

1978

Job seeking patterns of vocational rehabilitation clients

Sandra Marie Schneider
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds



Part of the [Social Work Commons](#), and the [Work, Economy and Organizations Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Schneider, Sandra Marie, "Job seeking patterns of vocational rehabilitation clients" (1978). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 2832.


<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.2826>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.


AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF Sandra Marie Schneider for
the Master of Social Work presented May 19, 1978.

Title: Job Seeking Patterns of Vocational Rehabilitation Clients.

APPROVED BY MEMBERS OF THE THESIS COMMITTEE:


Jerry J. Zadny, Chairman


Nancy Kofoloff


Neil Sherwood

Two hundred and seventy-three clients whose cases had been closed by the Oregon Vocational Rehabilitation Division (OVRD) between March 1, 1976 and February 28, 1977 were interviewed by telephone. They were asked to identify the different methods they had used during their job search, whether they had obtained a job while being served by OVRD, whether they were presently employed, and if employed whether the job was the same or different from the one they had obtained while being served by OVRD. They were also

asked to identify the sources of the lead which led to their jobs.

Friends or relatives and direct application resulted in most of the jobs obtained. Efficiency was calculated for ten job search methods. Methods, in descending order of efficiency, were schools, friends or relatives, unions, vocational rehabilitation counselors, former employers, direct application, want ads, the state employment service, job developers, and private employment agencies. Clients changed jobs quite frequently during the year between case closure and the survey. Methods which led to retention of jobs were schools, unions, and former employers. The methods which led to unstable jobs were rehabilitation counselors, direct application, and friends or relatives. Intensity of job search was associated with job search success. The most frequently mentioned problem encountered in job search was disability imposed limitations. Job seeking skills instruction was not shown to be effective.

JOB SEEKING PATTERNS OF VOCATIONAL
REHABILITATION CLIENTS

by

SANDRA MARIE SCHNEIDER

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER of SOCIAL WORK

Portland State University
1978

TO THE OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH:

The members of the Committee approve the thesis of
Sandra Marie Schneider presented May 19, 1978.

[Redacted Signature]

Jerry J. Zadny, Chairman

[Redacted Signature]

Nancy K. Roloff

00

[Redacted Signature]

Neil Sherwood

APPROVED:

[Redacted Signature]

Bernard Ross, Dean, School of Social Work

[Redacted Signature]

Stanley E. Rauch, Dean, Graduate Studies and Research

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF TABLES	iv
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	1
II METHOD	4
III RESULTS	6
Job Search	
Job Search Success	
Methods of Finding Jobs	
Efficiency of Job Search Methods	
Job Retention	
Problems in Job Search	
Job Seeking Skills Instruction	
IV DISCUSSION	27
BIBLIOGRAPHY	33
APPENDIX	35

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I	Number and Percentage of Clients Who Tried Different Search Methods While Being Served by OVRD	7
II	Percent of Respondents Reporting Use of Ten Job Search Methods	9
III	Methods of Finding Jobs Used by 145 Clients Who Reported Finding a Job While Being Served by OVRD	12
IV	Methods of Finding Jobs Used By 59 Clients Who Reported Finding a Job After Leaving the Agency	13
V	Retention of Jobs Found by Use of Different Job Search Methods	17
VI	Percentage Distribution of Coded Responses to "What was the Most Serious Problem You Encountered in Trying to Find a Job?"	19

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

If vocational rehabilitation counselors are to help their clients locate employment, it is important that they know which methods of job search offer the greatest likelihood of satisfactory placement. There has been little research, though, on which approaches are most effective. Description of the success rates associated with different patterns of search would provide counselors with a basis for guiding their clients along those avenues most likely to lead to suitable jobs.

Several studies have examined job seeking patterns in non-disabled populations. By and large, the results indicate informal job search, through family and friends and by direct application to employers, account for the lion's share of jobs obtained. These findings hold true for blue-collar workers (Reynolds, 1951; Parnes, 1954; Adams and Aronson, 1957; Wilcock and Franke, 1963; Sheppard and Belitsky, 1966; and Rungeling, Smith, and Scott, 1976), professionals and managers (Brown, 1967; Dyer, 1972; and

Granovetter, 1974), and recent college graduates (Young, 1975). In contrast, formal sources, such as want ads and employment agencies, though widely used, produce far fewer jobs.

Only two studies have examined job search patterns among disabled workers, and the results are less than definitive. Jaffe, Day, and Adams (1964) interviewed approximately 1,300 New York worker's compensation beneficiaries whose injuries had occurred in the early and mid 1950s. Of those men who were employed at the time of the interview in 1960 and who had not returned to their former employers, approximately 30% had obtained their jobs by applying directly to the firm, 24% had been assisted by friends and relatives, 12% obtained jobs through the state employment office, 9% had found jobs through want ads, and 23% had found jobs through labor unions or other sources. The authors state that these job seeking patterns resemble the pattern of manual workers at large.

Veglahn (1975) surveyed 48 employed male paraplegic clients of the Iowa vocational rehabilitation agency who had obtained employment within the preceding four years. He found that his respondents had used a mix of formal and informal methods, not unlike those used by nonhandicapped individuals. Twenty-eight percent were placed by the agency, 28% found jobs through direct application, 13% found jobs through friends or relatives, 13% found jobs through newspaper want ads and private employment agencies, and none

were placed by the state employment service.

Jaffe, et al (1964), generated some important information, but it is uncertain whether the population that they studied (men injured while employed) is representative of the general population of disabled persons or of those individuals who come to state rehabilitation agencies for assistance. Veglahn's study is more applicable to the population served by state VR agencies, but only 48 individuals were included and they represented only one type of disability. It would be worthwhile to extend the study to include a larger group representing different disabilities. Also, neither study included women in their sample, nor did they differentiate between severely disabled individuals and those not severely disabled. It is important to know whether severe handicaps require special approaches to job seeking. The available research tells us very little about how state agencies find clients jobs. The many difficulties disabled individuals encounter in looking for work suggest that their job search patterns may well differ from those of nondisabled people.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

The Regional Rehabilitation Research Institute at Portland State University conducted a study with the Oregon Vocational Rehabilitation Division to determine how clients served by OVRD in the metropolitan Portland area located jobs. A random sample of roughly 14% of all cases closed between March 1, 1976 and February 28, 1977 were called and interviewed by telephone. Generally, the purposes of the study were to describe clients' job search patterns, to determine how the clients found jobs, and to compare the experience of severely and not severely disabled clients.¹

The sample consisted of 355 individuals randomly selected from approximately 2,600 clients whose cases were closed as successful or unsuccessful after a plan for services had been formulated. More specifically, this includes clients closed in statuses 26, 28, and 30. (See Appendix A for definition of these codes.) Clients in school programs, drug abusers, alcoholics,

¹Designation of "severely disabled" and "not severely disabled" was provided by OVRD in accord with federal standards.

and those previously known to be deceased were excluded.

Each client was called up to four times to make contact. The first two calls occurred on consecutive workdays, Monday through Thursday between six and eight in the evening. The last two calls were made when necessary Monday through Friday between nine and four during the day in the week following the second call. Information was accepted only from the client or from an interpreter if the client was present but unable to communicate directly with the interviewer, as occurred when the client was deaf or mentally retarded.

Three female social work graduate students did the interviewing. Each interviewer followed a prepared questionnaire inventory, as shown in Appendix B. Clients' answers were recorded on the questionnaire and later keypunched and verified. To amplify the nature of search, clients were asked to state the most serious problem they encountered in looking for work. Responses were coded and tabulated by problem area. (Appendix C shows the coding schedule.)

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Two hundred and seventy-three of the 355 individuals called completed the interview yielding a 76.9% response rate. Seventy-four people were never contacted and there were eight refusals. The respondents included 175 males and 98 females. One hundred and forty-seven of the respondents were severely disabled and 126 were not severely disabled. Clients' disabilities were as follows: visually impaired, excluding those legally blind (8), hearing (9), orthopedic (136), amputation (11), mental (87), and other (22). The variables of sex, severity of disability, and type of disability were not related to whether an individual responded or not.

Job Search

Each respondent was asked to indicate whether they had tried each of ten different job search methods while they were with the agency. Table I presents the number and percentage of individuals using each method and also shows separate tallies for severely and not severely disabled respondents. Clients could and did indicate that they used more than one method in their job search.

TABLE I

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CLIENTS WHO TRIED
DIFFERENT SEARCH METHODS WHILE
BEING SERVED BY OVRD

Method	Severely Disabled n = 147	Not Severely Disabled n = 126	Total Number N = 273	Total Percent
Rehabilitation Counselor	56.5%	48.4%	144	52.7%
Job Developer	20.4	23.0	59	21.6
State Employment Service	47.6	52.4	136	49.8
Direct Application	63.3	71.4	183	67.0
Friend or Relative	45.6	50.8	131	48.0
Newspaper Want Ad	51.7	63.5	156	57.1
School or Training Facility	28.6	34.9	86	31.5
Private Employment Agency	20.4	11.9	45	16.5
Union	8.2	15.9	32	11.7
Former Employer	27.2	32.5	81	29.7

Methods in order of descending popularity were direct application, want ads, rehabilitation counselors, the state employment service, friends or relatives, schools or training facilities, former employers, job developers, private employment agencies, and unions. Patterns of job search for severely and not severely disabled respondents

were similar with the exception that severely disabled clients used want ads significantly less frequently ($z = 1.98, p < .05$) than not severely disabled respondents.

Job Search Success

There were a total of 145 clients who reported obtaining jobs while still being served by the agency. Of these, 80 clients remained in the same job from the time their case was closed until the survey, 34 individuals held different jobs, and 31 respondents had lost their jobs by the time they were interviewed. There were 59 individuals who were unemployed previously, but held a job at the time they were surveyed. Sixty-nine individuals had no job when OVRD closed their case and when they were surveyed. Chi square tests indicated that sex and severity of disability were not associated with obtaining employment while with OVRD ($p > .05$). However, type of disability was related to job search success. Clients with mental disabilities were much more likely to obtain employment before their case closed than those with orthopedic disabilities ($z = 4.12, p < .05$), amputations ($z = 2.13, p < .05$), and "other" disabilities ($z = 2.42, p < .05$). This finding may be due to the fact that mentally retarded clients who are included in the mental disabilities group, are often placed in sheltered workshops or other types of employment before case closure.

Intensity of job search seemed to be associated with obtaining a job. Table II shows the percentage of individuals from three groups who used various search methods. The three groups were

TABLE II
PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS REPORTING
USE OF TEN JOB SEARCH METHODS

Method	Found a Job While at OVRD n = 145	Found a Job Later n = 59	Never Found a Job n = 69
Rehabilitation Counselor	57.2%	50.9%	44.9%
Job Developer	22.1	27.1	15.9
State Employment Service	51.0	55.9	42.0
Direct Application	69.7	72.9	56.5
Friend or Relative	52.4	49.2	37.7
Newspaper Want Ad	57.2	59.3	55.1
School or Training Facility	31.7	39.0	24.6
Private Employment Agency	17.9	11.9	17.4
Union	11.0	17.0	8.7
Former Employer	35.2	18.6	27.5

those who found a job while at the agency, those who found a job after their case was closed, and those who had no job at closure and when surveyed. The relative frequency of use of each search method was about the same for clients in each group. However,

comparison across the groups indicates less successful clients were less inclined to use most methods. If only the group that found a job before agency closure and the group that never found a job are considered, there is a consistent tendency of the latter to be less likely to report using every method. Clients who obtained a job after the agency closed their case closely resembled those clients who found jobs while with the agency and indeed were more likely to report using several of the methods. There is no obvious explanation for this unless the group that found jobs later had a more difficult time in their job search and consequently put extra effort into their search or were involved in search for a longer period and thus had time to try different methods.

The average number of methods used by respondents in each group was related to job search success. Those who obtained a job before their case was closed used an average of 4.06 methods. The group who found a job later used an average of 4.02 search methods. The group who never found a job used an average of 3.30 search methods. The difference between the average number of search methods of the group who found a job while with the agency and the group who never found a job was significant ($t = 2.20$, $df = 212$, $p < .05$). The results indicate that while all groups tended to use the same methods, clients who were less successful in finding work by virtue of never having found a job tended to use all search methods less

frequently than those who found a job while with the agency.

Methods of Finding Jobs

The most frequently used job search methods did not necessarily yield the most jobs. Table III lists the methods of finding jobs used by 145 clients who found jobs while being served by OVRD. (Data are missing for this question for three clients.) Figures for severely and not severely disabled individuals are shown separately and two types of efficiency ratios are presented. Among clients who found jobs while with the agency, use of friends or relatives led to the most jobs, followed by direct application, rehabilitation counselors, schools, former employers, want ads, unions, the state employment service, and job developers. There were no significant differences due to severity of disability.

Table IV presents the methods of finding jobs used by 59 clients who reported finding a job after leaving the agency. These clients yielded a slightly different distribution of successful job search methods than the clients who found employment while they were still being served by the agency. Generally, clients who found a job later reported using job search methods at the agency less often and used other methods more often, which is understandable because sources at the agency were no longer available to them. Table IV also shows figures for the

TABLE III

METHODS OF FINDING JOBS USED BY 145 CLIENTS
WHO REPORTED FINDING A JOB WHILE
BEING SERVED BY OVRD

Method	Not		Total No.	Total Percent	Efficiency	
	Severely Disabled n = 73	Severely Disabled n = 69			(1)	(2)
Rehabilitation Counselor	15.1%	15.9%	22	15.5%	.153	.265
Job Developer	1.4	0.0	1	0.7	.017	.031
State Employment Service	2.7	2.9	4	2.8	.029	.054
Direct Application	17.8	18.8	26	18.3	.142	.257
Friend or Relative	24.7	20.3	32	22.5	.244	.421
Want Ad	5.5	7.3	9	6.3	.058	.108
School or Training Facility	19.2	10.1	21	14.8	.244	.457
Private Employment Agency	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	.000	.000
Union	2.7	4.4	5	3.5	.156	.313
Former Employer	5.5	11.6	12	8.5	.148	.235
Other	5.5	8.7	10	7.0	---	---

*Three clients did not report the methods by which they found their jobs.

TABLE IV
METHODS OF FINDING JOBS USED BY 59 CLIENTS
WHO REPORTED FINDING A JOB AFTER
LEAVING THE AGENCY

Methods	Severely Disabled n = 25	Not Severely Disabled n = 34	Total Number N = 59	Total Percent- age
Rehabilitation Counselor	8.0%	2.9%	3	5.1%
Job Developer	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
State Employment Service	8.0	5.9	4	6.8
Direct Application	20.0	14.7	10	17.0
Friend or Relative	32.0	26.5	17	28.8
Want Ad	20.0	17.7	11	18.6
School or Training Facility	4.0	8.8	4	6.8
Private Employment Agency	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
Union	0.0	2.9	1	1.7
Former Employer	4.0	5.9	3	5.1
Other	4.0	14.7	6	10.2

severely and not severely disabled respondents who located employment after their case was closed. There were no significant differences due to severity of disability.

Efficiency of Job Search Methods

The number of jobs found with each method is influenced by the number of individuals using a method. Ratios of the number of jobs obtained by a method to the number of people using the method were calculated in two different ways and are shown in Table III. To calculate the first efficiency ratio, the number of clients who found a job by a particular method while with the agency was divided by the total number of clients using the method during their association with the agency. Search methods, in order of descending efficiency, were schools, friends or relatives, unions, rehabilitation counselors, former employers, direct application, want ads, the state employment service, job developers, and private employment agencies.

Use of friends or relatives resulted in the greatest number of jobs, was only fifth in frequency of use, and was one of the two most efficient methods. Although use of direct application resulted in the second largest number of jobs and was the most frequently used search method, it was only sixth in efficiency. Rehabilitation counselors ranked as the third most productive source of job leads, the third

most often used source of leads, and the fourth most efficient method of finding a job. Leads through schools yielded the fourth highest number of jobs, were only sixth in amount of use, and were tied for first in terms of efficiency. Use of former employers was fifth in number of jobs obtained, seventh in use, and fifth in efficiency. Want ads were seventh in number of jobs found, second in frequency of use, and seventh in efficiency. Unions were eighth in number of job leads, used least often, but were third in most efficient method used. The state employment service was ninth in number of jobs, fourth in frequency of use, and eighth in efficiency. Leads from job developers were tenth in the number of jobs obtained, eighth in use, and ninth in efficiency. Use of leads from private employment agencies resulted in no jobs and were ninth in use.

The amount of usage seems to have no relation to the efficiency of a method. Friends or relatives, schools, former employers, and unions should be used more frequently because they are more efficient than their use indicates. Want ads and the state employment service are used at rates far in excess of any justified by the number of jobs obtained.

The second efficiency measure is similar to the first except that the denominator of the ratio is the number of clients who used a particular method and who reported finding jobs while with the agency, whether or not the method led to the job. Thus, the difference between the two efficiency ratios is that the first is based on all clients using each method, including clients who did not find a job

while with the agency. The second excludes clients who did not find a job while with the agency, and therefore compares the effectiveness of different methods among relatively successful job seekers. When only the most successful job seekers are considered, the effectiveness of friends or relatives and schools are more pronounced.

Job Retention

Table V shows the total number of individuals who found jobs by each search method and breaks down the total into the percentage of individuals who held the same jobs when surveyed, those who now had different jobs, and those who had quit or lost their jobs but had not obtained new employment. By comparing the three groups, the stability of jobs, or the extent to which jobs are retained, can be assessed in two different ways. First, retention of the same job indicates the most stable employment. Second, retention of a job, although a different job, indicates some degree of stability. The individuals without a job when surveyed were the least stable in employment.

Table V indicates that schools, unions, former employers, and "other" methods led to the most lasting jobs. Half or more of the jobs obtained through the remaining methods were either replaced by a new job or were lost and not replaced. Jobs obtained through job developers, the state employment service, and want ads were most likely to be replaced by a new job. It should be noted that the number of leads supplied through job developers, private

TABLE V
RETENTION OF JOBS FOUND BY USE OF DIFFERENT
JOB SEARCH METHODS

Method	Total number reported finding a job while at the agency	Percent who held same job at time of interview	Percent who held different job at time of interview	Percent found jobs while with agency, but lost job are now unemployed
	N = 142	n = 80	n = 34	n = 28
Rehabilitation Counselor	22	36.4%	22.7%	40.9%
Job Developer	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
State Employment Agency	4	25.0	75.0	0.0
Direct Application	26	50.0	23.1	26.9
Friend or Relative	32	50.0	25.0	25.0
Want Ad	9	33.3	55.6	11.1
School or Training Facility	21	90.5	9.5	0.0
Private Employment Agency	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Union	5	80.0	20.0	0.0
Former Employer	12	75.0	16.7	8.3
Other	10	70.0	10.0	20.0

employment agencies, the state employment service, and unions is so small that conclusions based upon the data must be regarded as highly tentative. A fourth or more of the respondents who obtained jobs through counselors, by direct application, or through a friend or relative were unemployed at the time of the interview. Jobs found through leads provided by counselors were most likely to end in unemployment.

Since jobs found through job developers, the state employment service, and want ads were most likely to be replaced, it is possible that jobs found through those methods were undesirable in terms of work conditions or wages, or that clients were promoted within the same organization or found different and perhaps better jobs at other companies. The low number of cases involved and the correlational nature of the study preclude any firm conclusions. It seems unlikely that the clients' abilities or competence were at issue because the clients were able to obtain different jobs. Instability of jobs found through counselors, direct application, and friends or relatives may in part reflect clients who are unmotivated to work or less able to retain a job, because the clients often did not find new jobs.

Problems in Job Search

Table VI indicates the percentage distribution of coded responses to the question, "What was the most serious problem you encountered in trying to find a job?" Respondents' answers were divided into severely and not severely disabled (Table VI),

TABLE VI

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF CODED RESPONSES TO:
 "WHAT WAS THE MOST SERIOUS PROBLEM
 YOU ENCOUNTERED IN TRYING TO
 FIND A JOB?"

Responses Grouped by Referent	Severely Disabled Client n = 146	Not Severely Disabled Client n = 125	Total Percent N = 271*
<u>Employers</u>			
A generally unfavorable job market, high unemployment	6.8%	7.9%	7.3%
Poor employer reception or prejudice	5.4	4.8	5.1
Lack of jobs suitable to my training and skills	3.4	6.3	4.8
Employer fears re-injury	2.0	5.6	3.7
Employers see me as unable to do job	4.1	2.4	3.3
Barriers in hiring requirements	2.0	0.8	1.5
Employer concern about insurance costs or safety record	0.7	0.8	0.7

Table VI continued -

Responses Grouped by Referent	Severely Disabled Client n = 146	Not Severely Disabled Client n = 125	Total Percent N = 271*
Employers simply will not hire me	0.0%	1.6%	0.7%
<u>Client</u>			
Disability-imposed limitations (intellectual, physical, or cosmetic)	26.5	22.2	24.5
Experienced no problems	13.6	14.3	13.9
Little or no work experience	6.8	5.6	6.2
Inadequate or inappropriate vocational training or noncompetitive skills	6.1	5.6	5.9
Age, too old	3.4	4.8	4.0
Did not look for work	4.1	1.6	2.9
Jobs do not pay enough	0.7	4.8	2.6
Lack of sufficient education	2.0	1.6	1.8
Poor or spotty work history	2.0	0.8	1.5

Table VI continued -

Responses Grouped by Referent	Severely Disabled Client n = 146	Not Severely Disabled Client n = 125	Total Percent N = 271*
Language problem (poor verbal or written communi- cation skills)	0.0%	1.6%	0.7%
Deficient job seeking skills, not knowing where or how to look	0.0	0.8	0.4
Deficient social skills, grooming, clothes	0.7	0.0	0.4
Lack of confidence	0.0	0.8	0.4
Alcoholism, drug abuse, or criminal record	0.7	0.0	0.4
Other	1.4	2.4	1.8
<u>Agency</u>			
No help from agency or counselor in where or how to look	0.7	0.8	0.7
Client not disposed to pursue job goal advocated by counselor	0.7	0.8	0.7
Other agency problems	0.0	0.8	0.4

Table VI continued -

Responses Grouped by Referent	Severely Disabled Client n = 146	Not Severely Disabled Client n = 125	Total Percent N = 271*
<u>Environmental</u>			
Transportation	4.1%	0.0%	2.2%
Architectural barriers	1.4	0.0	0.7

*Data are missing for this question for two clients.

female and male, orthopedic and mental disability types, and those who had a job at closure or when interviewed and the individuals who did not hold a job at either one of those times. (Data are missing for this question for two clients.) The reliability of the coding was tested by having three individuals independently code a random sample of fifty responses. Reliability by Kappa averaged .93 ($z = 17.63$, $p < .05$).

Disability imposed limitations were mentioned by 24.5% of the respondents and were the most frequently cited problem. No problems (13.9%), a generally unfavorable job market, high unemployment (7.3%), little or no work experience (6.2%), and inadequate or inappropriate vocational training or noncompetitive skills (5.9%) followed. None of the remaining responses were cited

by more than 6% of the respondents.

In another study (Zadny and James, 1978), rehabilitation counselors were asked, "What three factors most often account for the difficulties your clients encounter trying to find a job?" The most frequently cited responses, in descending order, were an unfavorable job market, deficient job seeking skills, poor employer reception, little or no work experience, and lack of motivation. In contrast to the present study in which disability imposed limitations were mentioned most frequently, the counselors mentioned that problem only 5.4% of the time.

Table VI shows responses for severely and not severely disabled individuals. The severely disabled respondents mentioned low pay significantly less often ($z = 2.01, p < .05$) and transportation problems significantly more often ($z = 2.49, p < .05$) than the not severely disabled respondents. It appears that either severely disabled individuals are paid more or that they are willing to work for lower wages. Assistance with transportation during their job search might increase the success of their search.

Comparison of the problem statements of individuals with orthopedic and mental disabilities indicated that the orthopedic group mentioned employer prejudice ($z = 2.04, p < .05$) and employer fear of re-injury ($z = 2.92, p < .05$) more often than the mental disabilities group. Clients with mental disabilities also stated that

they encountered no problems significantly more often ($z = 2.90$, $p < .05$) than the people with orthopedic disabilities. Orthopedic disabilities are more obvious than mental disabilities and it is very likely that the extent to which a disability is obvious is associated with encountering difficulty in looking for work. The other disability groups were not analyzed because there were too few observations to permit statistical comparisons within the 28 problem code categories.

Respondents who obtained a job either before their case was closed or later were less likely to state that their worst problem was disability imposed limitations ($z = 2.96$, $p < .05$) and were more likely to say that they experienced no problems ($z = 3.26$, $p < .05$) than individuals who had no job at closure and when surveyed. It makes sense that those who were more successful in their search would have fewer problems and that they would not perceive their disabilities as preventing them from obtaining employment.

The response to the question did not differ significantly between females and males.

Job Seeking Skills Instruction

Forty-five and nine-tenths percent of the clients who reported receiving job seeking skills instruction found jobs before their cases were closed, whereas 54.6% of the respondents who did

not report participating in such classes found jobs. Thus, a greater percentage of individuals without job seeking skills training obtained jobs than those who attended such classes, but the difference was not statistically significant. It is possible either that individuals most likely to encounter difficulty in their job search were given job seeking skills training or that the instruction had a negative effect so that participants became less likely to find a job than if they had not received instruction.

Individuals who held a job when their case was closed were divided into those who were still employed in either the same job or a different job and those that lost their jobs and failed to find another. Of those who were not offered job seeking skills instruction by OVRD, 80.5% of those employed at closure were still employed when interviewed. But of the group who reported receiving job seeking skills training and were employed at closure, 68.2% were still employed later. The difference was not statistically significant but the tendency was for the group that participated in job seeking skills training to have less stable employment.

Of those respondents who were unemployed at closure and who received job seeking skills training, 50% obtained employment by the time of the interview, while 45.1% of those without instruction in job seeking skills found a job after closure. Although this finding is not statistically significant, it suggests a tendency for

job seeking skills training to have helped clients unemployed at closure to subsequently find jobs. Clients, of course, were not randomly assigned to receive or not receive job seeking skills training. Therefore, no firm conclusions can be drawn about the training's effectiveness. The findings do suggest that further research is needed to determine whether the training is being offered to the clients who can benefit from it and whether the training is as beneficial as previous studies suggest (Keith, Engelkes, and Winborn, 1977; McClure, 1972).

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The effectiveness of job search methods seem to be similar for disabled and nondisabled individuals. Among nondisabled workers, the most productive sources of job leads are informal ones, such as friends and relatives or direct application. Formal sources, such as want ads and employment agencies, though widely used, yield relatively few jobs. These patterns tended to hold true for disabled workers studied. Friends or relatives and direct application were productive sources. However, unions and rehabilitation counselors, which are formal sources, were also productive, but did not yield as many jobs. Some of the formal sources, such as job developers, the state employment service, want ads, and private employment agencies, did not appear to be effective. It appears that while informal methods of job search are productive for disabled individuals, some formal sources are also valuable. To conduct an efficient job search, disabled individuals should use a few select formal sources more frequently than nondisabled workers and also rely on informal sources.

The results of the survey are comparable to the findings of

two other studies which examined the effectiveness of different search methods among disabled populations. Jaffe, et al (1964) and Veglahn (1975) also found informal sources of job search are often the most productive sources and that formal methods, especially rehabilitation agencies and unions, can also be helpful.

The results of this study are applicable to rehabilitation counselors. Generally, counselors should recommend that their clients use either the most efficient methods or the sources that lead to the most stable jobs. However, the most efficient methods do not necessarily lead to the most stable jobs. There is no one best search method.

Stability may not be directly associated with search method. The type of individuals finding jobs through a particular method may have a more direct connection with the stability of the jobs they find. For example, the clients who obtain jobs through their counselors may be prone to experience unstable employment, by either obtaining different jobs or becoming unemployed.

The two most efficient methods as measured by the ratio of jobs obtained by a particular method and use of that method were friends or relatives and schools. The two methods which produced the most jobs were friends or relatives and direct application. However, 50% of the jobs found through friends or relatives ended in unemployment or were replaced by different jobs. The methods

leading to the most stable employment were schools and unions.

These are the methods on which clients should concentrate.

Because so few jobs were found through the methods which seemed inefficient and unstable, such as through job developers and private employment agencies, it is difficult to make generalizations. However, the state employment service and want ads were both used quite frequently but with little success and when jobs were found through these methods, they were usually replaced by other jobs.

Many clients appear to have found their own jobs. Less than 20% of the clients reported being assisted by their counselors, job developers, and the state employment service.

A large number of clients changed jobs at least once during the year after their cases were closed by OVRD. Among the individuals who lost their jobs, those who found their jobs through counselors were often unable to find new jobs, whereas the people who found their jobs through direct application, friends or relatives, and want ads were able to find new jobs more often. The latter group may have been able to find second jobs because they developed job seeking skills when looking for their first jobs, while the individuals who obtained their jobs through counselors may not have had the opportunity to benefit from the experience of an independent job search. In addition, clients should use as many of the

recommended different methods as possible because intensity of job search was associated with search success.

Disability imposed limitations were the most frequently mentioned problem by respondents in their job search. However, in a similar study by Zadny and James (1978), counselors cited disability imposed limitations only 5.4% of the time as one of three most serious problems with which their clients must deal. When clients state that they have problems in their job search because of their disabilities, then it could be assumed that since they can do nothing about their disability that they are relieved of the responsibility for their problems. The blame can be placed on their disabilities over which they have no control. Conversely, counselors may underestimate the extent to which disabilities do impose limitations in their clients' job search.

Counselors should also be aware that certain client characteristics are associated with particular problems and outcomes. Severely disabled clients stated that they experienced transportation problems more often than the not severely disabled respondents. If counselors were able to help their clients deal with this problem, then perhaps their clients would be more successful in their job search. Job seeking patterns differed between severely and not severely disabled clients in only one respect. The not severely disabled group used want ads more frequently than the

severely disabled group. Sources of successful job leads did not differ between the two groups. Based on these findings, it appears that counselors do not need to recommend that their severely disabled clients employ different job search patterns than not severely disabled clients. However, their severely disabled clients may need more assistance with transportation during their job search.

Individuals with mental disabilities were more likely to find jobs than clients with orthopedic, amputation, and "other" disabilities while they were still being served by OVRD. The latter three disability types may need extra attention because of disability imposed limitations or employer prejudice. The respondents with orthopedic disabilities stated that they found employer prejudice and fear of re-injury a serious problem more often than clients with mental disabilities. The finding indicates that visible disabilities are a greater obstacle in job search than hidden ones.

There was no evidence to demonstrate that job seeking skills instruction was effective. However, rehabilitation counselors (Zadny and James, 1978) frequently state that deficient job seeking skills are a factor in the difficulties their clients experience in trying to find a job. Either the job seeking skills instruction received by clients was ineffective or the clients most likely to experience difficulties in getting jobs were referred to the classes. Further study is needed to determine if job seeking skills instruction

is effective.

Counselors should advise their clients that schools, friends or relatives, and direct application are productive methods of job search and that schools and unions lead to stable jobs. Exclusive reliance on want ads and the state employment service should not be encouraged because relatively few clients found jobs by these methods. Because almost 41% of the jobs acquired through counselors were lost and not replaced, and many clients who obtained jobs by other means found need to change jobs within a year or less, clients should be encouraged to find their own jobs rather than relying on their counselors or job developers to locate jobs for them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, L.P. and Aronson, R.L. Workers and Industrial Change, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University, 1957.
- Brown, D. G. The Mobil Professors, Washington, D. C. : American Council on Education, 1967.
- Dyer, L. D. Managerial Jobseeking: Methods and Techniques, Monthly Labor Review, December 1972, 95(12), 29-30.
- Granovetter, M. S. Getting a Job, Cambridge, Mass. : Harvard University Press, 1974.
- Jaffe, A. J. ; Day, L. H. ; and Adams, W. Disabled Workers in the Labor Market, Totowa, New Jersey: Bedminster Press, 1964.
- Keith, R.D. ; Engelkes, J. R. ; and Winborn, B.B. Employment-Seeking Preparation and Activity: An Experimental Job-Placement Training Model for Rehabilitation Clients, Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 1977, 21(2), 159-165.
- McClure, D. Placement Through Improvement of Client's Job-Seeking Skills, Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling, 1972, 3, 188-196.
- Parnes, H. S. Research on Labor Mobility, New York: Social Science Research Council, 1954.
- Rehabilitation Services Administration, Rehabilitation Services Manual, MT #2, July 1974, pp. 10-11.
- Reynolds, L. G. The Structure of Labor Markets, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.
- Rungeling, B. ; Smith, L. F. ; and Scott, L. C. Effectiveness of Rural Job Search Methods, Monthly Labor Review, April 1976, 99(4), 27-30.

- Sheppard, H. R. and Belitsky, A. H. The Job Hunt: Job Seeking Behavior of Unemployed Workers in a Local Economy, The W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1966.
- Veglahn, P. A. Job Search Patterns of Paraplegics, Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 1975, 20(2), 129-136.
- Wilcock, R. C. and Franke, W. H. Unwanted Workers, New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1963.
- Young, A. M. College Graduates: Their Work Experiences Following Commencement, Occupational Outlook Quarterly, Summer 1975, 19(2), 35-36.
- Zadny, J. J. and James, L. F. The Problem with Placement is that . . . Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 1978, In Press.

APPENDIX A

STATUS DEFINITIONS

The Rehabilitation Services Administration has established a uniform system for coding the status of clients in service and the nature of exits from service which is used by OVRD and by other state vocational rehabilitation agencies. The following definitions of codes are taken from the RSA Services Manual of July 1974:

Status 26. CLOSED REHABILITATED. Cases closed as rehabilitated as a minimum (1) have been declared eligible, (2) have received appropriate diagnostic and related services, (3) have had a program for vocational rehabilitation services formulated, (4) have completed the program insofar as possible, (5) have been provided counseling as an essential rehabilitation service, and (6) have been determined to be suitably employed for a minimum of 60 days.

Status 28. CLOSED OTHER REASONS AFTER INDIVIDUALIZED WRITTEN REHABILITATION PROGRAM INITIATED. Cases closed in this category must have met the category (1), (2), and (3) above, and at least one of the services provided for by the program must have been initiated, but for some reason one or more of the criteria (4), (5), and (6) above were not met. Included here are

cases which are transferred to another state rehabilitation agency, either within the state, or in some other state. Also included here are those cases for which a rehabilitation program for counseling and guidance only was written, approved and initiated.

Status 30. CLOSED OTHER REASONS BEFORE INDIVIDUALIZED WRITTEN REHABILITATION PROGRAM INITIATED.

Cases closed in this category are those cases which, although accepted for rehabilitation services, did not progress to the point that rehabilitation services were actually initiated under a rehabilitation plan. Included here are cases which are transferred to another state rehabilitation agency, either within or without the state.

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE INVENTORY

Client Name: _____ ID Number _____

1. Telephone Number _____ - _____
 AREA NUMBER2. Telephone Contact Results (Mo/Da at left for each attempt.
Information at right completed up to and including a successful call. Code 0 for the remainder.)Date

_____ Call 1: Week (circle)	1	2	3	4	5		
Day	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Mon						Sun
Time (01-24)						_____	_____
_____ Call 2: Week (circle)	1	2	3	4	5		
Day	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Time (01-24)						_____	_____
_____ Call 3: Week (circle)	1	2	3	4	5		
Day	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Time (01-24)						_____	_____
_____ Call 4: Week (circle)	1	2	3	4	5		
Day	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Time (01-24)						_____	_____

3. Contacted = 1, else 0

Hello, my name is _____ and I am calling for the Oregon Vocational Rehabilitation Division. May I please speak to _____, I am calling for OVRD to see how you are doing. I have just a few questions which will only take a moment. Is that alright with you?

4. Outcome (circle): refusal (go to end) 1
else 0

5. Do you currently have a job? (circle) Yes 1
No 2

If yes (else 0)

Is it (circle) full time 1
or part time? 2

How did you first learn about the job? (circle)

counselor 01
job developer 02
employment division 03
direct application off the street* 04
friend or relative 05
want ad 06
school or training facility 07
private employment agency 08
union 09
former employer 10
other, specify: _____ 11

Is the job with a former employer? Yes 1
No 2

6. Did you have a job when the rehabilitation agency closed your case? (circle) Yes 1
No 2

*follow-up with "had you heard about the job elsewhere?"

If yes (else 0)

Was it the same job you have now? (circle) Yes 1
 No 2

If no (else 0)

How did you learn about the job you had when the agency closed your case? (circle)

counselor	01
job developer	02
employment division	03
direct application off the street*	04
friend or relative	05
want ad	06
school or training facility	07
private employment agency	08
union	09
former employer	10
other, specify: _____	11

Was that job with an employer for whom you had worked previously? (circle)

Yes 1
 No 2

7. While you were with the agency, did you ever take part in a group class on how to look for work? (circle)

Yes 1
 No 2

8. I would like to know where you looked for job openings while you were with the agency. I will read a list of places you might have tried, and I would like you to say "yes" when I mention one you did try, even if only once. (circle 1 if yes, else 0)

through your rehabilitation counselor 1
 through a job developer at the rehabilitation agency . . . 1

*follow-up with "had you heard about the job elsewhere?"

- the employment division 1
- by applying directly to an employer, e. g., just going
in and applying off the street 1
- friends and relatives 1
- newspaper want ads 1
- through a school or training facility where you received
training 1
- a private employment agency. 1
- unions 1
- former employers. 1

9. Many disabled persons experience difficulty in finding work.
What was the most serious problem you encountered?
(Paraphrase essence of reply in 10-20 words.)

10. If client is contacted (else 0)

Enter major disability code _____

Enter from print-out severely disabled 1

not severely disabled 2

Problem statement code _____

11. Sex

Female 1

Male 2

APPENDIX C

PROBLEM CODES

- 01 - A generally unfavorable job market, high unemployment
- 02 - Lack of jobs suitable to my training and skills
- 03 - Poor employer reception or prejudice
- 04 - Employer concern about insurance costs or safety record
- 05 - Barriers in hiring requirements
- 06 - Employers see me as unable to do the job
- 07 - Employers simply will not hire
- 08 - Deficient job seeking skills, not knowing where to look or how
to present themselves
- 09 - Little or no work experience
- 10 - Poor or spotty work history
- 11 - Inadequate or inappropriate vocational training or non-
competitive skills
- 12 - Disability imposed limitations (intellectual, physical, or
appearance)
- 13 - Transportation
- 14 - Architectural barriers - environmental
- 15 - Lack of sufficient education
- 16 - Language problem (poor verbal or written communication skills)

- 17 - Age, too old
- 18 - Deficient social skills, grooming, and attire
- 19 - Jobs do not pay enough
- 20 - Alcoholism, drug abuse, or criminal record
- 21 - No help from agency or counselor in where or how to look
- 22 - Client not disposed to pursue job goal advocated by counselor
- 23 - Other agency problems
- 24 - Employers fear re-injury
- 25 - Did not look for work
- 26 - Lack of confidence
- 27 - Other (not codable)
- 99 - No problems
- 00 - No answer