

**A SURVEY OF PARTICIPANTS AND
WORKSITE SUPERVISORS IN THE
NEW YORK CITY WORK
EXPERIENCE PROGRAM**

**Gregory Hoerz
Karla Hanson**

**Manpower Demonstration
Research Corporation**

September 1986

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many officials of New York City's Human Resources Administration assisted in the implementation of the survey and provided background information on the Work Experience Program. Appreciation is extended to Herbert Rosenzweig, the Executive Deputy Commissioner of the Income Assistance Agency; Dennis Anderson, earlier Director of the Bureau of Employment Services; Martin Levine, the Deputy Director when the study began; and his successor, Ruth Zitt.

Among MDRC staff, special mention must be given to Cynthia Guy who tested the survey instrument, trained the interviewers, and wrote the sections of this report dealing with program background. The late Dr. Joseph Ball designed the survey and the study as a whole. Karla Hanson, David Palasits, Naomi Weinstein, Stephanie Powell, Shirley James and Tracy Brown conducted the interviews. Tracy Brown also data-entered the survey instruments under the supervision of Shirley James and Patti Anderson.

In addition, the report benefited from the editorial assistance of Sheila Mandel and comments on early drafts from Judith Gueron, Barbara Goldman, Janet Quint, and Patti Anderson. Karen Paget directed the project at MDRC and gave valuable advice and support.

This study was funded through a contract from the City of New York Human Resources Administration. The findings and conclusions do not necessarily represent the position of the funder.

The Authors

A SURVEY OF PARTICIPANTS
AND WORKSITE SUPERVISORS IN THE
NEW YORK CITY WORK EXPERIENCE PROGRAM

I. Introduction

This report discusses the experiences of AFDC recipients in the New York City Work Experience Program. The Work Experience Program was instituted by the Human Resources Administration (HRA) to meet several goals. As stated by the program director, these are to enhance the employability of welfare recipients, to familiarize them with the world of work, to improve their job skills, and to increase their motivation to find a job.

The program was initiated in 1983, when work requirements for welfare recipients were being implemented in many states in response to passage of the federal Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (OBRA) of 1981. Among other changes, states were given the option of operating Community Work Experience Programs (CWEP) for the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) welfare population. In such CWEP initiatives, able-bodied applicants to or recipients of AFDC can be required to work in public or nonprofit agencies for the hours determined by dividing the monthly grant by the minimum wage. The work obligation can last as long as the person receives welfare, but many states have limited its length to three months.

In New York City, the Work Experience Program has similar guidelines, although work requirements had been in existence through the Public Works Program (PWP) for a different, mostly male, Home Relief (or General Assistance) population since the early 1970s. In the Public Works Program, work was mandatory and open-ended, and hours were determined by the size of the

grant. The rules changed somewhat, as will be discussed later, when work requirements were extended to the AFDC population in 1983. At first, the Work Experience Program was targeted to AFDC recipients with children aged 16 or older, with the purpose of helping mothers transition into the workforce when their youngest child turned 18 and they were no longer eligible for AFDC benefits. The program was modified in 1984 to include AFDC recipients with children 13 years and older, and again, more extensively, in September 1985. At that point, the entire WIN-mandatory caseload of AFDC recipients with children aged six or older was declared eligible for the Work Experience Program.¹

This study was funded by HRA to explore some issues related to mandatory work programs based on MDRC's experience in conducting worksite surveys in work programs it is evaluating in six different states: Arkansas, Virginia, California (San Diego County), Illinois (Cook County), Maryland (primarily Baltimore) and West Virginia. These six states, along with Maine and New Jersey, are part of MDRC's larger multi-state Demonstration of State Work/Welfare Initiatives, which is assessing the effectiveness of state-designed programs in increasing the employment of welfare recipients and decreasing welfare caseloads and costs.² The worksite studies, which are part of the state evaluations, help MDRC to determine the nature and quality of the work provided to participants and to ascertain reactions to the work obligation. Since a standard instrument was used to interview a random selection of work participants and their supervisors across all states, HRA and MDRC believed that a similar worksite study would shed light on these issues in New York City's program.

For this report, the survey instrument was administered to 72 randomly

selected AFDC work experience participants and their immediate worksite supervisors from February to June 1986.³ Interviews lasted about 45 minutes with participants and almost an hour with supervisors. Supervisors were asked to respond to questions about what happened at the worksite; the job skills required for the work, as well as its importance; and the productivity of participants. Participants were asked about their job satisfaction and the fairness of working for their benefits, and they also supplied demographic information.

This report cannot address all of the issues covered in the MDRC evaluation of other state programs; resources limited this study to data based on interviews conducted in New York City and information already available from worksite interviews in other areas. In particular, larger questions -- who participated and the flow of participants through the Work Experience Program, how the program was run and how mandatory it was, how jobs were assigned and who was sanctioned and why -- could not be examined. Whether the New York City program increased employment of participants and/or decreased their dependence on welfare and whether the benefits of the program outweighed its costs are also important issues but beyond the scope of the survey. This report will, however, address such issues as the quality of work and the perceptions of both participants and their worksite supervisors about the work experience and compare results with the findings from the other state programs.

The following questions are the main focus of the report:

- What kinds of jobs were assigned to work experience participants?
- How important were the jobs to the sponsoring agencies? Were they "make-work" or a valuable contribution?

- What skills were important in the jobs, and what skills levels did participants bring to their jobs? How much did their skills improve on the job?
- How satisfied were supervisors with the participants' work; and how did they compare the performance and productivity of participants to those of other workers?
- How satisfied were participants with the work requirement and their work experience jobs?

II. Program Background

As of June 1986, most participants in the Work Experience Program were recipients of Home Relief: 12,500 out of 15,900 total participants. The remaining 3,400 were AFDC recipients. Parents of children aged 6 to 13 years accounted for 1,200 of these recipients.

The New York City Work Experience Program has two different work schedules because of special provisions to accommodate the child-care responsibilities of parents with children under 13. These recipients work from 9:30 to 1:30 for a maximum of 40 hours every two weeks. To further ensure that the parents work only during school hours, participants are furloughed over school holidays and vacations, and do not have to make up work hours missed when the child is sick and home from school. AFDC recipients with older children, however, can be scheduled for any of the hours normally worked at their sites throughout the entire year.

For both groups, the work obligation continues as long as participants receive welfare. Participants can thus be assigned to the same worksite for extended periods of time. Among the programs in the MDRC Work/Welfare Demonstration, only West Virginia has an open-ended obligation. The other

state programs limited work experience assignments to a 13- or 26-week period.

As in CWEP, the number of hours participants work in both groups is determined by the amount of the participant's grant. That grant, unlike the CWEP provisions, is then divided by the wage rate attached to the job category of the work assignment. The various wage rates are all under \$5.00 an hour, but not less than the minimum wage.

The Work Experience Program is administered by the HRA Bureau of Employment Services. Approximately 2,000 Home Relief and 1,500 AFDC recipients pass through the assessment office every week. As AFDC recipients are determined WIN-mandatory they are referred initially to Department of Labor employment services. Those who are screened out of the DOL services because of severe child-care problems or physical handicaps are usually the ones sent on to the Work Experience Program.

A Work Experience Program intake staff of 20 caseworkers and their supervisors assess these clients to determine their eligibility for work experience and assign them to sites. Between 30 and 40 percent of the welfare recipients called in for assessment fail to keep their appointments and are thus subject to sanctioning. Of the remaining 60 to 70 percent, half claim exemptions for various reasons. Eventually, about half of these are exempted, while the other half are referred again to the program.

About three-fourths of the assessed recipients are assigned to worksites. Of the rest, a small proportion became exempt for medical reasons. On occasion, there are no appropriate worksites. Some are excused if they speak only Spanish. (In assessing a client's linguistic capability, the intake workers refer to educational records. If the formal

education was primarily received in Puerto Rico, the client is usually judged unqualified for a work experience position. However, clients who have advanced into a New York City high school are assumed to be sufficiently proficient, since a high level of competence in English is not required for program participation.)

About 80 percent of those assigned to the worksites begin work there; those who do not are subject to sanctions. An additional 5 percent are sanctioned for program violations during their work experience assignments. Excessive absenteeism is the most frequent reason. Participants who miss 49 percent of their work hours in two successive two-week periods -- and are not excused from making up the work -- can be sanctioned. In agencies with automated attendance record-keeping (where about half of all participants work), noncompliant participant names are pulled from the records and the sanctioning process can begin. In sites without automated attendance records, excessive absenteeism is reported by the worksite supervisor.

An Agency Liaison Field Unit, made up of 12 staff members and a supervisor, monitors worksites to determine if the agencies and client activities comply with program regulations. The frequency with which sites are monitored depends upon the size of the site and the number of clients; the smallest worksites are visited by liaisons as rarely as twice a year, while the largest sites are visited weekly.⁴ The Work Experience Program also has several staff units: among them, one to counsel and assist clients who have difficulty participating during the course of their work assignments, and another to help adjudicate cases of noncompliance.

While it is recognized that most participants in the Work Experience

Program are recipients of Home Relief, this paper will focus only on AFDC participants in order to make the broader comparisons with AFDC workers in the other states MDRC is studying. The research sample has, however, two distinct groups of AFDC recipients: mothers of children 6 to 13 years, and those whose youngest child is aged 13 or older. The responses of these two groups are often presented separately.⁵

III. The Research Sample

The sample contains 32 participants who are parents of at least one child between 6 and 13, and 40 participants whose children are 13 or older. Table 1 summarizes the key characteristics of the total sample and the two groups separately. Almost all are women. Slightly less than half of the total sample (46 percent) are black, 44 percent are Hispanic, and the remaining few are white. On average, participants had completed 11 grades of school. Very few were married and living with their spouses; the great majority were either married and not living with their spouses or had never married. Sample members also had little prior attachment to the labor force; only 10 percent had held a job in the two years prior to the interview.

As expected, participants with young children were themselves younger than the other group of participants (35 versus 42 years). Not surprisingly, participants whose youngest child was 13 or older were more likely to have received welfare for a longer period of time. Eighty percent of these participants had received AFDC for more than six years compared to 53 percent of the participants with children under 13 years.

None of this demographic information is unusual for a group that

TABLE 1

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESEARCH SAMPLE AT THE TIME OF INTERVIEW, BY AGE OF YOUNGEST CHILD

Characteristic	Participants with Youngest Child 6 to 13 Years Old	Participants with Youngest Child 13 to 18 Years Old	Total
Average Age (Years)	35.0	42.1	38.9***
Sex (%)			
Male	0.0	5.0	2.8 ^c
Female	100.0	95.0	97.2 ^c
Ethnicity (%)			
White, Non-Hispanic	6.3	12.5	9.7 ^c
Black, Non-Hispanic	40.6	50.0	45.8
Hispanic	53.1	37.5	44.4
Grade Level Completed (%)			
Twelve Grades or More	28.1	34.2	31.4
Less Than 12 Grades	71.9	65.8	68.6
Average Highest Grade Completed	10.7	10.3	10.5
Marital Status (%)			
Never Married	50.0	25.0	36.1*
Married, Living with Spouse	6.3	10.0	8.3 ^c
Married, Not Living with Spouse	34.4	40.0	37.5
Divorced, Widowed	9.4	22.5	16.7
Average Number of Children Living with Participant	2.38	2.15	2.25
Any Children (%) ^a			
Between 6 and 12 Years	100.0	2.5 ^d	45.8***
Between 13 and 18 Years	40.6	95.0	70.8***
Average Age of Youngest Child on AFDC Grant (Years)	7.6	15.1	11.7***
Prior AFDC Dependency (%)			
Two Years or Less	21.9	7.5	13.9
Between 2 and 6 Years	25.0	2.5	12.5**
More Than 6 Years	53.1	80.0	68.1**
Average Months on AFDC During Two Years Prior to Interview	21.2	22.3	21.8
Held Job at any Time During Two Years Prior to Interview (%)	15.6	5.0	9.7 ^c
Total Sample ^b	32	40	72

(continued)

TABLE 1 (continued)

SOURCE: Interviews conducted by MDRC Research Staff between February and June 1986 with a random sample of participants in the Work Experience Program.

NOTES: Distributions may not add to 100.0 percent because of rounding.

Differences between subgroups are statistically significant using a two-tailed t-test or chi-square test at the following levels: * = 10 percent; ** = 5 percent; *** = 1 percent.

^a Distributions may not add to 100.0 percent because participants can have children in more than one category.

^b For selected characteristics, sample sizes may vary up to four sample points due to missing data.

^c Chi-square test inappropriate due to low expected cell frequencies.

^d One AFDC-U recipient had children between 6 and 12 but was placed in the subgroup of participants with older children because he worked longer than the standard 9:30-1:30 schedule.

includes long-term welfare recipients, although the New York sample appears to be more disadvantaged than the samples studied in other states.⁶ Table 2 illustrates the cross-state variation in key demographic characteristics. On average, New York City sample members were older (39 years) than those in other states, and their youngest child was also older (12 years). Minority participants predominated, and while Cook County (containing Chicago) had an equal proportion of minority participants (92 percent), at the other end of the range, West Virginia had only a 10 percent minority sample.

Level of disadvantage can often be most clearly seen in educational attainment and prior employment. The average grade level completed in school was lowest of all in New York (10.5 years), although not significantly lower than in Virginia and Maryland (10.9 and 10.7 years, respectively). The New York sample, however, was at a distinct disadvantage in terms of prior job-holding. In most states (with the exception of Illinois where 16 percent had had prior job experience), from one-fifth to one-half of participants had held a job at some time during the two years prior to the interviews. This compares with 10 percent in the New York sample, as noted above. Thus, the distinct features of the New York City sample, as well as the wide variation between other state samples, should be kept in mind when data are compared across states.

IV. Findings

A. Types of Jobs and Sponsoring Agencies

Participants in the Work Experience Program are given their program jobs by various public and nonprofit organizations. The great majority are

TABLE 2

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF WORK EXPERIENCE
PARTICIPANTS AT THE TIME OF INTERVIEW, BY STATE

Characteristic	New York	Arkansas	Virginia	California	Illinois	Maryland	W. Virginia
Average Age (Years)	38.9	31.0	36.0	30.5	33.4	29.8	38.3
Sex (%)							
Male	2.8	4.5	0.0	6.7	8.0	13.0	0.0
Female	97.2	95.5	100.0	93.3	92.0	87.0	100.0
Ethnicity (%)							
White, Non-Hispanic	9.7	45.5	21.3	13.3	8.0	24.1	86.7
Black, Non-Hispanic	45.8	54.5	76.6	26.7	80.0	75.9	10.0
Hispanic	44.4	0.0	0.0	33.3	12.0	0.0	0.0
Other	0.0	0.0	2.1	26.7	0.0	0.0	3.3
Grade Level Completed (%)							
Twelve Grades or More	31.4	63.6	46.8	53.3	56.0	48.1	43.3
Less Than 12 Grades	68.6	36.4	53.2	46.7	44.0	51.9	56.7
Average Highest Grade Completed	10.5	11.7	10.9	11.3	11.3	10.7	10.6
Marital Status (%)							
Never Married	36.1	31.8	38.3	6.7	56.0	40.7	26.7
Married, Living With Spouse	8.3	0.0	4.3	13.3	6.0	11.1	0.0
Married, Not Living With Spouse	37.5	18.2	34.0	53.3	18.0	25.9	13.3
Divorced, Widowed	16.7	50.0	21.3	26.7	20.0	22.2	60.0
Average Number of Children Living With Participant	2.25	2.41	2.11	2.33	2.50	1.91	2.07
Any Children (%) ^a							
Between 6 and 12 Years	45.8	63.6	74.5	93.3	86.0	72.2	60.0
Between 13 and 18 Years	70.8	40.9	57.4	33.3	46.0	29.6	60.0
Average Age of Youngest Child on AFDC Grant (Years)	11.7	10.0	10.5	8.6	9.0	8.4	11.4
Held Job at Any Time During Two Years Prior to Interview (%)	9.7	22.7	25.5	40.0	16.0	42.6	30.0
Total Sample ^b	72	22	47	15	50	54	30

(continued)

TABLE 2 (continued)

SOURCE: Interviews conducted by MDRC Field Research Staff between July 1983 and June 1986 with a random sample of participants in work experience jobs.

NOTES: Distributions may not add to 100.0 percent because of rounding.

^a Distributions may not add to 100.0 percent because participants can have children in more than one category.

^b For selected characteristics, sample sizes may vary up to twenty-one sample points due to missing data.

^c Chi-square test inappropriate due to low expected cell frequencies.

through public agencies, usually municipal. The most common work sponsors were Income Maintenance centers. And, although there were different types of positions at the different worksites, the assigned tasks fell into two principal categories: about two-thirds were clerical positions, and about one-fourth janitor/maintenance jobs. Typical assignments included the following:

- A woman performs clerical duties that involve answering the phone and mailing letters at the Board of Education offices.
- A man cleans the restrooms and sweeps the garage at a Sanitation Department garage.
- An office aide answers the phone and checks on licensing statuses at the State Liquor Authority.
- A home-care housekeeper does light housekeeping, shopping and laundry for the elderly in a self-help program.
- A woman files case records at an Income Maintenance center.
- An office secretary files, updates the mailing list and answers the phones at a local college newspaper.
- A participant does general custodial work (i.e., mopping and sweeping) at a city courthouse.
- Parks Department participants clean public restrooms and the departmental offices, and also pick up litter on the playgrounds.
- A woman does general office work, including filing, answering the telephones and scheduling appointments at a community center.
- A participant is a clerical aide for the Buildings and Grounds Department of a local college.

Participants with children between 6 and 13 have assignments similar to participants with older children.

While the level of skills needed for such work is suggested by the above descriptions, a better indicator of required skills is the wage rate

that the jobs normally command in the labor market. On average, an employee in a typical job would have been paid \$5.71 per hour.⁷ Forty percent of the jobs would have commanded only the minimum wage (\$3.35 per hour) or less, but another 29 percent would have paid more than \$8 per hour. These somewhat high hourly wages may have been due to the fact that employers, when asked for examples, could only cite rates for civil service employees, who must be hired in most city agency jobs.

B. Scheduled Hours and Work Schedules

Survey participants were assigned to an average of 82 hours of work per month. The scheduling of work hours for the two groups did vary, however. Mothers of children between 6 and 13 typically worked several hours nearly every day, for an average of 21 hours every week of the month. On average, mothers of older children -- who could be scheduled for more hours daily -- worked more hours every week (26) but somewhat less than a full month (just over three weeks). Thus, despite the two different work hour requirements, the average monthly hours of the two groups did not differ very much. Participants with younger children worked an average of 82 hours versus 83 hours for those with older children.

C. Importance of the Work to the Sponsoring Agency

The Work Experience Program jobs studied in this evaluation did not seem to be "make-work," a term that implies that the work has no particular importance to the agency. When supervisors and participants were asked to choose from a series of statements describing the value of the work to the agency, the majority of assignments were described as "a necessary part of the day-to-day business of the agency." (See Table 3.)

However, supervisors and participants did not always agree in their

TABLE 3

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF WORKSITE SUPERVISORS' AND PARTICIPANTS'
CHARACTERIZATION OF WORK EXPERIENCE JOBS IN TERMS OF IMPORTANCE
TO THE AGENCY, BY AGE OF YOUNGEST CHILD

Degree of Importance	Participants With Youngest Child 6 to 13 Years Old	Participants With Youngest Child 13 to 18 Years Old
<u>Supervisors' Perception</u>		
Necessary Work	75.8	85.0 ^a
Work Can Wait, But Eventually Needs to be Done	12.1	12.5
Helps if Work is Done	12.1	2.5
Work is Not Particularly Important to Agency	0.0	0.0
Total	100.0	100.0
Total Number of Supervisors Interviewed	33	40
<u>Participants' Perception</u>		
Necessary Work	81.3	64.9 ^a
Work Can Wait, But Eventually Needs to be Done	9.4	10.8
Helps if Work is Done	9.4	21.6
Work is Not Particularly Important to Agency	0.0	2.7
Total	100.0	100.0
Total Number ^b of Participants Interviewed	32	40

SOURCE: Interviews conducted by MDRC Research Staff between February and June 1986 with a random sample of participants in the Work Experience Program and their worksite supervisors.

NOTES: Distributions may not add exactly to 100.0 percent because of rounding.

Percentages exclude up to three cases with missing values.

^a Chi-square test inappropriate due to low expected cell frequencies.

^b In New York, 72 participants and 73 supervisors were interviewed. Percentages exclude up to 3 cases with missing values.

assessments: that is, individual participants who rated their jobs as necessary did not always work for supervisors who rated the jobs that way. Conversely, sometimes the supervisors thought the work was necessary but their participants disagreed. The end result was that, while most participants and supervisors believed the work was necessary, there were different ratings by subgroups. Participants with younger children were more likely to say their work was necessary than those with older children, but supervisors' responses took the opposite direction. Those responsible for mothers with older children were more likely to rate the work as necessary than supervisors of mothers with young children.

One factor that may have influenced supervisors' perceptions was the length of time the participants had been working at a site. At the point when the New York City interviews were held, the average time on the job was 23 weeks. The time was shorter for participants with younger children (16 weeks) than for those with older children (28 weeks).⁸ Supervisors of participants who were at a worksite for longer periods were more likely than supervisors of new workers to say that the work was necessary, regardless of whether they supervised participants with older children or not. Newer participants who had been on the job for a shorter time may not yet have been given full responsibilities and duties.

In comparison to other states, the sampled participants in New York City and their supervisors had similar perceptions about the necessity of their work. Table 4 illustrates the continuity across states of participant and supervisor perceptions about the importance of the assigned tasks.

As another measure of the value of work, supervisors were asked if the tasks currently assigned would be carried out if there were no longer a

DISTRIBUTION OF BY WORKSITE SUPERVISORS' AND PARTICIPANTS' CHARACTERIZATION
OF WORK EXPERIENCE JOBS IN TERMS OF IMPORTANCE TO THE AGENCY,
BY STATE

Degree of Importance	Participants (%) ^a										Average ^b
	New York	Arkansas	Virginia	California	Illinois	Maryland	W. Virginia				
<u>Supervisors' Perception</u>											
Necessary Work	80.8	79.2	84.8	80.0	78.0	96.3	83.3				83.2
Work Can Wait, But Eventually Needs to be Done	12.3	16.7	4.3	13.3	10.0	0.0	6.7				9.0
Helps if Work is Done	6.8	4.2	10.9	6.7	12.0	3.7	10.0				7.8
Work is Not Particularly Important to Agency	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0				0.0
Total Number of Supervisors Interviewed	73	24	47	15	50	54	30				293
<u>Participants' Perception</u>											
Necessary Work	72.5	77.3	86.7	80.0	74.0	80.8	86.7				79.7
Work Can Wait, But Eventually Needs to be Done	10.1	9.1	4.4	6.7	10.0	11.5	13.3				9.3
Helps if Work is Done	15.9	13.6	8.9	13.3	12.0	7.7	0.0				10.2
Work is Not Particularly Important to Agency	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0				0.8
Total Number of Participants Interviewed	72 ^c	22 ^d	47	15	50	54	30				290

SOURCE: Interviews conducted by MDRP Field Research Staff with a random sample of participants in work experience jobs between July 1983 and June 1986 and their worksite supervisors.

NOTES: Distributions may not add up to 100.0 percent because of rounding.

^a Percentages exclude up to three cases with missing values.

^b The average column reports the non-weighted average percent of responses in each category.

^c In New York, 72 participants and 73 supervisors were interviewed.

^d In Arkansas, 22 participants and 24 supervisors were interviewed.

work experience program. Only three in New York City replied that the work would no longer be done. The 70 supervisors who said the work would continue were asked who would do it. (They could give more than one response.) Existing regular employees were mentioned most often (by 47 supervisors), indicating that the work was important enough to do at the cost of increasing workloads, but not so demanding that it would overwhelm current staff. Hiring new staff was the second most frequent response (15 supervisors). When asked how likely it was that new staff would be hired, 21 percent felt it was "very likely," 36 percent believed it was "somewhat likely," and 43 percent thought it was "not very likely" or "not likely at all." Therefore, almost half of these new hires would probably never have taken place. Other subsidized workers and volunteers were also mentioned as replacing the work experience participants (by 12 and 2 supervisors, respectively).

D. Productivity: Participants Compared to Regular Employees

Another way to consider the importance of work experience is to examine the participants' productivity. If participants produce very little work in the course of a day compared to new employees in comparable positions, their work may be "non-work," rather than "make-work."

Supervisors were asked to compare the amount of work the participant did in a typical day to the amount performed by a new regular employee assigned to similar tasks. Supervisors were offered a range of choices, from one-tenth as much to the same amount. The possibility that the participant did more than a new regular employee was not offered as a choice, but it was recorded if the supervisor volunteered it.

Across all states, more than half of the supervisors rated the parti-

participants as doing as much work as a new regular employee, and over 10 percent volunteered that participants did more work than a new regular employee. Women with younger children were judged to be slightly less productive than new regular employees, while women with older children were judged to be more productive. The overall ratings were slightly higher than those of supervisors in the other state programs. It should be noted, however, that, in some cases, a high rating might reflect a supervisor's opinion of the work of a new regular employee compared to an experienced participant, one who had already been working for several months in that job. As previously mentioned, New York City Work Experience Program participants had worked an average of five months at the time of interviews.

The responses to all the questions above present a picture of work assignments that were not make-work and did contribute to the agencies' overall functioning. Because these jobs made real contributions to the agencies, it is natural to ask if they were of value to the participants. The next section will discuss the potential for skills development and how much can be expected from these work experience jobs.

E. Skills Development

Work experience programs are typically expected to help participants gain general work skills, such as good work habits, and to teach them how to interact with co-workers and supervisors.⁹ These types of skills might be called job-holding skills, in contrast to more specific occupational skills, which are not usually emphasized in work experience programs. The job-holding skills of participants are the primary focus of this study.

Supervisors were asked about two groups of job-holding skills,

cognitive and general working skills, and which of several specific skills in each group were important for the job in question. Additionally, as a very rough proxy of job complexity, supervisors were asked which kinds of tools or equipment were important to a job. Skills in the two groups, and the types of tools, are listed below.

Cognitive Skills

- ability to read and write
- arithmetic skills

and General Working Skills

- ability to communicate well
- cooperating with co-workers
- dealing with the public
- using one's own initiative
- working well without close supervision

and Ability to Use Tools

- simple tools (mops and brooms)
- tools requiring dexterity (simple office equipment)
- simple machines (telephones)
- complex machines (photocopying machines and CRT scanners)

As shown in a comparison of Tables 5 and 6, the jobs of participants with older children required more skills, except that a slightly higher proportion of jobs among mothers with young children required reading ability, working without supervision and operating complex equipment. The fact that mothers with older children had work requiring more skills is not surprising since these participants had been on the job longer, worked more hours per week, and their supervisors more frequently thought their tasks were necessary than the supervisors of participants with children 6 to 13.

For each important skill, supervisors were asked how adequate the participants were, both when the job assignment began and at the time of the interview. Supervisors were also asked to judge participants' adequacy

TABLE 5

ADEQUACY OF WORK EXPERIENCE PARTICIPANTS WITH A YOUNGEST CHILD
6 TO 13 YEARS OLD IN SELECTED SKILLS AND WORK HABITS
IMPORTANT FOR THEIR JOBS, AT THE START OF THEIR JOBS
AND AT TIME OF INTERVIEWS, AS JUDGED BY THEIR WORKSITE SUPERVISORS

Type of Skill or Work Habit	Number of Work Experience Jobs Where Skill is Important	Number of Participants Who Were:		
		Adequate or More Than Adequate at Start of Work Experience Job	Inadequate at Start of Work Experience Job	Inadequate at Time of Interview
Cognitive Skills				
Reading/Writing	12	12	0	0
Arithmetic	3	2	0	0
General Skills				
Communicates Well	16	14	1	0
Cooperate With Co-Workers	18	17	0	0
Deal with Public	9	7	2	0
Take Own Initiative	12	10	1	0
Work Without Supervision	21	18	3	0
Ability to Use Tools				
Simple Tools	5	5	0	0
Tools Requiring Dexterity	4	4	0	0
Simple Machines	14	13	1	0
Complex Machines	8	3	3	0
Work Habits				
Attendance	N/A	30	2	1
Concentrates on Task	N/A	29	2	0
Works Quickly	N/A	31	0	0
Follows Instructions	N/A	30	2	0
Calls in Sick	N/A	25	3	3
Completes Tasks	N/A	32	0	0
Learns from Mistakes	N/A	29	2	0
Sample Size	33			

SOURCE: Interviews conducted by MDRC Research Staff between February and June 1986 with worksite supervisors of a random sample of participants in the Work Experience Program.

NOTES: N/A indicates not applicable because all supervisors were asked to rate the adequacy of the participant.

The number of participants judged adequate and the number judged inadequate may not total to the number of work experience jobs where a skill is important, due to missing data.

TABLE 6

ADEQUACY OF WORK EXPERIENCE PARTICIPANTS WITH A YOUNGEST CHILD
13 TO 18 YEARS OLD IN SELECTED SKILLS AND WORK HABITS
IMPORTANT FOR THEIR JOBS, AT THE START OF THEIR JOBS
AND AT TIME OF INTERVIEWS, AS JUDGED BY THEIR WORKSITE SUPERVISORS

Type of Skill or Work Habit	Number of Work Experience Jobs Where Skill is Important	Number of Participants Who Were:		
		Adequate or More Than Adequate at Start of Work Experience Job	Inadequate at Start of Work Experience Job	Inadequate at Time of Interview
Cognitive Skills				
Reading/Writing	13	11	2	2
Arithmetic	4	3	1	0
General Skills				
Communicates Well	24	19	4	0
Cooperate With Co-Workers	25	21	1	0
Deal with Public	19	19	0	0
Take Own Initiative	20	18	0	0
Work Without Supervision	24	19	3	0
Ability to Use Tools				
Simple Tools	13	10	2	0
Tools Requiring Dexterity	6	5	0	0
Simple Machines	20	17	2	0
Complex Machines	6	4	2	0
Work Habits				
Attendance	N/A	34	5	1
Concentrates on Task	N/A	38	1	0
Works Quickly	N/A	37	0	0
Follows Instructions	N/A	38	1	0
Calls in Sick	N/A	34	2	0
Completes Tasks	N/A	38	1	0
Learns from Mistakes	N/A	33	1	0
Sample Size	40			

SOURCE: Interviews conducted by MDRC Research Staff between February and June 1986 with worksite supervisors of a random sample of participants in the Work Experience Program.

NOTES: N/A indicates not applicable because all supervisors were asked to rate the adequacy of participant.

The number of participants judged adequate and the number judged inadequate may not total to the number of work experience jobs where a skill is important, due to missing data.

in the following seven work habits, which apply to all jobs and work settings:

- attendance and punctuality
- concentrating on tasks
- working quickly and in a timely fashion
- following instructions
- calling in when sick or late
- completing tasks thoroughly
- learning from mistakes or constructive criticism

Results presented in Tables 5 and 6 show that most supervisors in the New York City program judged participants adequate or better in work habits and general skills at the time they began their jobs. The great majority of both groups of participants had the requisite skills levels. With the exception of three women who failed to call in when sick or tardy and two participants who still had poor reading skills, almost all participants who had been judged inadequate in one skill or another at the outset had improved and were considered "adequate" by the time of the interviews. Hence, while only a few participants had the opportunity to improve their skills, their work experience jobs did help them.

Table 7 compares job requirements in New York City and the six other state studies. Although there is wide variation across states, the opinions of the New York City sample of supervisors were not at an extreme of the range. Tables 8 and 9 show the general consistency of skill adequacy across states, both at the beginning of job assignments and at the time of the interviews. Caution should be used, however, in interpreting these ratings. Supervisors, in reporting the necessity and adequacy of skills, may have had different definitions of competency and what skills were most important. In addition, the amount of time participants had work-

TABLE 7

PERCENT OF WORK EXPERIENCE JOBS IN WHICH SELECTED SKILLS
WERE IMPORTANT FOR THE JOBS
AS JUDGED BY WORKSITE SUPERVISORS, BY STATE

Type of Skill or Work Habit	Percent of Work Experience Jobs ^a							Average ^b
	New York	Arkansas	Virginia	California	Illinois	Maryland	W. Virginia	
Average Number of Skills Important per Job								
Cognitive Skills	0.4	0.6	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.7	0.8	0.4
General Skills	2.6	4.5	1.4	2.7	1.7	3.2	3.8	2.8
Cognitive Skills								
Reading/Writing	34.2	45.8	0.0	18.2	20.0	51.9	51.7	31.7
Arithmetic	9.6	12.5	0.0	9.1	6.0	22.2	30.0	12.8
General Skills								
Communicates Well	54.8	100.0	6.4	58.3	30.0	62.3	73.3	55.0
Cooperates with Co-Workers	58.9	100.0	36.2	75.0	40.0	71.7	80.0	66.0
Deals With Public	38.4	95.8	36.2	53.8	42.0	57.4	70.0	56.2
Uses Own Initiative	43.8	62.5	23.4	58.3	22.0	62.3	83.3	50.8
Works Without Supervision	61.6	87.5	42.6	76.9	36.0	70.4	76.7	64.5
None	1.4	0.0	0.0	6.7	2.0	1.9	0.0	1.7
Ability to Use Tools								
Simple Tools	24.7	37.5	21.3	26.7	18.0	22.2	50.0	28.6
Tools Requiring Dexterity	13.7	62.5	6.4	40.0	48.0	40.7	30.0	34.5
Simple Machines	46.6	83.3	36.2	53.3	24.0	51.9	60.0	50.8
Complex Machines	19.2	41.7	34.0	6.7	16.0	37.0	16.7	24.5
None	17.8	0.0	17.0	13.3	12.0	5.6	13.3	11.3
How Complicated and Demanding Tasks Are:								
Very Simple, Undemanding.....1	17.8	4.2	0.0	6.7	16.0	9.8	3.3	8.3
2	9.6	20.8	17.4	6.7	24.0	3.9	30.0	16.1
Middle.....3	53.4	41.7	60.9	46.7	48.0	74.5	53.3	54.1
4	11.0	25.0	17.4	33.3	8.0	9.8	6.7	15.9
Very Complicated, Demanding.....5	8.2	8.3	4.3	6.7	4.0	2.0	6.7	5.7
Total Number of Supervisors Interviewed	73 ^c	24 ^d	47	15	50	54	30	293

(continued)

TABLE 7 (continued)

SOURCE: Interviews conducted by MDRC Field Research staff with the worksite supervisors of a random sample of participants in work experience jobs between July 1983 and June 1986.

^a Percentages exclude a small number of cases with missing values.

^b The average column reports the total non-weighted average percent of responses in each category across states.

^c In New York, 72 participants and 73 supervisors were interviewed.

^d In Arkansas, 22 participants and 24 supervisors were interviewed.

TABLE 8

NUMBER OF WORK EXPERIENCE PARTICIPANTS JUDGED INADEQUATE
BY THEIR WORKSITE SUPERVISORS IN SELECTED SKILLS
AND WORK HABITS, AT THE START OF THEIR JOBS, BY STATE

Type of Skill or Work Habit	Number of Participants ^a						
	New York	Arkansas	Virginia	California	Illinois	Maryland	W. Virginia
Cognitive Skills							
Reading/Writing	2	0	0	0	3	0	0
Arithmetic	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
General Skills							
Communicates Well	5	7	0	2	5	3	2
Cooperates with Co-Workers	1	0	1	1	2	2	2
Deals With Public	2	7	4	1	5	4	5
Uses Own Initiative	1	7	5	1	1	4	5
Works Without Supervision	6	1	10	2	3	2	5
Ability to Use Tools							
Simple Tools	2	0	2	1	2	2	0
Tools Requiring Dexterity	0	1	0	0	3	3	0
Simple Machines	3	6	10	0	5	14	2
Complex Machines	5	4	12	1	4	10	2
Work Habits							
Attendance	7	2	5	2	2	7	1
Concentrates on Task	3	2	5	1	4	8	4
Work Quickly	0	2	12	1	7	11	1
Follows Instructions	3	2	3	2	6	7	0
Calls in Sick	5	7	4	2	3	9	3
Completes Tasks	1	3	4	2	3	6	2
Learns from Mistakes	3	5	4	1	2	8	0
Total Number of Supervisors Interviewed	73	24	47	15	50	54	30

SOURCE: Interviews conducted by MDRC Field Research staff with the worksite supervisors of a random sample of participants in work experience jobs between July 1983 and June 1986.

^a Because of missing data or changes in the structure of the worksite questionnaire, not all supervisors were asked about all skills judged important in the worksite.

TABLE 9

NUMBER OF WORK EXPERIENCE PARTICIPANTS JUDGED INADEQUATE
BY THEIR WORKSITE SUPERVISORS IN SELECTED SKILLS
AND WORK HABITS, AT THE TIME OF INTERVIEW, BY STATE

Type of Skill or Work Habit	Number of Participants ^a						
	New York	Arkansas	Virginia	California	Illinois	Maryland	W. Virginia
Cognitive Skills							
Reading/Writing	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arithmetic	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
General Skills							
Communicates Well	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Cooperates with Co-Workers	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Deals With Public	0	2	1	0	1	0	1
Uses Own Initiative	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Works Without Supervision	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
Ability to Use Tools							
Simple Tools	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Tools Requiring Dexterity	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
Simple Machines	0	0	1	0	0	3	1
Complex Machines	0	0	1	1	0	2	0
Work Habits							
Attendance	2	0	2	1	0	3	0
Concentrates on Task	0	0	2	0	1	1	0
Work Quickly	0	1	2	1	3	1	0
Follows Instructions	0	0	1	0	3	1	0
Calls in Sick	3	3	2	1	2	3	2
Completes Tasks	0	1	1	0	2	1	1
Learns from Mistakes	0	2	1	0	1	2	0
Total Number of Supervisors Interviewed	73	24	47	15	50	54	30

SOURCE: Interviews conducted by MDRC Field Research staff with the worksite supervisors of a random sample of participants in work experience jobs between July 1983 and June 1986.

^a Because of missing data or changes in the structure of the worksite questionnaire, not all supervisors were asked about all skills judged important in the worksite.

ed at their current assignments varied across states, and since most states had a 13- or 26-week limit, work assignment participants in these states had spent much less time on the job when the interviews were held.

Participants themselves were also asked whether they had learned much on the job. They were asked if they strongly agreed, somewhat agreed, somewhat disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "I have not learned anything new on this job." Despite supervisors' different perceptions about the value of the work performed by those with younger versus older children, participants in both groups had similar responses to this statement. Many participants in the New York City sample, as well as in other states, believed they had learned something new in their work experience positions. (See Table 10.) It should be noted, however, that there was not much correlation between their responses and the judgments of supervisors to the questions on skills improvement. One possibility is that participants could have been referring to something they had learned other than concrete skills or to improvement in skills beyond "adequacy."

F. Participant Job Satisfaction and Sense of Fairness
About the Work Requirement

Two important issues in a mandatory work program are participants' job satisfaction and their sense of the relative fairness of a work requirement. To evaluate their perceptions, interviewers asked participants a series of questions at several points in the interviews. Intentionally, the same issue was explored more than once, with alternative wording. Questions examining the same issue were worded so that an affirmative response to some and a negative response to others would indicate a consistent attitude. This is standard practice in surveys on attitudes,

TABLE 10

WORK EXPERIENCE PARTICIPANT RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS
CONCERNING JOB SATISFACTION AT WORKSITES,
BY STATE

Question	Participant Responses (%) ^a							W. Virginia Average ^b
	New York	Arkansas	Virginia	California	Illinois	Maryland	W. Virginia	
Overall, I like my job. Strongly Disagree Somewhat Disagree Somewhat Agree Strongly Agree	5.6 1.4 28.2 64.8	4.5 4.5 13.6 77.3	4.3 0.0 21.3 74.5	13.3 0.0 40.0 46.7	6.0 0.0 24.0 70.0	0.0 5.6 22.2 72.2	3.3 0.0 33.3 63.3	5.3 1.6 26.1 67.0
Generally speaking, how do you feel most days about coming to work here? In other words, most days do you: Look forward to coming to work? Not care one way or the other? Hate the thought of coming to work?	76.4 15.3 8.3	90.9 9.1 0.0	88.9 6.7 4.4	66.7 6.7 26.7	68.0 18.0 14.0	90.6 7.5 1.9	76.7 13.3 10.0	79.7 10.9 9.3
As far as you are concerned how much of the work on this assignment do you find to be simple and boring? Most of the work Some of the work None of the work	16.9 31.0 52.1	4.8 28.6 66.7	6.5 21.7 71.7	28.6 28.6 42.9	16.0 20.0 64.0	13.0 31.5 55.6	13.3 30.0 56.7	14.2 27.3 58.5
What about your supervisor and other regular employees here — do you feel they look on you as part of the regular staff? Yes No	84.7 15.3	100.0 0.0	97.6 2.4	73.3 26.7	85.7 14.3	87.0 13.0	90.0 10.0	88.3 11.7
The kind of work I'm doing will help me to get a decent-paying job later. Strongly Disagree Somewhat Disagree Somewhat Agree Strongly Agree	11.3 7.0 32.4 49.3	9.1 8.1 45.5 36.4	6.4 4.3 19.1 70.2	13.3 13.3 33.3 40.0	26.0 6.0 34.0 34.0	11.1 5.6 31.5 51.9	6.7 10.0 40.0 43.3	12.0 7.9 33.7 46.4
I have not learned anything new on this job. Strongly Disagree Somewhat Disagree Somewhat Agree Strongly Agree	57.7 18.3 7.0 16.9	61.8 4.5 9.1 4.5	65.2 8.7 17.4 8.7	53.3 6.7 6.7 33.3	52.0 14.0 14.0 20.0	63.0 7.4 14.8 14.8	33.3 23.3 13.3 30.0	58.5 11.8 11.8 18.3
Total Number of Participants Interviewed	72 ^c	22 ^d	47	15	50	54	30	290

[continued]

TABLE 10 (continued)

SOURCE: Interviews conducted by MDRC Field Research Staff with a random sample of participants in work experience jobs between July 1983 and June 1986.

NOTES: Distributions may not add up to 100.0 percent because of rounding.

^a Percentages exclude a small number of cases of missing values.

^b The average column reports the non-weighted average percent of responses in each category across states.

^c In New York, 72 participants and 73 supervisors were interviewed.

^d In Arkansas, 22 participants and 24 supervisors were interviewed.

and recent research indicates that it may be particularly important in interviews with respondents with low levels of educational attainment. They may be more likely than educated respondents to agree with statements offered by the interviewer.¹⁰ Only a few questions from the survey are presented in the tables that follow.

When the participants were asked if they were satisfied receiving their benefits tied to a job, most often they replied they were "somewhat or very satisfied" (39 percent). (See Table 11.) However, participants with older children expressed satisfaction more often (68 percent) than participants with younger children (44 percent). When all the states are compared, Illinois (Cook County) and New York City appear to have the largest proportion of participants dissatisfied with the work-for-benefits arrangement (56 and 43 percent, respectively). Participants in Maryland, primarily Baltimore, were also frequently negative. One possibility may be that an urban population, as represented in these three samples, is more resentful of a work obligation than participants in more rural areas.

Another question dealt with the issue of fairness in terms of financial equity. When asked to compare the usefulness of their work to the amount of money they received in benefits, the large majority of participants in New York City as well as in other state areas believed that the agency was getting the better end of the deal. (See Table 11.) The exceptions were California and participants with younger children in New York City. In the Work Experience Program, 20 percent of the participants with children aged 6 to 13 felt that they, not the agency, were getting the better end of the financial deal.

The fact that New York City participants with older children felt that

TABLE 11

WORK EXPERIENCE PARTICIPANT RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS CONCERNING
THE FAIRNESS OF A WORK REQUIREMENT, BY STATE

Question	Participant Responses (%) ^a								Average ^b
	New York	Arkansas	Virginia	California	Illinois	Maryland	W. Virginia		
How satisfied are you about receiving welfare benefits like this -- that is, tied to a job, instead of simply receiving your benefits? Very Satisfied Somewhat Satisfied Somewhat Dissatisfied Not Satisfied at All	18.1	18.2	39.1	60.0	16.0	23.1	43.3	31.1	
	38.9	54.5	45.7	33.3	28.0	38.5	36.7	39.4	
	22.2	27.3	6.5	0.0	24.0	9.6	10.0	14.2	
	20.8	0.0	8.7	6.7	32.0	28.8	10.0	15.3	
I feel better about receiving welfare now that I am working for it. Strongly Agree Somewhat Agree Somewhat Disagree Strongly Disagree	50.7	45.5	52.3	78.6	26.0	33.3	60.0	49.5	
	30.4	31.8	9.1	0.0	28.0	25.9	30.0	22.2	
	5.8	9.1	6.8	0.0	18.0	13.0	3.3	8.0	
	13.0	13.6	31.8	21.4	28.0	27.8	6.7	20.3	
I'd like to ask you how useful your work is to the agency. Let's say you compare the usefulness of your work to the amount of money you receive in benefits -- who would you say is probably getting the better end of the deal: you or the agency? Me Neither One Agency	14.3	14.3	18.2	35.7	6.0	3.7	13.3	15.1	
	15.7	9.5	9.1	14.3	10.0	0.0	13.3	10.3	
	70.0	76.2	72.7	50.0	82.0	96.3	73.3	74.4	
Does participant understand that participation is mandatory? Yes No	98.6	85.7	89.5	85.7	95.9	66.7	100.0	88.9	
	1.4	14.3	10.5	14.3	4.1	33.3	0.0	11.1	
Total Number of Participants Interviewed	72 ^d	22 ^e	47	15	50	54	30	280	

(continued)

TABLE 11 (continued)

SOURCE: Interviews conducted by MDRC Field Research Staff with a random sample of participants in work experience jobs between July 1983 and June 1986.

NOTES: Distributions may not add up to 100.0 percent because of rounding.

^a Percentages exclude a small number of cases with missing values.

^b The average column reports the total non-weighted average percent of responses in each category across states.

^c Respondents were categorized as knowing the program was mandatory if they felt their grants would be reduced if they refused to take a job or quit the job before it ended.

^d In New York, 72 participants and 73 supervisors were interviewed.

^e In Arkansas, 22 participants and 24 supervisors were interviewed.

agencies benefited more than they did is not surprising since they had more demanding jobs requiring more skills. The work hours were also longer for these participants. Participants with younger children, with less demanding jobs and more lenient work hours, would more easily see themselves as having the advantage.

However, in general, participants believed the work requirement was fair, even though they expressed discontent with the work-for-benefits financial arrangement. To examine this positive reaction, interviewers asked questions to find out if the participants understood that their programs were mandatory. In every state where interviews were conducted, nearly all the participants (an average of 89 percent), understood that their grants were in jeopardy if they did not meet the participation requirement. (See Table 11.) This observation dispels the possibility that participants' sense of fairness about the work obligation came from a belief that the work was voluntary.

It is nevertheless possible that participants might regard a work requirement as unfair in some ways, yet still be satisfied with the job itself. When asked to respond to the statement, "Overall, I like my job," 93 percent of the sampled participants in New York City agreed with it to some degree (see Table 10). (It should be noted that all the participants who disagreed with this statement -- and therefore disliked their jobs -- were participants with younger children.)

Another way to judge job satisfaction is to determine whether the participants thought their work experience jobs would help them obtain a job later. Eighty-two percent of the participants (87 percent of the participants with older children and 75 percent of the participants with

younger ones) either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with a statement probing this issue. In responding to this statement and other questions, participants in all seven states appeared to believe that a work experience assignment could lead to a better-paying job in the future.

A series of questions explored the participants' attitudes toward being on welfare and working at a worksite where co-workers knew they were receiving welfare. Over 80 percent of the New York City participants agreed with the statement, "I feel better about receiving welfare now that I am working for it," compared to an average of 72 percent across all the samples. This seems to contradict the finding that a fairly high proportion (43 percent) of participants in New York City were not satisfied with receiving welfare benefits tied to a job. (See Table 11.)

Eighty percent of the participants thought that the regular employees knew they were receiving welfare. Despite this, 85 percent felt they were treated like a regular employee by their supervisor and other workers. The participants with younger children were more likely than those with older children to feel that they were treated differently (15 percent compared to 8 percent). Participants with older children were more likely to see themselves as part of the regular staff (83 percent versus 76 percent). These differences reflect the greater integration into the worksite of the participants with older children as a result of their longer time on the job and the greater complexity and importance of their work. In neither subgroup, however, did many participants in New York City feel stigmatized at the worksite by their status as welfare recipients.

V. Conclusion

The participants in the New York City Work Experience Program were a very disadvantaged population. They had a lower average grade level and a much less extensive work history than the samples in other states MDRC has studied. New York City's sample contained long-term welfare recipients; the majority had received AFDC for more than six years.

The two distinct subgroups within New York's sample -- participants with children aged 6 to 13 and those with children 13 or older -- had somewhat different experiences in the Work Experience Program. The structure of work in the program was such that a participant with older children had a longer average length of stay at a worksite. Work positions held by this group appear to have required more skills and a greater ability to use equipment. A larger proportion of their supervisors said their work was "a necessary part of the day-to-day business of the agency" than did the supervisors of participants with younger children. In addition, all participants with older children liked their jobs, at least to some extent, while parents with younger children expressed more displeasure. This is not surprising considering the few skills their work required and the supervisors' reduced esteem for their work. In brief, participants with only older children had a more challenging program of work experience than participants with younger children.

Overall, the program appears to be meeting its goal of familiarizing AFDC recipients with the world of work by placing this disadvantaged group into work experience jobs that were not make-work. Although only a limited number of skills were required for many positions, almost all of the few participants who did not already possess adequate job-holding skills when

they began their assignments did improve and were rated by their supervisors as "adequate" at the time of the interviews. Most participants also believed that they had "learned something on the job," and that this job would lead to a better one. In addition, the majority expressed satisfaction with receiving benefits tied to a job, and over 80 percent said they felt better about receiving welfare now that they were working for it.

In a general comparison to the other state samples studied with the same survey instrument, the participants and supervisors in New York, Illinois (primarily Chicago) and sometimes Maryland (mostly Baltimore) responded for the most part in a similar way. Both the New York City and Chicago samples had a large proportion of minority participants, particularly participants with low educational levels. Their findings may illustrate some of the similarities of urban worksites and the reactions of both supervisors and participants to work requirements in that environment.

FOOTNOTES

1. In addition to being the mother of a child under six years of age, individuals are not WIN-mandatory if they are:
 1. under 16 years old;
 2. enrolled full-time in school and under 21 years old;
 3. sick, as determined by the Income Maintenance unit;
 4. incapacitated, as determined by the Income Maintenance unit;
 5. 65 years old or more;
 6. a caretaker of a sick person; or
 7. a mother or female whose spouse is a WIN registrant.

2. For more information about the Work/Welfare Demonstration and the specific states, see the following MDRC reports:

Ball, Joseph; with Hamilton, Gayle; Hoerz, Gregory; Goldman, Barbara; and Gueron, Judith. 1984. West Virginia: Interim Findings on the Community Work Experience Demonstrations.

Friedlander, Daniel; Hoerz, Gregory; Long, David; Quint, Janet; with Goldman, Barbara; and Gueron, Judith. 1985. Maryland: Final Report on the Employment Initiatives Evaluation;

Friedlander, Daniel; Hoerz, Gregory; Quint, Janet; Riccio, James; with Goldman, Barbara; Gueron, Judith; and Long, David. 1985. Arkansas: Final Report on the WORK Program in Two Counties;

Goldman, Barbara; Friedlander, Daniel; Gueron, Judith; Long, David; with Hamilton, Gayle; and Hoerz, Gregory. 1985. Findings From the San Diego Job Search and Work Experience Demonstration;

Price, Marilyn; with Ball, Joseph; Goldman, Barbara; Gruber, David; Gueron, Judith; and Hamilton, Gayle. 1985. Interim Findings From the Virginia Employment Services Program; and

Quint, Janet; Guy, Cynthia; with Hoerz, Gregory; Hamilton, Gayle; Ball, Joseph; Goldman, Barbara; and Gueron, Judith. 1986. Interim Findings From the Illinois WIN Demonstration Program in Cook County;

3. A random sample was drawn each month from a list of AFDC recipients who were assigned to worksites that month. To avoid excessive travel, worksites in Staten Island were excluded. Because at one site a participant left the work assignment before she could be interviewed, only the worksite supervisor was interviewed. Thus, the research sample contained 72 participants and 73 supervisors.

4. The interview data show that 52 percent of all direct supervisors were never contacted by Work Experience Program staff.
5. One male recipient with a child under 13 years of age was included within the group with older children because his work schedule matched that group's hours.
6. Some of the states in the Work/Welfare Demonstration required AFDC-U recipients, who are primarily male, to participate. However, because WIN regulations governing AFDC-U recipients are different from those for AFDC recipients (and it was expected that worksite experiences would be different for the two groups), the analysis is limited to AFDC participants in states with significant numbers of AFDC-U participants.
7. For selected work experience positions with missing data for equivalent wage rates, the values were set according to the wage schedule of the City of New York for comparable jobs.
8. There are two reasons for this large difference in length of time on the job. First, the program for mothers of younger children had begun more recently than the program for recipients with older children. Shorter duration could result from initial program lags (i.e., intake and other problems). Second, the interviews were conducted just two to six months following winter recess for the schools, when all participants with young children had been furloughed from their jobs. These participants did not always return to their prior worksites and/or supervisors.
9. See Regis Walther, 1976, "Analysis and Synthesis of DOL Experience in Youth Transition to Work Programs," Springfield, Virginia: National Technical Information Service; Joseph Ball, David Gerould and Paul Burstein, 1980, The Quality of Work in the Youth Entitlement Demonstration, New York: MDRC; and Edward Dement, 1982, Results-Oriented Work Experience Programming Salt Lake City, Utah: Olympus Publishing Company.
10. See Norman Bradburn, "Response Effects" and Paul Sheatsley, "Questionnaire Construction and Item Writing." 1983. In Handbook of Survey Research, Peter Rossi, James Wright and Andy Anderson, eds. New York: Academic Press. Pages 289-328 and pages 195-230. See also Howard Schuman and Stanley Presser. 1981. Questions and Answers in Attitude Surveys. New York: Academic Press.