY THE CONTROL SAMPLE BEFORE AND AFTER TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgment</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = .02$ (Not Significant)
Job-Seeking Success

The second hypothesis was that:

\[ H_2: \text{there would be significant differences favoring educable mentally retarded youth having had training in job-seeking skills, including completion of applications for employment, as opposed to educable mentally retarded youth without such training, in terms of several variables relating to job-seeking and vocational success, as measured by a follow-up after at least a four month time period.} \]

This section examines data gathered in follow-up interviews with 138 of the subjects.

The follow-up was begun in October 1966 and extended until March 1967. October 1, 1966 was used as a cut-off date for all subjects, so that only jobs obtained prior to that time were included in the study. Data were collected by interviews for 138 of the 158 subjects in the study. This included 87.34 percent of the original sample. Another five subjects were located, but were not interviewed. One was in a state institution, one in the military service, one in jail, and two had moved to other states. Counting these five subjects, those located included 90.5 percent of the original sample. Fifteen subjects were not traced.
The following tables give the number of persons or jobs for which data were available. For those subjects for whom information taken in the interview was not complete or did not appear to be accurate, attempts were made to gather additional information from teachers, guidance counselors, work-coordinators, and employers whenever appropriate.

It was predicted that the experimental subjects would have more positive results in their job-search than would the members of the control group. Several variables were examined to determine if this was the case. This section presents these variables with comparisons between experimental and control groups. The .05 level of confidence was selected for acceptance of the predicted change in direction of the hypothesis when predictions were made.

A first comparison (Table 16) was made between the experimental and control groups to determine if significantly more experimental subjects sought work. It was predicted that a significantly greater number of experimental subjects would seek work. Of 109 subjects who indicated they actively
sought work, 48 were from the experimental group and 61 were from the control group. Of 26 subjects who indicated that they did not look for work, 15 were from the experimental group and 11 were from the control group. In addition, 20 subjects were not followed, as indicated elsewhere, and 3 did not reply. The prediction was tested by a one-tailed chi-square test. Chi-square was equal to 1.57 and was not significant at the .05 level of confidence. It was concluded that the training had no effect on the number of subjects who looked for work.

TABLE 16
NUMBER OF SUBJECTS WHO LOOKED FOR WORK BY EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Looked for work</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not look</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 1.57 (Not Significant)

Table 17 provides data comparing the number of successful job-seekers in the experimental and control groups. It was predicted that the subjects in the
The experimental group would hold more jobs. In the experimental group, 38 of the 68 subjects held jobs, while 49 of the 90 control subjects held jobs. A one-tailed chi-square test equaled .37 showed the two groups to be not significantly different at the .05 level of confidence. It was concluded that training had no effect on the number of successful job-seekers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPARISON OF THE NUMBER OF SUCCESSFUL JOB-SEEKERS BY EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL STATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = .37 \text{ (Not Significant)} \]

A total of 136 jobs, as described in Table 18, were held by the subjects in the study. The subjects in the experimental group held 62 of these jobs. The control subjects found 74 jobs. Of 68 experimental subjects, only 38 held jobs. Of 90 control subjects, 49
When the number of jobs held was divided by the number of subjects who worked, the experimental subjects who worked held a mean number of 1.63 jobs each. The 49 control subjects who worked held a mean number of 1.51 jobs each. By visual inspection, there appear to be no major differences in the performance of the two groups. It was concluded that training produced no differences in the number of jobs held by the subjects.

TABLE 18

NUMBER OF JOBS HELD BY SUBJECTS IN THE EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of subjects</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of jobs held</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of subjects who worked</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of jobs held by subjects who worked</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 136 jobs obtained by the 87 successful job-seekers were categorized according to the classification system developed by the U.S. Department of Labor in the most recent edition of the Dictionary of Occupational
Titles. Table 19 lists these occupational classifications and gives the number of jobs obtained in each category for the experimental, control and total groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Technical and Managerial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and Sales</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, Fishery, Forestry and related</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine Trades</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bench Work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Work</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
<td><strong>136</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the subjects obtained jobs in the professional, technical and managerial category. Service occupations provided over half the jobs obtained, while structural work, miscellaneous, and clerical and sales categories trailed.
By visual inspection, there appear to be no major differences in the types of jobs held by the two groups. Again, it was concluded that training had no effect.

In Table 20, the mean number of hours worked per job for each group are compared. It was predicted that the experimental subjects would work more hours per job. For 60 jobs held by experimental subjects, the mean number of hours worked was 464.9 hours per job. For 71 jobs held by control subjects, the mean number of hours worked was 307.0 per job.

**TABLE 20**

TOTAL HOURS WORKED PER JOB BY EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of jobs</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of hours worked per job</td>
<td>464.9</td>
<td>307.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = 14.38 \text{ (Significant at} .05 \text{ level)} \]

Comparisons between the groups were made with a one-tailed \( t \)-test. The \( t \)-test with 129 degrees of freedom,
was equal to 14.38 and was significant at the .05 level of confidence. It was concluded that the experimental group worked significantly more hours per job than did the control group.

The length of time jobs were held in months is presented in Table 21 for the experimental and control groups. For 61 jobs held by the experimental group, the mean number of months was 5.1. For the 71 jobs for which data was available held by subjects in the control group, the mean number of months was 3.4.

TABLE 21
LENGTH OF TIME JOBS WERE HELD IN MONTHS
BY EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of jobs</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of months jobs were held</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = 13.06 \text{ (Significant at .05 level)} \]

A comparison was made between the experimental and control groups to test the prediction that the subjects in the experimental group would hold their jobs for a
significantly greater length of time. A one-tailed $t$-test with 131 degrees of freedom was equal to 13.06 and was significant at the .05 level of confidence. It was concluded that the subjects in the experimental group held their jobs for a significantly longer period of time.

Table 22 presents the mean and standard deviation of the amount of money earned per job for subjects in the experimental and control groups. It was predicted that the jobs held by members of the experimental group would return significantly more money per job than would the jobs held by the controls. The experimental subjects held a total of 60 jobs and their total earnings amounted to $24,826. For the 72 jobs held by subjects in the control group, the total amount earned was $21,818. The total earnings for the 132 jobs held by all subjects for whom data was available was $46,644.

The amount of money earned on jobs held by the experimental and control subjects was compared. With 130 degrees of freedom, a $t$-test was equal to 6.70 and was significant at the .05 level of confidence. It was evident
TABLE 22
AMOUNT OF MONEY EARNED PER JOB BY EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of jobs</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total money earned</td>
<td>$24,826</td>
<td>$21,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean amount of money e^n per job</td>
<td>$ 653.31</td>
<td>$ 445.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>54.75</td>
<td>52.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$t = 6.70$ (Significant at .05 level)

that the members of the experimental group earned significantly more money per job than did the control subjects. This result was presumably related to the length of time jobs were held.

Table 23 presents data on the amount of pay earned per hour by subjects in the experimental and control groups. A prediction was made that the experimental group would receive significantly more pay per hour than the controls. For 59 jobs held by experimental subjects, the mean amount of money received per hour was $1.12. For 73 jobs held by control subjects, the mean amount of money received per hour was $1.08.
TABLE 23
HOURLY WAGES EARNED BY EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of jobs</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean pay per hour per job</td>
<td>$1.12</td>
<td>$1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$t = .005$ (Not Significant)

A comparison of the amount of pay per hour was made between the two groups. With 130 degrees of freedom, a $t$-test was equal to .005 and was not significant at the .05 level of confidence. It was concluded that the experimental subjects did not earn more money per hour than did the control subjects. It is evident that the greater total financial return found for the experimental group was due not to the amount of money earned per hour but to the greater length of time jobs were held.

Table 24 presents the mean age and standard deviations of the age of the subjects in the experimental and control groups, by success or failure in job-seeking. For this comparison, it was predicted that there would be no
significant difference. The $t$-tests between the successful groups (experimental and control) and between the unsuccessful groups (experimental and control) were not significant ($t = .76$ and $t = 1.12$ respectively) at the .05 level of confidence. A $t$-test between the experimental groups (successful and unsuccessful) was significant at the .05 level ($t = 1.97$) and a $t$-test between the control groups (successful and unsuccessful) was significant at the .05 level of confidence ($t = 2.71$). Thus success or its lack was apparently dependent upon age and not upon experimental or control status.

Table 25 gives the mean and standard deviation of the IQ scores of the subjects in both the experimental and control groups, divided by their success or failure in job-seeking. For purposes of this comparison, it was predicted that there would be no difference. The $t$-tests between the successful and unsuccessful groups (experimental and control) were not significant ($t = .36$ and $t = 1.19$ respectively) at the .05 level of confidence. The $t$-tests
between the experimental groups (successful and unsuccessful) and the control groups (successful and unsuccessful) were not significant at the .05 level of confidence (t = 1.01 and t = .66 respectively).

**TABLE 24**

**COMPARISON BY AGE OF EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS BY SUCCESS IN JOB-SEEKING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimental</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>207.9</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>197.8</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>204.7</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>191.0</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental (successful versus unsuccessful)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.97&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (successful versus unsuccessful)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.71&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful (experimental versus control)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful (experimental versus control)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Significant at .05 level
It was concluded that there was no significant difference in the success or failure of the four groups due to IQ differences.

### Table 25
Comparison by IQ of Experimental and Control Groups by Success in Job-Seeking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimental</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>68.74</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66.91</td>
<td>8.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>68.16</td>
<td>8.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>69.38</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental (Successful versus unsuccessful)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (Successful versus unsuccessful)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful (Experimental versus control)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful (Experimental versus control)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26 presents the numbers of subjects in the experimental and control groups divided by sex. For this comparison, it was predicted that no differences would
be found between the experimental and the control groups, nor between the male and female groups within the experimental and control categories.

**TABLE 26**  
**COMPARISON BY SEX OF EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS BY SUCCESS IN JOB-SEEKING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square of 11.79 demonstrated that there were significant differences in the success of the experimental group when divided by sex. A chi-square of 2.94 demonstrated no significant differences in the success of the control group when divided by sex. Chi-square of .28 demonstrated no significant differences at the .05 level of confidence in the success among males in the experimental versus the control groups. Also, a chi-square of 1.74 demonstrated no significant differences in the success of females in the experimental versus the control groups.
It was concluded that sex differences did have a significant impact on job-seeking success for the experimental group only. The males in the experimental group had significantly greater success in seeking jobs than did females in the experimental group.

**TABLE 27**
NUMBER OF YEARS IN REGULAR CLASSES FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS BY JOB-SEEKING SUCCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successful \ Experimental Control</th>
<th>Unsuccessful \ Experimental Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>38 \ 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean years</td>
<td>5.08 \ 4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>2.3 \ 2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df \ t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental (Successful versus unsuccessful)</td>
<td>85 \ 1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (Successful versus unsuccessful)</td>
<td>50 \ .09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful (Experimental versus Control)</td>
<td>61 \ .46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful (Experimental versus Control)</td>
<td>74 \ .72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison was made in Table 27 of the number of years spent in regular classes for the experimental and control groups and the successful and unsuccessful job-seekers. It was predicted that there would be no differences. Of 87 experimental subjects, 38 were successful and 49 unsuccessful.
Successful subjects had a mean number of 5.08 years in regular classes while unsuccessful subjects had a mean number of 4.34 years. This difference was not significant at the .05 level ($t = 1.51$). Of 52 control subjects, the 25 successful subjects had a mean of 4.80 years of regular classes while the 27 unsuccessful subjects had a mean of 4.74 years. This difference was not significant ($t = .09$) at the .05 level.

Of 63 successful subjects, 38 experimental and 25 control subjects had attended regular classes for mean numbers of 5.08 and 4.80 years respectively. This difference was not significant at the .05 level ($t = .56$). Of 76 subjects who failed to get jobs, 49 experimental and 27 control subjects had attended regular classes for mean numbers of 4.34 and 4.74 years respectively. This difference was not significant ($t = .72$) at the .05 level. It was concluded that the number of years of attendance in regular classes was not related to success in job-seeking or to experimental or control status.
A similar comparison was made in Table 28 of the number of years spent in special classes for the experimental and control subjects and the successful and unsuccessful job-seekers. It was predicted that there would be no differences. Of 87 experimental subjects, 38 were successful in their job search, while 49 were unsuccessful. The successful subjects had a mean number of years in special classes of 5.87 and the unsuccessful subjects had a mean number of years of 4.68. This difference, tested by a two-tailed \( t \) test, showed \( t \) equal to 2.11. This difference was not significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Of 52 control subjects, the mean number of years of special class for 25 successful subjects was 5.75. The 27 unsuccessful subjects had a mean number of years of 4.66. This difference was tested by a two-tailed \( t \) test and was equal to 1.78. This difference was not significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Of the 63 successful subjects, the 38 experimental subjects had a mean number of years of special classes of 5.87 and the 25 control subjects had a corresponding mean
TABLE 28

NUMBER OF YEARS IN SPECIAL CLASSES FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS BY JOB-SEEKING SUCCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th></th>
<th>Unsuccessful</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean years</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental (Successful versus unsuccessful)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (Successful versus unsuccessful)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful (Experimental versus Control)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful (Experimental versus Control)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of years of 5.75. This difference was subjected to a t-test. The t-test was equal to .19 and was not significant at the .05 level of confidence. For the 76 subjects who failed to get jobs, the 49 from the experimental group had a mean number of years of special classes of 4.68 and the 27 from the control group had a corresponding mean of 4.66. This difference was tested and t was equal to .03 which was not significant at the .05 level of confidence.
Table 29 lists the job-seeking techniques which were perceived as useful by the experimental and the control groups both before and after job-seeking. The relatively impersonal methods of help wanted ads in newspapers and the State Employment Service were the major methods chosen by educable mentally retarded youth. Visual inspection reveals no differences in the data for the groups.

Noteworthy is the finding that processes, such as interviews and filling out applications, and people, such as teachers, friends and parents, were perceived as not useful in job-seeking both before and after job-seeking. This finding will be commented upon below.

During the follow-up interviews, each subject was asked specifically whether or not he had completed any applications for employment in his job-search. It was predicted that success was related to the completion of applications for both groups. Table 30 shows that 73 subjects of the total of 136 for whom data was available, had completed applications. Of these 73 subjects, 63 were successful in job-seeking. Some 63 subjects did not
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Experimental Before</th>
<th>Experimental After</th>
<th>Control Before</th>
<th>Control After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help Wanted Ads Radio</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Wanted Ads Newspapers</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Employment Agencies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filling out applications</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups or organizations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance Counselor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going through interviews</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Employment Service</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
complete applications and only 22 of them were successful in their job search. This difference was tested by chi-square. Chi-square equaled 18.49 for the experimental group and 20.35 for the control group and was significant at the .05 level in both cases.

Comparisons were also made between the successful and the unsuccessful groups. It was predicted that the experimental group within each of the above two groups would be significantly different from the control groups. A chi-square of 1.99 demonstrated that there was no significant difference at the .05 level in the successful groups when divided by their completion of non-completion of applications. A chi-square of 1.15 demonstrated that there was no significant difference at the .05 level in the unsuccessful groups when divided by their completion or non-completion of applications. Thus while the completion of applications was related to job-seeking success, the experimental group did not complete significantly more applications than the control group. This finding is contrary to the prediction made in the study.
Successful subjects were asked how they found their job or jobs, in terms of the listing of twelve selected techniques. For a total of 136 jobs, the 87 successful job-seekers gave (Table 31) 154 responses to the listing of methods they actually used to get jobs. By visual inspection there are few differences in terms of experimental or control status in methods used. The most prominent techniques used involved guidance counselors and friends. Teachers ranked third in importance as a technique to get jobs. It is noteworthy in Table 31 that the successful job-seekers did not spontaneously indicate that they actually used either interviews or applications for

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed applications</th>
<th>Experimental Success</th>
<th>Experimental Failure</th>
<th>Control Success</th>
<th>Control Failure</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not complete</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
employment. Comparison with Table 29 reveals that while guidance counselors, teachers and friends were important in actual success, they were not perceived as important either before or after job-seeking.

**TABLE 31**

HOW SUCCESSFUL JOB-SEEKERS FOUND JOBS BY EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help wanted ads on radios or in storefronts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help wanted ads in newspapers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Employment agencies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups or organizations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance Counselors</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Employment Service</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>154</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of Successful and Unsuccessful Job-Seekers

Three comparisons were made of successful and unsuccessful job-seekers on the variables of age, sex and IQ. The purpose of these comparisons was to determine whether these variables were related to success in job-seeking for this study. Previously cited studies have indicated a relationship between the variables of sex and age and vocational behavior. For the variable of intelligence, however, studies as listed in Chapter II have found that, within the restricted range of intelligence found among educable mentally retarded persons, IQ is not related to vocational success.

For the comparisons, therefore, it was predicted that greater age and male sex would be associated with successful job-seeking, while IQ would have no relationship to successful job-seeking.

The first comparison made was by age. Table 32 reveals that the successful job-seekers had a mean age of 206.1 months, and unsuccessful job-seekers had a mean
age of 193.7 months. This difference was significant as measured by a one-tailed t-test with 136 degrees of freedom at the .05 level of confidence (t = 3.46).

### TABLE 32
**COMPARISON OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL JOB-SEEKERS BY AGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Unsuccessful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean age in months</td>
<td>206.1</td>
<td>193.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>19.26</td>
<td>21.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = 3.46 \] (Significant at .05 level)

The second comparison was concerned with IQ. Data about IQ scores presented in Table 33 revealed that the successful group had a mean IQ of 68.43, with a corresponding figure for the unsuccessful group of 68.23. There was no significant difference between the successful and unsuccessful groups with a two-tailed t-test equal to .15 with 122 degrees of freedom.

The third comparison was made to ascertain the effect of sex on job-seeking success. This information is
TABLE 33
COMPARISON OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL JOB-SEEKERS BY IQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Unsuccessful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean IQ</td>
<td>68.43</td>
<td>68.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$t = .15$ (Not Significant)

TABLE 34
COMPARISON OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL JOB-SEEKERS BY SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 13.29$ (Significant at .05 level)

presented in Table 34. It was predicted that there would be differences in success due to sex differences. Some 66 males were successful in job-seeking while only 23 males were unsuccessful. Of 57 females, 21 were successful while
28 did not obtain a job. This difference was tested by a one-tailed chi-square test. The difference was significant at the .05 level of confidence ($\chi^2 = 13.29$).

The predictions made were fulfilled. As previous studies have indicated, age and male sex are positively related to job-seeking success, and behavior, for youth. IQ was found to be unrelated to job-seeking success, as predicted. Presumably this latter result is related to the previously discussed restriction of range of intelligence as found among the mentally retarded.

**Perceptions of Job-Seeking Techniques**

The purpose of the rating sheet (Appendix C), as described in Chapter III, was to contrast perceptions of and use of 1) processes, such as interviews and applications for employment, with 2) community resources, such as the employment service, with 3) people, such as parents or friends.

Table 35 presents data on the number and percent of educable mentally retarded youth who 1) planned to find, 2) actually looked for and/or 3) found a job or jobs
through use of any of the twelve listed methods. The first choice of the respondents on the rating sheet was used to develop the rankings for perceptions and looking for jobs categories. For the methods successfully used to find jobs, answers were taken from the follow-up interview schedule (Appendix E) and then categorized in terms of the twelve techniques. More than one answer was permitted for this part of the rankings.

It is evident from visual inspection that the perceptions of and the use of various techniques are significantly different from the techniques successfully used to find jobs. Use of guidance counselors, friends and teachers resulted in success. The techniques perceived as valuable and used most frequently, including newspapers and the employment service, did not result in success. It can be concluded that 1) the techniques perceived as valuable are not and 2) the techniques most frequently used, do not result in success.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Perceptions Before</th>
<th>Perceptions After</th>
<th>How looked for a job</th>
<th>How found a job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want Ads Radio</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want Ads Newspaper</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Employment Agencies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance Counselors</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Service</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>148</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The numbers were figured as percentages to permit comparisons according to the Sheppard-Bellitsky formula. The percent for each technique for how jobs were actually found, was used as a dividend. The percent for perceptions before seeking employment, for after seeking employment and for methods actually used to look for employment were then divided by the percent for methods by which jobs were actually found. Table 36 lists this data.

Essentially, Table 36 provides an indication of the realism of the perceptions or actual use of the techniques to seek employment. The closer a number is to 1.0, the more realistic the perception or use of the technique in terms of the results actually obtained. Higher numbers (than 1.0) are indicative that the technique was viewed more positively than it proved to be. Lower numbers are indicative that techniques were viewed less positively than they actually were in practice. Noteworthy is the similarity of the three listings. Private employment agencies, newspaper ads, groups or organizations and the State Employment Service were all perceived as better techniques of job-seeking
than they proved to be. Friends, teachers, guidance counselors and relatives were better sources of jobs than perceptions would indicate.

### TABLE 36

REALISM OF PERCEPTIONS OF, AND USE OF, SELECTED TECHNIQUES USED TO SEEK EMPLOYMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Perception Before</th>
<th>Perception After</th>
<th>How looked for a job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help Want Ads Radios</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Want Ads Newspaper</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Employ Agency</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups or organizations</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance Counselors</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.1p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Employ Service</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A sufficient number of rankings of the best techniques to get jobs, by special class teachers or guidance counselors, for analysis by use of the Sheppard-Bellitsky Index of
Effectiveness was not available. Therefore, for the 14 rankings made by eleven teachers and three counselors, a listing, rather than the Index of Effectiveness, was used to develop a ranking of the importance of each technique. The rankings made before job-seeking by 158 educable mentally retarded students were used for comparison purposes. Table 37 lists these rankings of techniques.

The techniques chosen by the educable mentally retarded youth as most important, were the newspaper, the State Employment Service, and help wanted ads over radios or in storefronts. Teachers and counselors ranked teachers highest, with guidance counselors closely following.

The surprising finding in this series of tables is that the almost universally used interview was ranked as one of the least important techniques in finding employment. The processes of interviewing and of completing applications were not perceived as important, whereas the community resources and people were far more favorably viewed. In general, for the retarded youth, the perceptions of the best techniques to get jobs were oriented
toward relatively impersonal resources, even though success in finding jobs came through use of more personal resources such as teachers, guidance counselors, and friends. Perceptions are, according to this data, relatively independent of experience and of actual job-seeking results.

### TABLE 37

**RANKINGS OF JOB-SEEKING TECHNIQUES BY EDUCABLE MENTALLY RETARDED YOUTH AND SPECIAL CLASS TEACHERS AND GUIDANCE COUNSELORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Type of Technique</th>
<th>EMR Youth (N=158)</th>
<th>Teachers (N=14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help Want Ads Newspapers</td>
<td>Comm Resource</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Employ Service</td>
<td>Comm Resource</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Want Ads Radios</td>
<td>Comm Resource</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance Counselors</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Employ Agencies</td>
<td>Comm Resource</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Organizations</td>
<td>Comm Resource</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND DISCUSSION

Summary

Increasing concern about facilitating the transition of young people from school to work has developed in our society because of the importance of this transition to the individual, the economic system, and the educational system. Many young people have problems in obtaining jobs. These problems may lead to individual maladjustment, delinquent behavior, and social unrest. Of the many factors causing these problems in obtaining jobs, one is the individual's ability to find, apply for, and get a job.

A brief training program was developed to increase the ability of individuals to apply for jobs. It was hypothesized that such a program would facilitate the transition to work and that those who had received such training would be better able to get jobs, and would in fact, get better jobs.

A review of the literature indicated a need to study the effects of a brief training program on job-seeking skills.
among educable mentally retarded youth. The need was established on the basis of two major considerations. The first consideration was whether it was possible to alter job-seeking behavior of educable mentally retarded youth through use of a brief training program. Second, a model, for research, promulgated by Goldstein,\(^1\) was used in this study. This model appears to be worthwhile for further research with related types of training programs.

The primary purpose of the study was to develop, use, and evaluate a brief specific training program to teach, through vocational counseling, job-seeking skills, including the skills necessary to fill out applications for employment.

Two hypotheses were made. The first stated that:

\(H_1: \) There would be significant differences favoring educable mentally retarded youth with training in job-seeking skills, including completion of applications for employment, as opposed to educable mentally retarded youth without such training, in terms of the quality, as judged by experts, of completed composite application forms.

The second hypothesis stated:

\(H_2: \) There would be significant differences favoring educable mentally retarded youth having had training

\(^1\)Goldstein, \(op. \ cit.\)
in job-seeking skills, including completion of applications for employment, as opposed to educable mentally retarded youth without such training, in terms of several variables relating to job-seeking and vocational success, as measured by a follow-up after at least a four month time period.

Additionally, three questions were raised:

1. What is the typical content of the application for employment?
2. How frequently do various items appear on the application for employment?
3. How do educators or counselors, and successful and unsuccessful job-seeking educable mentally retarded youth, before and after experience at seeking jobs, rank various means of seeking jobs.

Development of a specific training curriculum was accomplished through reviewing relevant literature. The program was designed to simulate employment interviews for 158 educable mentally retarded youth in six schools. Subjects selected were in special classes for the mentally retarded and did not have observable physical defects. All subjects were initially tested. Then the experimental subjects, including 68 subjects, were individually trained. The members of the control group, including 90 subjects, were returned to their classrooms. Evaluation of the results
of the program took place by 1) retesting the subjects with a composite application for employment at least one month after the initial test, and 2) studying job-seeking behavior through follow-up interviews at least four months after the retesting.

Comparisons, between the experimental and control groups, and between males and females, were made of the 158 composite applications completed initially. There were no significant differences. Comparisons were made of the 129 composite applications completed at least one month after training had been administered to the experimental group. A comparison by sex revealed no significant differences between males and females in their ability to complete an application as judged by six experts. A comparison of the experimental and the control group revealed a significant difference, at the .05 level of confidence, in ability to complete applications as judged by six experts. This finding confirmed the first hypothesis made in the study. Comparisons were made of the 128 applications completed by the experimental group before and after training. The results were in the predicted direction but were not significant. A similar
comparison was made of the 159 test and retest applications completed by the control group. Chi-square revealed no significant differences.

Comparisons between the experimental and the control group were made on several variables relating to job-seeking and vocational success. The number of persons in the experimental and in the control groups who sought work was found to be not significantly different as tested by chi-square. The number of persons in the experimental and in the control group who sought and were successful in finding work was found to be not significantly different as tested by chi-square.

Visual inspection indicated there were no major differences in the number of jobs held by members of the experimental and control groups. Visual inspection also revealed no major differences in the types of jobs held by the members of the experimental and the control group, as classified by the *Dictionary of Occupational Titles*.\(^1\)

Comparison of the number of hours worked per job for the subjects in the experimental and control groups was made with a t-test. The prediction that the subjects in

---

the experimental group would work more hours than the subjects in the control group was confirmed, with $t$ significant at the .05 level of confidence. Comparison of the length of time jobs were held in months between the experimental and control groups was made with a $t$-test. The difference was significant at the .05 level of confidence.

The amount of money earned per job was compared for the experimental and the control group. The difference was found to be significant at the .05 level of confidence, according to a $t$-test. The hourly wages earned by the experimental and the control subjects were compared by a $t$-test. The difference was found to be not significant at the .05 level of confidence. The experimental group did not earn more money per hour than the control group.

A number of comparisons were made to explore differences between successful and unsuccessful job-seekers in the experimental and control groups. It had been assumed for this group of youth that age would make a difference in job-seeking success. The successful group was older than the unsuccessful group, with a $t$-test significant at the .05 level of confidence. Significant differences were found
between the successful and unsuccessful job-seekers for age within the experimental group only and the control group only, as well.

A similar test by IQ revealed no significant differences in IQ for successful or unsuccessful groups, whether consideration was made of the entire group or of the experimental or control groups alone.

It was predicted that sex differences would not make a difference in job-seeking success. A significant difference was found indicating that males were more successful in job-seeking. When further division into experimental and control groups was made, the differences in job-seeking success were still significantly affected by sex.

Comparisons were made between successful and unsuccessful subjects in the experimental and in the control groups of the number of years spent in regular classes. No significant differences were found. Comparisons were made between experimental and control subjects who were successful and unsuccessful in job-seeking regarding the number of years found.

Comparisons were made between successful and unsuccessful
subjects in the experimental and in the control groups of the number of years spent in special classes. These differences, as tested by a t-test, were found to be significant at the .05 level of confidence. Successful subjects spent significantly more time in special classes than unsuccessful subjects. A comparison was made between experimental and control subjects who were successful or unsuccessful in job-seeking of the number of years spent in special classes. No significant differences were found.

Visual inspection revealed no major differences between the experimental and the control group in methods used to get jobs. A comparison was made of successful versus unsuccessful job-seekers in each group (experimental and control) to determine whether completion of applications for employment while job-seeking was related to success. Chi-square comparisons were significant for each group, indicating that completion of applications during job-seeking was significantly related to job-seeking success. A further comparison was made between experimental and control subjects divided by success or failure. Chi-square was not significant indicating that neither the experimental nor the control
group completed more applications in their job-seeking attempts.

Thus, the second hypothesis was only partially confirmed. The difference found was that the experimental subjects went to work before the control subjects, and therefore worked more hours and months and received more money.

Information was presented about the application for employment and perceptions regarding job-seeking techniques.

Data on applications were secured through two surveys of Onondaga County manufacturing and non-manufacturing firms. The applications were tabulated to provide a listing of the frequency of occurrence of specific items on the blanks. A composite form was developed from this listing and is found in Appendix A. It is this composite application that was used to test and retest the subjects in the study.

Perceptions regarding job-seeking techniques were found to be, for educable mentally retarded youth, somewhat unrealistic as measured by the Sheppard-Bellitsky Index of Effectiveness, and were oriented towards use of impersonal methods. It was interesting to note that guidance counselors, friends, and teachers provided the greatest amount of help in job-seeking, but rankings of these "personal" techniques, even after job-seeking, were low.
Discussion

The implications of these results are several. First, it is evident that instruction given during a simulated employment interview can be effective in improving skills needed to complete applications for employment. This skill was present even after a month's interval of time. It is feasible, therefore, to teach job-seeking skills, including how to complete applications to educable mentally retarded youth, and to expect qualitative changes.

Second, instruction given resulted in a more rapid search for employment and a greater length of employment. The trained group worked for more time than did the control group. It appears that teaching job-seeking skills can result in an improvement in at least one measure of vocational success.

However, the limited changes that were found in vocational success for the experimental group may or may not be attributable to the training given to the experimental group. The likelihood that a significant finding at the .05 level of confidence will be found is one in twenty. With a large number of variables tested, it may be that the
finding was spurious. This interpretation has added weight when it is recalled that the experimental and the control groups did not differ in terms of use of application blanks for seeking employment.

It may be that the skill to complete applications and seek employment did not transfer to actual ability to locate, apply for, and get jobs. Both specific and general knowledge appear to have been transferred because the retest for the experimental group was significantly improved while the retest for the control group was not. In terms of job-seeking and vocational success, it was evident that general knowledge was partially transferred because the members of the experimental group obtained jobs sooner than did members of the control group. However, the evidence to the contrary, as previously stated, indicates that this finding may be spurious.

Performance did differ with training for the completion of applications—a verbal level of behavior. Behavior related to getting jobs changed only slightly.

It is not possible to conclude that verbal communication was ineffective or highly effective in producing noticeable differences in behavior. However, it can be concluded
that the effect was not necessarily uniform.

This study sought to evaluate the use of one specific and limited skill involved in job-seeking. There are numerous other areas, as listed by Hoppock\(^1\) among others, which are relevant aspects of the total range of skills required for successful job-seeking. Varying combinations of these skills and activities can be taught to students about to leave school for work. It appears from the results of this study that specific techniques taught in relative isolation are not a rapid avenue for producing job-seeking skills and vocational success. Comprehensive approaches may be necessary. This particular approach did produce significant change in terms of more rapid success, but this result may have been spurious.

It was noteworthy that success in job-seeking was related to age and sex, but not to IQ. Presumably the finding that fewer females went to work was related to the data reported by the U.S. Department of Labor\(^2\) which indicated that twice as many males as females are in the labor force. Presumably also, because the subjects ranged in age from

---


14 through 21, age played an important role in vocational success. It is not surprising that IQ was not related to success in view of similar previous findings reported in the literature.

The data obtained about the application for employment may provide a foundation for future research on application forms. It may be possible to develop a method of weighting items for their importance in influencing employers, just as employers have weighted items for choosing and selecting employees. The composite application or the frequency tabulation of the items can be used for further research.

The data collected about perceptions of methods of job-seeking need further elucidation. The lack of consistency between techniques that are perceived as valuable and techniques that are valuable indicates that some techniques are apparently advertised more frequently and more successfully than they should be. Teachers and counselors should evaluate methods before expounding on which techniques are useful. There are differences, even in the limited data collected, regarding the perceptions of educable mentally retarded youth and teachers and counselors. Thus, information is not being
received solely from the educational system. The sources of such information should be traced, and a more creative effort should be made to instruct youth in using those methods which are most valuable.

Goldstein's\textsuperscript{1} suggestion that programs require evaluation through study of treatment effects on the outcome, was followed for this study. The methodology appears appropriate, It is possible that the criteria used to judge the outcome were not equally sensitive. In any case, the research methodology could be followed for similar studies using other job-seeking techniques, or using various combinations of vocational counseling, occupational information giving, work-experience programs and other related types of treatment.

\textsuperscript{1}Goldstein, \textit{op. cit.}
APPENDIX A

GREGORY COMPOSITE APPLICATION FOR EMPLOYMENT (GCAFE)
The New York State Law Against Discrimination
Prohibits Discrimination Because of Age

GREGORY COMPOSITE
APPLICATION FOR EMPLOYMENT

1. Personal Data
Date ____________________
Name ______________________________ Social Sec. No. ________________
Present Address ____________________ Permanent Address ______________
Telephone __________ Birth Date ______ Age ____ Sex ____ US Citizen ___
Height _____ Weight _____ Color of Hair _____ Color of Eyes _____
Name and address of person to be notified in case of emergency ______

Do you own your home? ____ Rent? ____ Board? ____ Do you own a car? ___

2. Employment History (list three—most recent first)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer and Address</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Dates Employed</th>
<th>Type of Work Done</th>
<th>Past Wages</th>
<th>Reason Left</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Educational Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Dates of Attendance</th>
<th>When Did Graduate</th>
<th>Major Subject</th>
<th>Minor Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade or Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What foreign languages do you speak? __________________

4. Military History

Branch of Service __________________ Dates of Service ______________

Type of Discharge __________________

Are you a member of the Reserves or National Guard? ____________
5. Medical Data
Do you have any disabilities? ________________________________
How is your hearing? _______ Eyes? _______ Any Speech Problem? _____

6. Family Data
Married ____ Single ____ Divorced ____ Separated ____ Widowed ____
Children? ____ What are their ages? ____ Other Dependents ____
Do you have relatives working for this company? ____ Relationship ____
_________________________ What are their jobs here?____________________

7. Hobbies
What are your hobbies? __________________________________________
What kinds of groups do you belong to? ______________________________

8. References

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Work Preference
Wages Expected ___________ When can you start work? ___________
Job Wanted _____________________________________________________
Did you ever work for this company? ____ If so, when? ____________
Tell why you should have this job ________________________________

__________________________
Signature __________________

10. Interviewer's Comments
Hired or not hired? __________ Wages wanted or agreed to _______
Comments ______________________________________________________

__________________________
Interviewer's Name ______________
APPENDIX B

PRINCIPLES OF INSTRUCTION FOR

COMPLETING APPLICATIONS
HOW TO FILL OUT AN APPLICATION FOR A JOB

A. Before you start to fill out the application:

1. Ask at least three people to be your references.
2. Write down important information such as phone numbers and addresses of references, your work and school history, and other information on a sheet of paper. Carry this information with you when you go looking for a job.
3. Carry your own ballpoint pen with blue ink.

B. When you start to fill out the application:

1. Read the questions on the application carefully.
2. Ask about anything you do not understand.
3. Follow all directions, and work carefully.
4. Write clearly and neatly except if you are asked to print.
5. Be careful about spelling.
6. Do not skip anything that applies to you.
7. Answer each question honestly.
8. Do not get mad if the questions seem personal.
9. Draw a short line in any space where the question does not apply to you.
10. Be ready to explain any answers you put down.
11. If there is a space for you to add extra information, tell about something you do well, or something you think will help you get the job.

C. After you fill out the application:

1. Go over the application to see if you made any mistakes or left anything out.
2. Be sure the application does not have words that are spelled wrong, or ink blots, or messy mistakes. Ask for a new application if the first one is messy.
APPENDIX C

LISTING OF JOB-SEEKING TECHNIQUES
LISTING OF JOB-SEEKING TECHNIQUES

Date ______________________

Name ________________________ Birthdate ______________________

1. How do you plan to get a job? _______________________________________________________

2. Here is a list of people that might help, places to go, and ways to get jobs. Which do you plan to use first? . . . second? . . . third? . . . and so on.

_______ Help wanted ads over the radio or in fronts of stores
_______ Help wanted ads in newspapers
_______ Private employment agencies
_______ Relatives, other than parents
_______ Parents
_______ Filling out applications
_______ Groups or organizations such as unions, churches, Urban League, NAACP, Manufacturer's Association
_______ Guidance counselor
_______ Teachers
_______ Friends
_______ Going through interviews
_______ State Employment Service
APPENDIX D

INSTRUCTIONS FOR JUDGING APPLICATIONS
INSTRUCTIONS

Here is a large stack of applications. Please look over ten or fifteen carefully, and then glance through the entire stack quickly. Then, return to the beginning. Go through the entire stack, one application at a time, and separate the stack into two piles, based on the following criteria:

1. Pile A should include applications of persons whom you feel are likely to obtain jobs in the Syracuse labor market. These are applications which you feel would make a favorable impression on employers.

2. Pile B should include applications of persons whom you feel are not likely to obtain jobs in the Syracuse labor market. These are applications which you feel would make an unfavorable impression on employers.

You will find that there are two applications for some of the persons. Disregard this, and do not try to remember which pile you put the applications on. You must judge each application separately and individually. You must place each and every application on one of the two piles. There may be some which are borderline. However, this must be disregarded for the purposes of this project.

When you finish, please write on a separate sheet of paper the reasons you found yourself using as to why you placed the applications on pile A versus pile B.

Thank you for your cooperation.
APPENDIX E

FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
Follow-Up Interview Schedule

INTERVIEWER: 
Name __________________ Date __________ Place __________ 

Mileage ___________________ Total minutes for interview _________

SUBJECT:

Name ____________________ Soc. Sec. Number ________________

Address ____________________ Sex __________________________

Birthdate ____________________ Age _________________________

Marital Status __________________

Father's Occupation __________________

Mother's Occupation __________________

Physical disabilities __________________

School currently attending or last attended __________________

Number of years of special classes __________________

Number of years of regular classes __________________

Total number of years of education __________________

Have you ever looked for work? __________________ If yes, then how
did you go about looking for work? __________________

Note to Interviewer: (Describe in as much detail as possible)
Prompt detail by mentioning such steps as the employment service, the Crusade For Opportunity, filling out applications, interviews, help from teachers, parents, friends, and/or others, BUT prompt only after the youth has stated as much as he can on his own.

If the general search for work resulted in attempts to obtain a specific job, then fill out "Specific Job Search Form".
Remember the first (second, third, etc.) time you tried to get a specific job:

How did you first hear about the job? ______________________________________

From whom and from what places did you hear about the job? ________________

Describe in detail what you did after learning there was a job ________________

Did you complete any applications? ______________________________________

Did you go through interviews? ______________________________________

How did you learn whether or not you got the job? __________________________

How long did it take from first hearing about the job til you knew whether or not you were hired? __________________________

If not hired, why not? ______________________________________

If hired, complete a "SPECIFIC JOB FOUND FORM".

Comments ______________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________
SPECIFIC JOB FOUND FORM

Employer ____________________________

Address ____________________________

Describe duties, activities, and responsibilities of the job ________________

_____________________________________________________________________

DOT code ____________________________ Skill level ________________

Date started work ____________________________

Date left job, if left ____________________________

Reason left ____________________________

Number of hours worked per day ____________________________

Number of days worked per week ____________________________

Number of weeks worked (Starting date subtracted from date left work or from October 1, 1966) ____________________________

Has work been steady? ____________________________

Time lost due to layoffs, strikes, vacations, sickness, lack of work, or other reasons ____________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

Total number of hours actually worked ____________________________

Pay per hour ______ per day ______ per week ______ per month ______

Raises or decreases in pay ____________________________

Date effective ____________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

Total amount earned ____________________________

Comments ____________________________
1. What job would you like to have if you could choose any job you wanted?

2. What job do you think you will be able to get when you get out of school?

3. How far do you expect to go in school (or did you go?)

4. Where did you get (Who gave you) the idea that you could get a job as a *

5. Who has helped you most in thinking about a job?

6. What sort of things does a * __________________ do?

7. Have you ever done any of the things that a * __________ does?

8. Do you know anybody who is a * __________________ ?

9. What job does your father have?

10. Has your father ever talked with you about what job you might get when you get out of school?

* Fill in response to question #2.
11. What does your mother do?

12. Has your mother ever talked with you about what job you might get when you get out of school?

13. Do you have brothers or sisters?

14. What do they do?

15. Has your brother/sister(s) ever talked with you about what job you might get when you get out of school?

Comments:
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