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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Unemployment Problems in Michigan

The decade of the 1990s began with a belatedly recognized economic recession in the United States. Michigan was especially hard hit since this recession was partly caused by, and was aggravated by, declining sales in its #1 industry--automobiles. Ever since the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (O.P.E.C.) energy price shock of the early 1970s, together with competition from Japanese cars, Michigan has been suffering employment structural adjustment.

The specific employment trend which hit Michigan especially hard was the permanent loss of 106,000 jobs from 1990 to 1992 to some lower labor cost southern states, Japan, Mexico and other countries (Zagaroli, 1992). These jobs had been largely those requiring less education and skill. Therefore, the possibility of a permanently unemployable "underclass" especially in the nation's largest central cities, has arisen. At the same time, this recession has seen a larger percentage of white collar and managerial lay-offs than in other post World War II recessions.

The unemployment rate in Michigan in March of 1991 rose to 11.0% from 10.2% in February, 1991 (MESC, 1991). The problem was finally admitted by the federal government in March of 1991 as the demand for employment services and unemployment benefits increased.

1

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
An extension of unemployment insurance benefits from 26 to 39 weeks in Michigan and a few other states was officially announced in March, 1991 (Skidmore, 1992, p. C2) and again, on July 3, 1992 in recognition of the fact that in terms of unemployment this recession persisted.

During the latter part of March in 1990, the Kercher Center for Social Research at Western Michigan University conducted a survey of employment services in Michigan. Four hundred and fifty nine people were randomly selected across the state of Michigan and interviewed using Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing software (CATI). About a year later, in March 1991, the unemployment problem was getting worse as the economic recession bottomed out. Therefore, in the last week of March, a second survey was done with a sample of 505. It was essentially a replication of the 1990 survey, since the core items on job search and training were retained. This dissertation will use data from these two surveys, with an emphasis on the 1991 version in order to better understand how a representative sample of Michigan's adult non-retired residents sought employment.

The Special Nature of the Recent Recession

This job search study is unique in that it replicates a survey before and after a major recession was officially recognized. The other studies cited were generally cross sectional projects and tended not to describe the state of the economy at the time of the survey. Also they were usually not on a general public sample.
Therefore, we were explicitly rooted in a very specific historical moment—one of the long series of recessions in the post O.P.E.C. era in which structural dislocations have become ever more important than the usual cyclical unemployment which "normally" characterized periodic recessions.

Since these surveys have been completed, the recession has been announced as having ended in March 1991, but only in terms of non-employment indicators. "The Business Cycle Dating Committee of the National Bureau of Economic Research, the official arbiter of the beginning and ending of recessions, said the economy's slump concluded in March, 1991 eight months after it began in July 1990" (Skidmore, 1992). However "while the economy has been growing and profits are up at many corporations, that is not translating into many new jobs, a government unemployment report released yesterday shows" (Hilzenrath, 1993, p. 1). The recovery in employment has been less after this recession than has been the case in recent recessions. The 1.6 million new jobs projected for 1993 by "50 prominent economists," 3 times the 1992 growth, would still "be far weaker than the increases of 3.5 million jobs in 1983. The years following the previous recession" ("Jobs Grow," 1993, p. A5). Meanwhile the number of major employers announcing large permanent layoffs seems to grow every day.

The causes of this massive reorganization of the U.S. and world economies are far beyond the reach of this dissertation. However, at least they can be listed in support of our emphasis on the structural nature of the 1990 recession:
1. The basic level of the U.S. productivity-competitiveness crisis which primarily affects manufacturing due to the internationalization of the world's economic system. More and more U.S. manufacturing jobs are moving abroad (Thurow, 1985).

2. Deregulation. This quite separate development is focused primarily on banking, communications and transportation, hence our separation of these industries as will be explained below on page 107. They tend to be more "stable" than manufacturing in the aggregate, but unlike government and education, they suffer a high rate of turnover, hence insecurity (Thurow, 1985, p. 375).

3. The unexpectedly abrupt end of the cold war in 1989. With a decline in the defense budget, many manufacturing firms will be affected, as well as communities with closed military bases. In early 1992, it was predicted that, since the peak years of Reagan's defense buildup in 1987, up to 700,000 jobs could be lost by 1995 even if Bush had been reelected (Greenwald, 1992, p. 40).

The combination of these three separate structural shifts with the usual cyclical unemployment is extraordinary in a heavily manufacturing state like Michigan. It means that even when the cyclical recession is over, persistently high structural unemployment remains. Yet the Federal government under Reagan and Bush were disposed to let "the market" solve the reallocation of labor. Therefore "the economy" became the decisive issue in the recent presidential election.

Even in 1980 it was evident that we faced "inequality in an age of decline" (Blumberg, 1980). Initially it was the traditionally
disadvantaged who were most hurt but increasingly, with massive lay-offs, all types of Americans except the wealthiest were suffering declines of income. When new jobs can be found they are normally at a lower income with lower fringe benefits or employment security.

A recent study of income shifts in Michigan during the 1980s showed that the rich became richer while the others became poorer. "The income gap between the richest families and middle class families (those in the middle fifth) grew faster in Michigan than in all but eight states" was reported from a research project by The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities compiled by Sheldon Danziger of the University of Michigan (Foren, 1992).

Another feature of this recession is the decline in the safety net available for the unemployed. When the Reagan Administration shifted many Federal programs to the states, which generally cannot run annual deficits, governors had to cut programs or raise taxes. So, one change was to reduce the categories of workers who could expect unemployment compensation, especially on an extended basis or if defined by the U.S. Labor Department as "discouraged" (e.g., those no longer looking for a job after 30 days). In December 1991, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities in Washington announced that "Michigan's cuts in programs for (the) needy were (the) nation's deepest, as it cut general assistance for those not eligible for unemployment compensation. In this recession, "far fewer of the jobless are covered by unemployment compensation than in past recessions. as many as 75% of the unemployed drew benefits in past
recessions (while) only half that many were getting them now" (Clymer, 1991, p. 1).

A report by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities in April 1991 noted that "In 1990, when Michigan's unemployment rate for the year was the highest in the nation at 7.5%, the nation provided only 37% of the jobless workers with unemployment insurance benefits, a record low since World War II" (Rich, 1991, p. A17).

Purpose of the Study

The primary goal of this study is to contribute to a better understanding of the job search process. It will also focus on different socioeconomic and geographic groups in terms of their perception of the effectiveness of the Michigan employment service system. Alternative formal and informal sources of employment information, which will cover the respondents' past experience and future job seeking plans, will also be examined.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Research on the job search process has a long and central role in economics, with occasional contributions from sociologists and other social scientists. It does appear to be a fruitful problem from varying perspectives.

Wegener (1991), one of the very few sociologists interested in job searching, concluded, in his study of the life history data of 604 subjects in Germany, that "most studies of occupational mobility neglect the everyday social interaction processes by which individuals acquire jobs" (p. 60). His statement brought attention to micro-level mobility research, which argues that job changes depend on the job seeker's social network and social ties, rather than on rationalized national or even local employment service.

The major job seeking behavior studies at the macro level which have been most utilized are: (a) a special wave of the 1976 Job Seeking Activities of the Unemployed by the Current Population Survey (CPS) (which excluded job seeking by the employed); (b) the 1981 youth panel of the National Longitudinal Survey (NLS); and (c) a 1980 household survey of a sample of low income people in a set of job training and search assistance sites throughout the United States. However, Mangum noted in his 1982 "state of the art" monograph on job search surveys, "while a few of the studies are based on data from national samples, a majority cover very limited populations and..."
geographical areas," and usually only the long term unemployed (Mangum, 1982, p. 18). It, therefore, seems especially desirable to study the job search behavior of a general public sample to offset the limitations of those special populations.

Job Seeking Methods and Employment Status

On the issue of the effect of employment status on the effectiveness of job search, one of the key findings of Blau and Robins' analysis (1990) was that the success rate per contact is greater for employed searchers than for unemployed searchers. In spite of the fact that employed people have less time for a job search, they are more successful than the unemployed. These authors felt that further research on this issue is needed because many models of job search behavior are based on the assumption that job searching is more effective when one is unemployed. Their conclusion, on the other hand, is that the searching methods used by the employed are more effective than those used by the unemployed either because of better search technology (e.g., access to internal career ladders and better contacts) or because of the stigma associated with unemployment.

Another research report had different findings, the "differences in search choices at least partly explain differences in search outcomes between two groups: unemployed searchers apparently were more likely than employed searchers to gain new employment," and "the number of search methods used has a significant effect on the
probability of receiving offers and appears to explain most of the
differential attributed to unemployed status" (Holzer, 1987b, pp. 601-
608). Gottschalk and Maloney (1985) presented contradictory evidence
that employment status per se has no significant effect on whether
individuals thought they were "better off" in their new jobs. How­
ever, they did report that involuntary job terminations prior to un­
employment did result in more negative outcomes. It is therefore not
clear whether being employed at the time one is searching for job is
an important factor affecting the methods adopted, the length of
searching, and the job locating rate. Given the controversy on the
importance of the seeker's current employment status and this contra­
dictory evidence, we will therefore be testing hypotheses on these
issues.

Formal and Informal Job Search Media

There have been different ways of characterizing both formal
and informal information networks in terms of job seeking. However,
the most commonly cited formal job search methods included searching
through the public or state employment services, private employment
agencies, school placement offices, labor union hiring halls, and
newspaper advertisements. Informal methods, generally cover direct
approaches to potential employers, contacts through relatives,
friends and associates, and walk-ins (Rees, 1966, p. 559; Reid, 1972;

From the data of a study by the Monmoth County New Jersey
Welfare Board, Farnell and Pitzalis (1978) found informal methods to be the most popular, with direct application and the aid of friends and relatives being the most widely used and most effective media (in this dissertation, for the sake of consistency, media will be used to refer to job search techniques, approaches, means, etc.). More than three-fourths of the recipients were shown to have no contact with public agencies in their search.

On the issue of who uses which methods, there are contradictory findings. Granovetter and Tilly (1988) noted that "workers are typically matched to jobs through informal local institutions and networks of personal contacts. Contact networks are usually the largest channel of job matching and are associated with higher incomes in some occupations" (p. 192). It seems that although empirical studies differ with respect to timing, location, sample size, job seeker characteristics and a multitude of other differentiating variables, they have all tended to emphasize the importance of informal methods neglecting, as will be discussed below, semi-formal methods.

Holzer (1988) found in his study that unemployed workers use informal search methods, such as contacting friends, relatives or approaching firms directly more frequently than they use formal labor market intermediaries. In addition, workers using these informal search methods generate better job offers than workers using formal methods. In addition it was noted that low status individuals are more likely than high status individuals to use contact persons
(Corcoran, Datcher & Duncan, 1980).

In a study conducted in 1974 in medium sized cities, 2,000 job seekers concluded that the informal job search methods were preferred way ahead of any of the approaches involving third party labor market intermediaries (Camil Associates, 1976).

Wielgosz and Carpenter (1987) found in their analysis of the data from the 1982 National Longitudinal Survey of Youth Labor Market Experience that informal methods were widely preferred because they reduced the duration of search, but not necessarily because they provided certain important intensive and qualitative information about the workplace and working conditions.

It still appears that little is known about what determines the use of informal contacts as compared to other job search methods (Wegener, 1991, p. 65). However, it is quite clear by now that informal search methods are important, and viewed as effective, and are the most used media in job searching.

The State Employment Service

Government-run employment information services have been set up in an attempt to aid workers in the job seeking process (Kahn & Low, 1984). By providing information to job searchers, the government hopes to improve the match between supply and demand in the labor market (Barron & Mellow, 1982). The Michigan Employment Security Commission (MESC) is Michigan’s official state employment service and it has 54 branch offices throughout the State of Michigan. The
main functions of these public employment service agencies is to help people (either out of work, or working but seeking a different position) find jobs (MESC, 1991).

Local Employment Service offices of the MESC, besides helping in the job search, also administer unemployment compensation, and have been concerned with testing and training. In the 1960s, new programs which stressed counseling and training, especially for disadvantaged workers, were added to the local manpower system.

Whereas job placement used to be a fairly routine matter of matching people to jobs, the new emphases on counseling and training and on serving the disadvantaged worker have heightened the role of other social service organizations, such as sheltered workshops, in the system and probably complicated their official employment office's ability to assist in the job search process (Aldrich, 1976).

In contrast to informal networks, public employment services have been less utilized by job searchers. A 1974 study conducted in medium-sized cities sought to determine the role of the public employment service in job search activities. It concluded that it was clear that the public employment service, in addition to being relatively lightly used by job seekers and having a relatively low success rate, is seldom used as the sole source of recruitment by employers (Camil Associates, 1976).

Common complaints by employers about the employment services reported by Decker (1979) "were poor screening of applicants, the predominance of minorities referred, failure of referrals to keep
appointments, the length of time between placing the order and receiving referrals, and the anonymity of the job bank system" (pp. 463-464).

The same study indicated that the success rate for the employment service was 20% of all job seekers finding their job through the employment service).

A study (Mangum, 1982) funded by the Labor Department and conducted in medium sized cities concluded that the

negative comments of seekers concerning the public employment service include: standing in line too long, poor treatment, being referred to positions that have already been filled, the lack of good jobs listed, and the employment service being too employer-oriented. (p. 35)

Another possible explanation for this low evaluation is that the service is used more frequently by individuals with historically longer unemployment spells and inefficient search techniques (Felder, 1975). In short, it is the media of last resort for the hardest to place.

In summary, the main problems would seem to be that the official employment service normally has the fewest openings listed when it has the greatest flow of unemployed seeking work. "The employment service had been called upon to fulfill so many public roles that its ability to attain many goals had been hampered" (Mangum, 1982, p. 35)--hence public dissatisfaction. And also, in bad times it is preoccupied with paying out unemployment insurance coverage to those eligible. Finally, in the past 20 years it has been burdened with having to oversee training and other non-job seeking activities.
The Bureau of Labor Statistics in 1973 studied the ways in which over 10,000 workers sought for and found jobs. Friends and relatives were the second most frequently used search technique after classified ads, but only about one-fourth of those who used that method found their jobs that way. The most used source, direct application, was the most successful job finding method, with only a two to one ratio between searching and finding a job. Newspaper ads and the public employment service were third and fourth among search sources, but third and sixth, respectively, among sources through which jobs were actually found (U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1975).

Another major source, Bradshaw (1973) found that help wanted ads were one of the sources of job availability information most used yet least effective in actually finding a job. However, they are also the least expensive source of such information in terms of time as well as money invested (Johnson, 1987; Walker, 1973).

The Issue of Media Effectiveness

Throughout this review of the literature, many studies of the job search were concerned with measuring the effectiveness of various media in actually locating jobs. However, only few studies actually measured effectiveness and the probability of securing employment through alternative methods of job searching" (Mangum, 1982, p. 38).

Despite the large number of studies addressing specific aspects
of the job search process, the existing studies have not provided a consistent framework for separating out the effects of searcher characteristics on the different stages and types of the search process that ultimately determine the job-finding rate (Blau & Robins, 1990). This issue obviously demands further study.

The above mentioned studies offer generalized statements as to how various groups of job seekers seek and find work and to identify job seeker characteristics, institutional attributes, constraints, and other socioeconomic phenomena that may influence search success, such as age, sex, race, marriage, region, and education.

**Social Inequality**

According to the literature, the differential occupational distribution and employment experiences of men and women by race, age, education, and employment status affect all of these attitude and experiential questions, because the labor market is not a homogenous set of opportunities equally available to all.

In the Labor Department’s 1973 Job Finding Survey, a much larger proportion of men than women reported asking friends and relatives, and using the state employment service and unions. Women tended to rely more on newspapers and community organizations (Hilaski, 1971; Bradshaw, 1973). Men and older workers used more job search methods than women and younger workers and spent more time engaged in searching (Bradshaw, 1973). Youths tended to use fewer job search methods than did other age groups (Stephenson, 1976).
Significant differences in job search behavior occur by race. Black people are less likely to use direct application to employers or to have answered newspaper wanted ads (Bradshaw, 1973). They are more likely than whites to have approached friends and relatives, and to use the public employment service (Bradshaw, 1973; Hilaski, 1971). Black job seekers turn to formal job search methods more frequently than do whites (Hilaski, 1971; Kidder, 1967). Blacks also tend to use fewer methods than whites, and they are not linked into informal informational networks (Kidder, 1967).

Recently, it seems that the pattern of race differences in job seeking has changed somewhat (Reits, 1984), that in New York, contrary to a common misunderstanding, blacks were not highly segregated by firm or industry; on the contrary, they spread most widely of the three groups across industries, and suffered for it. Being in lower level positions, blacks did better in those few industries, such as Pullman car pottering, in which networks of recruitment and of supply fused into a near-monopoly of employment.

Hilaski and his colleagues conducted a study of rural job seekers to compare the effectiveness of various job search techniques. They found that rural residents use direct application to employer the most, followed by friends and relatives (Hilaski, 1975). Hilaski’s urban-specific study concluded that the urban population mentions use of the state employment service significantly more than the populations of other studies (Hilaski, 1975).

In terms of the issue of inequality, Granovetter and Tilly (1988) noticed that not all inequality is the intended result of bargaining processes. Some is instead created and reproduced by
behavior that rationally pursues some small-scale aim without seeing what larger effect ensues. Thus employers want new employees who are certified by current ones, believing not only that they will be competent but also that, with connections to existing employees, they will learn the ropes quickly. It follows that anti-discrimination legislation may serve not only to overcome prejudice, but more important, may force employers to recruit in ways that would not ordinarily seem efficient--to hire more unknown quantities than usual. (p. 194)

Summary

The literature reviewed suggests the following conclusions:

1. Employment status at the time of searching for job has a significant effect on job searching behavior. However, the nature of the effect is far from clear. Therefore, further research is needed to clarify this issue.

2. Informal methods used in job searching are the most favorably cited media. Using personal contacts appears to be a key to success in finding meaningful employment, especially for blue collar workers, blacks, and the unemployed. The information about jobs from informal networks is better than from formal employment services.

3. State employment services are ranked low in terms of performance and the utilization rate.

4. Present measures of the effectiveness and efficiency of various job search methods are insufficient. No conclusion can be reached as to whether or not seekers make efficient use of the methods available to them. No measure of the comparative efficiency of different job search methods has yet been devised.

5. Significant variation in job search methods used occurs by
race. Minorities are appeared to be less capable of obtaining access to effective informal information networks.

6. Differences exist in adopting searching methods for different groups in terms of age, race, gender, education and region, which suggest that job search behavior reinforces social inequality.

7. The literature on job search behavior is largely based on small, non-random samples. These studies were all limited to particular groups. Only three studies were based on national samples and all of these were limited to youth and the unemployed.

There are many contradictory conclusions on the subject of social inequality in terms of social demographic groups. These apparent contradictions or differences may occur due to different populations studied, different questions asked, different emphases of researchers, or the changing patterns of social norms as impacted by the feminist movement and the civil rights movement. In this study, we hope to resolve some of these issues by surveying the general public with hypotheses spelled out in research models in Chapter IV. In general, however, we hypothesize that disadvantaged groups will tend to choose job search media which will perpetuate their disadvantages.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Population and Sampling

Two data sets will serve as the basis for this dissertation (see the attached 1990 and 1991 instruments, Appendices B and C). Both surveys asked about the respondents' gender, age, race, occupation and employment status and experiences, and county of residence. The respondents were also asked about past job search media experiences and future media preferences. In 1991, the respondents were also asked questions about their employment expectations, and one about job discrimination.

The first was a survey done in March of 1990, with a sample size of 459, carried out by the Kercher Center at Western Michigan University. It was requested by a Michigan State government office. The questions asked in the 1990 survey focused primarily on individuals' employment/unemployment history, their interest in and plans for job training, job-seeking plans, perceived barriers to employment or training, experience with job assistance programs, and desired employment services. The purpose of this survey was to get public input on the design of new or reformed state employment and job training systems in response to the prolonged and accelerating loss of jobs in Michigan during the 1980s.

This first survey had a problem. It included the retired as
part of the general public; while they could and did respond to questions on their past experiences, they of course did not respond to future job seeking plans. Dropping the retired to focus more on current job seekers reduced the number of usable responses from 458 to 387, which in turn left too few people in a number of response categories. As a consequence, we will be basing our analysis primarily on a 1991 survey, referring to 1990 where the level of response makes this possible.

The second survey was also carried out by the Kercher Center, in March of 1991 and achieved a response of 505. It used a modification of the same instrument on the same sample of phone numbers as was used for the 1990 survey. A major goal of replicating the survey a year later was to determine the effect of the officially announced economic recession which was proclaimed in 1991 between the first and the second samples.

In March of 1990, unemployment was lower and the reality of a recession was yet to be officially recognized. However, after a decade of "prosperity" during which over 125,000 Michigan jobs had been lost, largely in the automotive industry, it is not clear that the Michigan public was in a "before a recession" mood. It could have been that the replication would have served more to strengthen the confidence we have in patterns which are repeated rather than in measuring the effect of intervening events which could have changed things in a predictable direction. As it turned out, however, unemployment did rise from 14.8% in 1990 to 15.7% in 1991 among our
sample and the self-employed, a usual alternative to unemployment, grew .5%.

The 1990 results were used as a pretest to establish more precisely measured variables and scales for the 1991 survey. The samples used both in 1990 and 1991 were drawn from a set of 2,500 randomly selected residential phone numbers throughout the state of Michigan provided by Survey Sampling Incorporated of Fairfield, Connecticut. Respondents from the 1990 sample who were identified as "permanently retired" (n = 71) were screened out of the 1991 survey to shift the focus of the study to those who could be looking for jobs, so only the non-retired were called again. More numbers were added using the same randomizing methods, and we ended up with 505 respondents for 1991. These two sets of data will be compared. The 1990 census results are used as a base line for the evaluation of the representativeness of our survey samples (Table 1).

The 1991 survey instrument repeated the employment and personal background items used in 1990, in the same order, to make it as much of a replication as possible.

Other variables were reorganized and some new variables were added, to enrich the data and to treat other topics more concisely. The new instrument was also designed with more flexibility to adapt to respondents' opinions beyond the given choices with more open-ended and multiple choices. In addition, the sponsor of this study was announced as "a independent public opinion survey of Michigan residents on the current employment situation" run by the Kercher
Center rather than the prior 1990 sponsor who was identified as "The Michigan Department of Management and Budget."

Compared to most of the previous surveys done in this area, this sample is almost unique in being a general public survey, limited only

### Table 1

Percentages of Age, Race, Gender, and Employment Status of 1990 and 1991 Data Compared to Michigan 1990 Census Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>99.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>97.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Labor Force</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to Michigan and excluding the retired and those under 18.

The sample does appear to over-represent both female and white respondents. However, the sampling approach adopted for these two surveys was simple random sampling, which involves no personal judgement in the selection process. The reason simple random samples were employed was because that the equal opportunity for an individual resident of the state being selected is more important than the subgroups in the population being selected for the purpose of these surveys. In addition, we also intended to investigate the amount of sampling error likely to occur because a sample rather than a census when gathering the data.

In terms of sample adequacy, 500 is considered as fairly enough since the number of subgroups to be studied is around average and it is a regional study. Rossi (1983) conducted a study on the topic of sample sizes, they listed some typical sample sizes in which a sample of 200-500 with average number of subgroups was considered adequate for a regional or special study, and 500-1,000 would be sufficient for a national level of study.

Data Collection

Both surveys used computer assisted telephone interviewing (CATI). CATI employs an interactive computing system to assist interviewers and their supervisors in performing the basic data-collection tasks of telephone interviews (Nicholls & Groves, 1986). Major features of CATI are on-line interviewing, on-line monitoring,
and preparation of data sets. For on-line interviewing, the system displays interviewer instructions, the survey question, and response categories on the interviewer's computer screen. Screens may contain "fills" or alterations of the display text based on prior answers or batch input from case records. Answers to closed questions may be entered by numeric or alphanumeric codes, and these codes and other numeric entries may be edited by sets of permissible values, by ranges, or by logical or arithmetic operations. Edit failures may result either in an unaccepted entry or in the display of additional probes or questions to be asked. Extended text answers may be entered for open-ended questions. Branching or skipping to the next item is automatic and may be based on logical or arithmetic tests of any prior entries or input data. Interviewers may interrupt and resume interviews in mid-course; review, back up to, and change prior entries.

Ci2, the computer assisted telephone interviewing program used to collect both the 1990 and 1991 data, is able to reproduce any interviewer's screen at a supervisor's terminal where audio monitoring may also occur. The system maintains records of on-line calls, their outcomes, response rates, and interviewer productivity make this information accessible to survey supervisors and managers in on-line or printed reports. The Ci2 outcome files are produced in a form ready for the next stage of processing. This may be post interview editing and coding, batch editing or weighting, and analysis.
Description of Variables

Questions about the respondents' socioeconomic status, employment status, job seeking experiences, job seeking expectation, attitudes towards employment services, job training, and difficulties they had in finding jobs were asked in both '90 and '91 surveys. The following is a description of these variables using 1991 variable numbers (Table 2) which will assist readers in locating the full wording of the questions in Appendices B and C.

Job Search Methods Used (V13-V23)

All the respondents who were in the labor force and had looked for a job were given a list of possible job search assistance media including friends/family, union, church, MESC (Michigan Employment Service Commission), community college placement, college/university placement, classified ads in newspapers, private employment agency, occupational newsletter, and "other." Respondents were given a chance to mention as many choices as they liked in both 1990 and 1991, and the "other" media were specified. These unanticipated others were later coded as "direct application," "via temporary employment services," "special training project," and "they came after me." During data analysis, this set of variables was further recoded into the formal, informal and semi-formal system, and will be used as one of the dependent variables.
Table 2
Variables Used in Both 1990 and 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable 1991</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Variable 1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v4</td>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>v2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v5</td>
<td>Primary Job</td>
<td>v3,v4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v6</td>
<td>Length of Primary Job</td>
<td>v5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v7</td>
<td>Full Time Job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v8</td>
<td>Have a Second Job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v9</td>
<td>Being Laid Off in Future</td>
<td>v80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v10</td>
<td>Have Been Laid Off</td>
<td>v81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v11</td>
<td>Unemployed over 3 Months before Found Another Job</td>
<td>v82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v12</td>
<td>Have You Looked for a Job</td>
<td>v32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v13-23</td>
<td>Where did you go to get assistance in finding this job?</td>
<td>v33-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v24</td>
<td>Which source was the most helpful to you?</td>
<td>v38-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v25-37</td>
<td>Where would you go to find job leads if you were looking in the future?</td>
<td>v49-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v38-44</td>
<td>What could be done to make MESC more useful for you?</td>
<td>v43-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v45</td>
<td>Do you feel a job would be hard to get if you were looking?</td>
<td>v68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v46-56</td>
<td>Which of the following would make it difficult for you to find a job?</td>
<td>v69-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v57-63</td>
<td>Could you tell us what type of discrimination you face?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v64-71</td>
<td>Which of the following services do you think might be important to you if you were looking for a job?</td>
<td>v23-31,v84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v113</td>
<td>What is your age?</td>
<td>v85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v114</td>
<td>What is the highest grade or year of school you completed?</td>
<td>v87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v115</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>v88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v116</td>
<td>What is your race or ethnicity?</td>
<td>v86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v117</td>
<td>What county do you live in?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v118</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>v91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Most Useful Method (V24)

Whatever methods an individual mentioned in "job search methods used" were restored on the screen for a follow up question of "which source of assistance was the most useful to you?" therefore the individual had a chance to designate which one was the most useful method.

Where to Find a Job in the Future (V25-V35)

This is an opinion variable about respondents' choices in future job seeking. All the respondents were asked "if you were to seek a job in next few years, where would you look to get assistance in finding a job?" The same list of job search methods was used to assess sources of information about job searching which they would use in the future. Therefore the methods which were actually used could be compared to those which would be preferred in the future.

Employment Status (V4)

Current employment status was categorized into employed for a salary/wage, self employed, unemployed for less than one year, unemployed for more than one year, student, homemaker, and never employed, according to the respondents' self-reported status. Since this study mainly focuses on job search behavior, those who were students, housewives and never been employed at the time interviewed were grouped together as one category of "out of the labor force." As a result, 61.2% of the total sample was employed, 8.9% was
selfemployed, 13.1% was unemployed, and 16.8% were out of the labor force in 1991.

**Feelings About the Recession (V2)**

Respondents were also asked their feelings about the recession which served as an attitudinal indicator. The responses ranged from "it will be long and deep" (21.4%), "it will be over in a few months to a year and mild" (43.6%), "have already bottomed out and are recovering" (18.6%), and others (16.4%).

Those who were employed at the time of the survey were asked about the following two items:

**Length of Primary Job (V6)**

"How long have you been in your current primary job?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less one year</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2.9 year</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5.9 years</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 20 years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Full Time Job (V7)**

"If your primary job is a full time job (over 30 hours per week)?" 49.1% said yes and 11.5% said no.

**Being Laid Off in Future (V9)**

When the question "Are you concerned about being laid off in the near future?" was asked to those employed, 20.7% estimated that
they might be laid off in the future.

**Unemployment Experience (V10)**

Those who were in the labor force were asked if they had been laid off in last five years, 19.7% had been laid off.

**Looked for a Job (V12)**

All the respondents who were in the labor force were asked this question, and of the total who answered, 46.3% had and 53.7% had not looked for a job.

**How to Make the MESC More Useful (V38-44)**

This was a multi-response question with an "other" option. Respondents were given a chance to select as many "mentions" as they liked but the list was not read to them. In answering "what could be done to make the MESC more useful for you?" the respondents' answers were:

- list more jobs in my field
- career counseling to determine my interests and skills
- job training
- job search techniques and resume writing
- other (specify)

**Feeling a Job is Hard to Get (V45)**

All respondents were asked "if you were looking for a job, do you feel it would be hard for you to get one?" 227 answered yes (45%) and 273 said no (54%).
Difficulties in Finding a Job (V46-56)

This is again a multiple-response question with a given list of possible difficulties and a chance to specify "other." The choices were:

- don't know what jobs are there
- don't know where to go to get job information
- no jobs in area where I live
- need different skills to fit with job openings
- wages are too low
- discrimination
- lack transportation
- need child or adult care
- don't have enough time
- other

There were so few "others" that they were not analyzed.

Discrimination and Other Obstacles to Employment (V57-V63)

Among the choices to the previous questions was discrimination. Those who responded that they were "discriminated" against during their previous job search were then given an opportunity to identify the source. Listed choices were age, race, sex, and "other." As it turned out, 74.5% of all those who claimed that they were discriminated against listed age, 10.9% race, 5.5% sex, and 9.1% "other."

Age (V113)

With all retired people and those under age of 18 screened out at the beginning of the interview, 58% of all respondents were in categories of 30 to 49. The average age was in the mid 40s.
Gender (V118)

The gender of respondents was determined by the interviewer assessment of the voice of the respondent immediately after the interview. The respondents were 34.3% male and 65.7% female.

Education (V114)

The variable "Education" was categorized in:

- some high school: 7.9%
- high school graduate: 67.3%
- college: 14.1%
- graduate: 8.5%

Marital Status (V115)

Sixty seven point one percent (67.1%) of all respondents were married, 7.9% divorced, 2.8% separated, and 21.8% never married.

Race (V116)

Among all respondents, 88.9% were white, 8.5% black and 2.6% other or refused to answer.

Occupation (V5) (V124)

A question on "what is your primary job?" was asked of those who were either employed or self-employed. Categories were defined according to the U.S. Census classification and consistent with the occupational coding used in the 1990 survey. The answers were also reclassified into six "industrial" categories according to their current growth status. See definitions on page 80.
Residence (V117)

Residence was identified by asking the respondents what county they were in. All 81 counties in Michigan were subsequently categorized into 11 metropolitan areas or as non-metropolitan. The metropolitan areas are:

- Detroit
- Grand Rapids
- Bay City-Saginaw-Midland
- Flint
- Lansing
- Ann Arbor
- Kalamazoo
- Benton Harbor
- Battle Creek
- Jackson
- Muskegon
CHAPTER IV

THEORETICAL MODELS

Theoretical Perspectives

Sociologists have devoted a great deal of attention to "economic" behavior. However, searching for jobs does not appear to have been a topic of much interest. None of the textbooks in Industrial Sociology or the Sociology of Work or the Sociology of Occupations have been found with even an index reference to job searching. (Career Choice, occupational prestige ranking and other topics are very common but not the practical problem of finding a job.) This is an area that obviously needs more attention from sociologists.

We are thus left with a disciplinary dilemma--our specific type of behavior has rarely been studied by sociologists. The few that did look at it (Granovetter & Tilly, 1988; Wegener, 1991) used an early non-mathematical network model which specified a few types of media but did not go on to integrate these findings with general sociological theory.

Mangum (1982), in a major review of the literature on job searching, found that

the theoretical research literature (in Economics) has relatively little to offer as a guide to teaching job search skills. Much of the research has been formulated as a test of the predictiveness of the neo-classical assumptions about the extent of job search, not about the techniques used. (p. 4).

Neo-classical labor market models assume perfect knowledge on
the part of all participants in the market whereas "the real world is one characterized by uncertainty and imperfect information" (Mangum, 1982).

However, Sociology and Economics are rich with ideas on the reinforcing advantages or vicious circle disadvantages of class status. This survey gathered information on race, age, education, employment status, and gender and a question specifically dealing with job discrimination. Therefore, we are able to link theories of social inequality to the job search process.

Social Inequality

Our primary directing hypothesis is that social inequality is reinforced during the job search process. As Granovetter and Tilly (1988) noted, "since personal relations are typically homogeneous by class, ethnicity, and region, this mode of allocation can efficiently reproduce existing inequalities." Schiller (1975) compared and contrasted the search patterns as recorded in the Census Bureau's 1973 Job Finding Survey with the search patterns of WIN participants and pointed out that "the least skilled have the greatest difficulty finding employment, even when they use the same search media as the better skilled" (p. 211).

Market Segmentation

Inequality has given rise to recent theorizing about "split" or "segmented" labor markets. According to segmented labor market
theory (Dickens & Lang, 1988), the labor market is divided into two sectors: a primary sector with good working conditions, stable employment, and substantial returns for human capital variables such as education and experience, and a secondary sector with the opposite characteristics (1988). In primary sectors of the labor market, employers and workers develop compacts that provide employers with a stable, reliable labor force and the workers with superior remuneration and job security; in the other sector, competition, conflict, exploitation, and instability rule the day (Granovetter & Tilly, 1988, p. 194).

Sociologist Edna Bonacich (1976) defines a split labor market as one in which there is a large differential in the price of labor between two or more groups of workers, holding constant their efficiency and productivity. The split occurs between the privileged and the less privileged and is shaped by the conditions of the initial contact between the incoming group and the labor market. Minority groups, such as blacks and women, found themselves more or less permanently placed into the secondary economic sector, or stuck in entry-level positions in the primary sector.

Levitan, Mangum and Marshall (1976) could not agree to divide labor markets into two such simple aggregate categories as primary and secondary. "There are many labor markets, but several broad classifications might be described as ideal types for purposes of illustration." So, they described four broad labor markets:

The first was the professional labor market, which comprises
the various professions and is characterized by no tangible product and usually a high income elasticity of demand. The second was the mainstream labor market, which is characterized by extensive political and economic power, control of markets through product diversification and differentiation, considerable integration of production processes, the power to distribute products throughout a wide market, and ready or preferential access to credit and financial resources. In these few firms that account for large shares of total sales, the workers usually require extensive training, are well unionized, have considerable upgrading opportunities within the internal labor markets, and receive high wages. The third was the marginal labor market. Firms in this labor market lack most of the advantages of those in the mainstream, are highly competitive and, have low profit margins. And finally the submarginal labor market. Jobs in this labor market usually are characterized by very low entry requirements, low wages, high rates of turnover, informal work patterns.

Mangum (1982) ends his review of job search theoretical models in economics by "regretting the absence of psychological and sociological perspectives" (p. 14). Only a few economists have explored what most sociologists would expect to be a crucial variable--nonpecuniary goals in the job search.

Networking

Networking theory started with a strong base in social
psychology and in anthropological field research. However, it de­
developed within sociology in the direction of formal mathematical model
building with most empirical research focussed on elite and profes­
sional informal networks. Granovetter, a sociologist, and one of the
very few scholars to apply network theory to the job search, re­
gretted not only the lack of empirical research but the lack of even
an integrating theoretical basis for the heavily mathematical models
presented at networking conferences (1979).

Granovetter and Tilly (1988) concluded that

the distinction between networks of recruitment and of
supply matters for two important reasons. First, supply
networks differ greatly in composition by age, gender, race,
national origin, and citizenship; which supply networks
articulate most directly with which recruitment networks
therefore strongly affects the recruitment of workers to
firms. Second, once established and producing satisfactory
results for those who control the recruitment network, a
given articulation of recruitment and supply networks tends
to reproduce itself. (p. 191)

Within the arena of employment categories, then, we see
multiple actors embedded in their own social networks,
disposing unequally of resources, and bargaining over the
creation and ranking of positions with respect to labor
processes, over the sorting of individuals and groups into
those positions, and over discrimination among individuals
within those position. Similar processes govern allocation
within the other two arenas: job and labor markets. (p.
189)

A final limitation of network analysis is that, by definition,
it is concerned primarily with only one of the job search media con­
tventionally measured by scholars in this field, namely "informal con­
tacts." We are concerned not with dissecting the internal structure
of informal networks, but rather, viewing them in the context of the
full set of more formal or official media such as classified ads,
state employment agencies, job training programs, and direct application. Therefore, for our purposes, network analysis has limited relevance.

Modernization

Another theoretical perspective involves the question of where the labor market fits into the process of modernization from gemeinschaft to gesellschaft societies. Sociologists such as Max Weber, seemed to view modernization as an endless process of rationalizing all aspects of life. Today non-labor markets are most likely to confront this pressure with computer technology and software, practically replacing moment to moment decisions in such areas as programmed trading in stock markets. Hopefully this dissertation will add some clarification in defining the type of people who prefer "old fashioned" personal contacts to the formal job search institutions which in principle seem so much more "modern." The formal job search media appear to better fit both equal opportunity and classical economic models. The obstacles seem to be the type of information both workers and employers seek, which is not available in the formal system; and the fact that there are many labor markets--there are markets internal to organizations and external as well as segregated by skill level, industry.

In summary, job search behavior is a rather dynamic and complicated social phenomenon. With rapid changes in both macro and micro social and economic situations, individual behavior is, to some
extent, affected by the changes in the broader environment.

The Impact of the Recession on Job Search Behavior

As was mentioned in the review of literature, none of the major studies cited discussed the state of the contemporary labor market or business cycle. There was thus lacking an historical discussion of whether things were "normal" or how the job search efforts studied were affected by the state of the economy when these surveys were conducted. Fortunately, the two Kercher Center surveys were done before the official announcement of the last recession and right at the time when it was about to bottom out. This timing gives us a good chance to study how the recession and previous job search experiences have influenced people's future employment expectations and other related perspectives.

The research model below is designed to test how the employment experiences and various social demographic factors would affect the choice of job search media based on the previous research results reviewed.

General Assumptions

1. Social and economic status affect people's choices of job search media.

2. Previous job search experiences have an impact on the future job search decision making.
Operational Hypotheses

1. Those disadvantaged tended to choose media which the literature has viewed as less effective.
2. People who have been unemployed for a longer period of time tend to use less effective methods.
3. The currently employed have a better chance to use more effective methods.
4. The number of methods used would affect the employment outcome (those who have used more methods are more likely to be currently employed).

Formal and Informal Job Search Media

In most job search studies, job search media have been categorized into formal and informal. Although there are different ways to categorize media, most researchers preferred to have the state employment services (in Michigan the MESC) at the formal extreme, and friends and family or word of mouth at the other end.

None of these studies, however, was concerned with theory per se or even clarifying their basic terminology. It was evidently assumed that the dimension of formality needed no definition or discussion even though there were variations in the categorization of such media as "direct approach," "classified ads" and others.

In this dissertation, "formal" refers to an organization (MESC) or practice (job listings in occupational newsletters) whose explicit purpose is to facilitate job searching. "Informal" refers to those
institutions, groups, and networks, which have been set up or evolved to serve primarily non-job related functions, but which can be used for this purpose.

This leaves open the issue of whether we have a simple dichotomy or a ranked trichotomy with a semi-formal type. Below I explore the utility of this intermediate category.

In the research cited above, the alleged effectiveness and utilization rate of informal media were commonly highlighted. However, we found in our data that there are other, new employment services available to the public, and these services do not fit into the simple dichotomous system used by previous studies. For example, in our surveys, there were more alternative job search methods listed (12 plus "other") by our respondents than in any other survey. Therefore, with the information available, we added an intermediate category - semi-formal based on the primary goals of the organizations which offer those services. Hence, we coded the 12 job search methods into a three-category system, namely formal, semi-formal, and informal. Here is how the responses to the past and future job search media were coded (See V13-V22 and V25-V33 in the 1991 survey in Appendix B for the full wording).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal</th>
<th>MESC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>private agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>temp employment services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>special training programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>direct application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-formal</th>
<th>Unions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community college placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>college/university placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>professional news letters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Informal friends & family
classified ads
they came after me

1990 data were coded with the same system except that we did not have an open-ended option. Hence "direct application," and "they came after me" were not included as available methods.

With these newly created variables, the following hypotheses will be tested.

**General Assumptions**

1. Informal media are seen as more useful in terms of help finding jobs, while formal media are seen as less useful.
2. Social and economic status affect people's choices among formal, semi-formal, and informal media.
3. Previous job search experiences have an impact on future job search decision making.

**Operational Hypotheses**

1. The disadvantaged workers (less educated, older, black, and unemployed, etc.) are more likely to use formal methods;
2. Socioeconomic variables, such as age, gender, race, education, occupation, industry, residence, affect the choice of media for job searching;
3. People with previous job search experiences make better choices in their future search methods in terms of the literature. Therefore, the more advantaged workers would use more informal
methods, stay in better jobs, and develop better informal methods for future use;

4. Those who are currently employed but think they could be laid off in the future prefer informal methods more than others.

5. Informal methods work better for those who have used them before. Therefore, they would chose to use them again when they need them.

6. Informal methods are viewed as more effective than formal and semi-formal methods.

Michigan Employment Service Commission and Other Media

Most of the literature concluded that the public employment service, in addition to being relatively lightly used by job seekers, also had a relatively low success rate (Camil Associates, 1976). The success rate for the employment service was 20% (Walker, 1973).

In summary, the main problems regarding official employment services mentioned in the literature are such items as their low utilization rate, the lack of good jobs listed or listing positions that have already been filled, long waiting lines, and a poor service manner.

General Assumptions

1. The MESC job listing function is seen as less effective than other job search media.

2. Socioeconomically disadvantaged people are more likely to
use the MESC job service than the advantaged.

Operational Hypotheses

1. The MESC branch offices in more highly industrialized areas (industrial eastern section) are more preferred than in rural areas during the recession controlling for availability.

2. The MESC is utilized more by the less skilled than by professionals.

3. People who have used the MESC would tend to avoid using it in future job searching.

4. The disadvantaged (blacks, elders, the unemployed, women, the lower skilled, city dwellers and those in declining industries) tend to rely much more heavily on the MESC than do others.

5. The utilization rate of the MESC is lower than other media.

6. The continued use rate of the MESC is lower than other media.

Social Inequality

Social inequality is the most important issue in studying the job search process, therefore it involves in all rest of the aspects of this chapter. In working out the labor market consequences of social inequality, we expect to find a segmented labor market in which varying groups of job seekers look to separate media. Professionals rarely would look to the MESC and unskilled workers would not have access to colleges or "occupational newsletters."
Perceived Job Search Effectiveness

A number of job search researchers discussed the issue of the measurement of the effectiveness of various media. However, it seems that they have not reached a consensus on definition and measurement of the effectiveness yet. The data used in this study provide a chance to test reported media effectiveness with a generalizable list of the most effective media, which consists of the following two dimensions: 1. Efficiency defined by our question as "the most useful" out of what had been used; 2. Preference--would use in the future vs used in the past. In the 1990 survey, those who looked for jobs were asked "where did you find job leads" and then "which were most helpful?" followed by "where would you seek job leads in the future?" In 1991, those who found a job in the past 5 years were asked "where did you look to get assistance in finding this job?" followed by "for those just mentioned which source of assistance was the most useful to you." Then, everyone was asked "if you were to seek a job in the next few years, where would you look to get assistance in finding a job?"

These very similar approaches would seem to give us a measure of media effectiveness--not just media preference. Therefore we can look at the tendency of various groups in our sample to use media perceived as more or less effective based on this norm. Our hypotheses will test if the more advantaged workers (based on gender, education, etc.) would use the methods that have been evaluated as more effective.
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On the other hand, neither our data nor most of the economic studies had an objective measure of what actually was decisive in helping workers find jobs. It is quite possible that job seekers misperceive the basis for their successful job searches. Nevertheless, since our approach parallels that of the existing literature in relying largely on workers' self evaluations of media efficiency, we can at least use existing findings as a basis for hypotheses on the choice of methods perceived to be more or less effective. However, this study is clearly dealing with perceptions and not an objective analysis of behavioral outcomes.

Hypotheses

1. "Friends and family" media is more useful in help finding jobs than other media.
2. Informal media is more useful than formal.
3. More advantaged workers would use more useful media.

Summary of Hypotheses

Based on the hypotheses made in the subareas in the above section, followings will be tested and analysed in the remaining chapters as guidelines.

I. The disadvantaged workers tended to choose job search media which the literature had reviewed as less effective.

II. Informal media are viewed as more useful in terms of help finding jobs, while formal media are seen as less useful.
IV. The MESC is less effective than other job search media.

V. More elders, the unemployed, black, and less skilled workers used the MESC than other groups did.

VI. The continued use rate of the MESC is lower than that of other media.

VII. The utilization rate of the MESC is lower than that of other media.

VIII. Friends and family as media are seen as more useful than other media.

Analytical Methodology

This analysis used both 1990 and 1991 data and multivariate statistical techniques to examine the various theoretical assumptions about the job search behavior. The basic consideration involved in analyzing the two data sets described above were; the research design, scale of measurement, and the assumptions underlying the data.

In terms of levels of measurement, in general, chi-square, discriminant analysis, and loglinear analysis were employed for the nominal and ordinal data, while multiple regressions were used for interval or ratio level data analyses.

The dependence and interdependence of variables was also considered as a basis for selecting the analytical method. In interdependence we are concerned with the relationship of a set of variables among themselves, no one being selected as special in the sense of the dependent variable (Kendall, 1968). In our case, factor
factor analysis was used for this purpose at the beginning of the process.

Comparison of '90 and '91 data picked up possible differences in attitude change toward using different job search techniques due to the impact of the recession. An assessment of the perceived causes of the respondents' success or failure in looking for jobs was a major focus. The respondents who were dissatisfied with various employment services were compared to those satisfied in terms of their socio-economic status. The demographic differences among the respondents with regard to their past search methods choices as well their preferences in future searching, were analyzed and compared. The job search methods were evaluated by the respondents in terms of their choices of the services, satisfaction with the services, and the perceived utility of these services.

As an initial step in data analysis, factor analysis was used to explore differences in job search patterns between 1990 and 1991. Two parallel analyses were run separately in order to address the issues of whether these variables have something in common, whether they reflect some underlying, unobserved constructs. The results of these factor analysis showed very similar patterns of correlations among observed variables of job search activity, attitudes toward employment services, future job search preferences, and socio-economic status. Therefore, the details of the findings will not be discussed in the text.

Chi-square analysis was used to test the relationships in the
hypotheses mentioned above and to compare '90 and '91 employment status, job search methods, and job search methods likely to be used in the future.

Loglinear analysis will be used to measure the strength of the interactions among those categorical variables and other variables that were recoded into a smaller number of subgroups for the purpose of better identifying job search patterns (e.g., variables of employment status, industry, job search methods used before and would use in the future).

Discriminant function analysis will be performed to predict the future job search methods likely to be used among the respondents with different employment experiences and socioeconomic status. This method was used also because the dependent variable of future job search method would use was recoded into three categories (e.g., formal, semi-formal, and informal).

Multiple regression analysis will be used to investigate the relationship between "length in primary job" and socioeconomic status.

There are eight multiple-response questions in the 1991 questionnaire and also eight in the 1990 instrument. Each multiple-response question consist of several choices, which were previously named as 1st mention, 2nd mention, etc. In interviewing, the respondents were asked to choose all the answers that applied in the lists. Those mentions that were chosen were recorded. Using the SPSS MULT RESPONSE procedure, the data on multi-responses were
combined into groups, and the combined frequencies with percentages were calculated and cross-tabulated with other variables for analyses. On the other hand, individual mentions can also be used as individual variables.
CHAPTER V

FINDINGS

The Impact of the 1990-91 Recession on Job Search Media Choices

One of the major indicators of an economic recession is the unemployment rate. According to MESC statistics, the unemployment rate for the State of Michigan was 11.0% in March 1991, whereas it was 7.6% in March 1990 (Table 3).

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>MESC</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 1991</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1990</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In our surveys, it was 15.7% in 1991 and 14.8% in 1990. The differences revealed an official methodological difference in the State Labor Statistics. Basically the "discouraged" unemployed (have not looked for a job in the past month) were removed from the official unemployed category in 1967.

All the multiple responses to "difficulties in finding a job" were tabulated (Table 4), from which we can get a general picture of what the major problems were, which people complained about in
finding a job. "Wages too low" was ranked #1 in 1991 but #3 in 1990. And "Need a different skills" was #1 in 1990 and #2 in 1991. This is a good measure of the effect of the recession.

Table 4
Frequencies for Multiple-Response Question on Difficulties in Finding a Job: 1990 and 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990 Count</th>
<th>Pct of Resp</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>1991 Count</th>
<th>Pct of Resp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wages too Low</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need Different Skills</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Job Available</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Know What Jobs</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Know How to Find Job</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Child Care</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Transportation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Time</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the 1991 survey we asked a question specifically about the recession, "how do you feel about this recession?" whereas in 1990 we did not. We intend to measure the impact of the recession in terms of the public's image of the possibility of getting a job in the future as measured by the "feeling that a job would be hard to get"
A multiple regression test was performed with 1991 data to determine what score of perceived job security "might be laid off in the future" would be predicted with various job search and socioeconomic variables, such as "have been laid off in past 5 years," "have looked for jobs in the past 5 years," "feel a job would hard to get," industry, age, and education, marital status, race, residence, and gender. SPSS regression analysis showed that only unemployment experience, "feeling a job is hard to get," and race were significant.

Therefore, the regression model was adjusted to gain a better fit by including only the three significant independent variables, and using stepwise regression for both 1991 and 1990 data. The first test of 1991 had 298 cases available in the analysis. The sequence of selection of the variables is have been laid off in the past, feeling a job would be hard to get, and race with overall multiple R = .348. The regression model was significantly different from zero, F(3,294) = 13.46, (a = .0000). Table 5 displays the correlations among the variables, the unstandardized regression coefficients (B) and intercept, the standardized Beta weights (Beta), and R-square.

With the stepwise regression, "laid off before," "feeling a job is hard to get," and race contributed significantly to the prediction of job security. The three independent variables together contributed 12.1% of the job security in future. Therefore, we have:
Y' = 1.354 + .24(laid off before) + .13(hard to get) - .19(race).

The same analytical criteria were used with the same variables in 1990 data (Table 6). The sequence of selection of the variables was race, "laid off before," and "feeling a job would be hard to get" with overall multiple R = .230. R for regression was significantly different from zero, F(3,426) = 10.02, (a = .0000).

Table 5
Correlations and Regression Beta Weights On Job Security and Three Predictors: 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Job</th>
<th>L. B.</th>
<th>Hard</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Sig T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laid off before</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Hard</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.0040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.191</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>.0137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.354</td>
<td></td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job</th>
<th>L. B.</th>
<th>Hard</th>
<th>Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laid off before</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = .348**
R² = .121

Residual: 294
D.F.: 3
Std. Error: .38

**a = .0000
Note: race: white = 1, black = 2
laid off before yes = 1, no = 2
job hard yes = 1, no = 2

With stepwise regression, race was first selected and then having been laid off before, feeling a job would be hard to get, and race. The
three independent variables together contributed 5.3% of the job security in future (Table 6). The equation:

\[ Y' = 1.777 - .16(\text{race}) + .11(\text{laid off before}) + .06(\text{hard to get}) \]

If we compare the above two equations we can find that these three variables contributed only 6.6% to "thinking you might be laid off in the near future" in 1990, but 12.1% in 1991. Past unemployment experience affected future job security more in 1991 than it had in 1990. Though the absolute amount of variance is low, the difference from a year earlier during which the recession had bottomed out, was statistically significant and meaningful.

Table 6
Correlations and Regression Beta Weights On Job Security and Three Predictors: 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Job</th>
<th>L. B.</th>
<th>Hard</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Sig T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laid off before</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.0022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job is Hard to get</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.0085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.160</td>
<td>-.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.777</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.90</th>
<th>1.85</th>
<th>1.62</th>
<th>1.08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Standard deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>.30</th>
<th>.34</th>
<th>.49</th>
<th>.27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

\( R = .230^{**} \)
\( R^2 = .053 \)
Residual: 425
D.F.: 3
Std. Error: .29

\(^{**a} a = .0000 \)
The metric slopes for the independent variables indicated that the predicted job security (Y) was higher (more secure) in 1990 (1.78) than in 1991 (1.35) when independent variables were held constant. The Beta weight values, as standardized slopes, allow us to compare the effects of the individual independent variables on job security prediction. Unemployment experience had a greater effect (.232) on job security in 1991 than in 1990 (.126). "Feeling a job is hard to get" affected the image of current job security more in 1991 than in 1990, (given the employment environment at the time). In both years, race was negatively related to job security, which means that blacks felt more insecure than non-blacks even before the recession. However, the magnitude of effects remained relatively constant.

In conclusion, unemployment experience played a more important role in predicting job security in 1991 than in 1990. For an example, a black person who had been laid off before and felt a job would be hard to get would be more likely to feel he/she might be laid off in the near future.

Formal and Informal Job Search Media

Via Loglinear Analysis

A three-way frequency analysis was performed to develop a log-linear model of relationship of formal/informal job search networks used before and the dichotomous variables of whether or not the respondents have been laid off before, and feel would be laid off in
the near future.

One hundred and twenty nine (129) weighted cases were used in the analysis. All two-way contingency tables provided expected frequencies in excess of 3 stepwise selection by simple deletion of effects using SPSS produced a model that included all first-order effects. The Likelihood ratio Chi$^2$ (1) = 3.69, $p = .05$, and Pearson Chi$^2$(1) = 6.16, $p = .01$ indicating a good fit between observed frequencies and expected frequencies generated by the model. A summary of the model with results of tests of significance and loglinear parameter estimates in raw and standardized form is shown in Table 7.

The perceived job security were compared and cross examined with two groups who had or had not been laid off before and the formal and informal networks used. In the group of people who had used an informal network to find jobs and who had not been laid off before, 9.3% felt that they would be laid off in the future, while 28.7% did not feel they would be laid off in the future. For their counterparts in the group of those who used formal job search methods and who had not been laid off before, there were only 4.7% who expected that they would be laid off in the future and 23.3% did not.

It seems that formal job search methods give people better information about more jobs, which confirms findings discussed in Chapter VI. The same analyses will be carried out on this issue (Tables 9 & 10) with 1990 data.

Looking at the entire model, the highest adjusted residual value was found in the group of the employed and those who thought
Table 7

Expected Frequencies and Residuals in Loglinear Analysis of Job Search Media Used, Laid Off Before, and Might be Laid Off In the Future: 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Observed Frequencies</th>
<th>Expected Frequencies</th>
<th>Residual Standard Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laid off B.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laid off F.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>-.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>-.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>36.15</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media used</td>
<td>Semi-Formal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laid off B.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laid off F.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>-.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>-.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media used</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laid off B.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laid off F.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>-.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>-.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>29.15</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goodness-of-fit test statistics
Pearson Chi Square = 6.1564  DF = 1  P = .013

Note: media used: informal = 1, semi-formal = 2, formal = 3
laid off before: yes = 1, no = 2
laid off in the future: yes = 1, no = 2
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Table 8

Parameter Estimates of Effects of Loglinear Analysis Job Search Media Used On Attitudes on Might be Laid Off In the Future: 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Parameter Estimate</th>
<th>Std. Error /SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td>.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-Formal</td>
<td>-1.381</td>
<td>.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laid Off Before</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-.661</td>
<td>.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laid Off in Future</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-.614</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media by Laid Off Before</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-F</td>
<td>-.379</td>
<td>.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media by Laid Off in Future</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-F</td>
<td>-.332</td>
<td>.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media by Laid Off Before by Laid Off in Future</td>
<td>Informal Yes Yes</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal Yes No</td>
<td>-.251</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal No Yes</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal No No</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-F Yes Yes</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-F Yes No</td>
<td>-.154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-F No Yes</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-F No No</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal Yes Yes</td>
<td>-.154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal Yes No</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal No Yes</td>
<td>-.251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal No No</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 9**

Expected Frequencies and Residuals of Loglinear Analysis of Job Search Media Used, Laid Off Before, and Might be Laid Off In the Future: 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Observed Frequencies</th>
<th>Expected Frequencies</th>
<th>Residual</th>
<th>Standard Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laid Off Before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laid Off Future</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>-4.205</td>
<td>-1.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>7.398</td>
<td>8.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laid Off Future</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>10.87</td>
<td>-.871</td>
<td>-1.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>6.961</td>
<td>11.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laid Off Before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laid Off Future</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>-3.347</td>
<td>-4.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td>-3.389</td>
<td>-5.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laid Off Future</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10.87</td>
<td>-2.994</td>
<td>-3.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>1.820</td>
<td>2.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laid Off Before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laid Off Future</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>-2.356</td>
<td>-3.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>17.78</td>
<td>-2.320</td>
<td>2.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laid Off Future</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>11.38</td>
<td>-1.890</td>
<td>-2.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>4.260</td>
<td>5.050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goodness-of-fit test statistics

- Likelihood Ratio Chi Square = 165.102, DF = 7, P = .000
- Pearson Chi Square = 176.777, DF = 7, P = .000

Note: media used: informal = 1, semi-formal = 2, formal = 3
laid off before: yes = 1, no = 2
laid off in the future: yes = 1, no = 2
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Table 10


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect Level</th>
<th>Parameter Estimate</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Std. Error Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media used by laid off before by laid off in the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Yes Yes</td>
<td>.46400</td>
<td>.1202</td>
<td>3.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Yes No</td>
<td>-.21044</td>
<td>.1198</td>
<td>-1.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal No Yes</td>
<td>.35356</td>
<td>.1198</td>
<td>3.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal No No</td>
<td>.46400</td>
<td>.1198</td>
<td>3.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-F Yes Yes</td>
<td>.21044</td>
<td>.1198</td>
<td>1.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-F Yes No</td>
<td>.35356</td>
<td>.1198</td>
<td>3.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-F No Yes</td>
<td>.21044</td>
<td>.1198</td>
<td>1.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-F No No</td>
<td>.46400</td>
<td>.1198</td>
<td>3.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Yes Yes</td>
<td>.35356</td>
<td>.1198</td>
<td>3.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Yes No</td>
<td>.46400</td>
<td>.1198</td>
<td>3.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal No Yes</td>
<td>.21044</td>
<td>.1198</td>
<td>1.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal No No</td>
<td>.35356</td>
<td>.1198</td>
<td>3.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: media used: informal = 1, semi-formal = 2, formal = 3
laid off before: yes = 1, no = 2
laid off in the future: yes = 1, no = 2

"a job would be hard to get." The residual between observed frequencies was also positive, which means those who held jobs at the time were not confident about getting a job if they looked.
Via Discriminant Function Analysis

Discriminant analysis was used instead of regression because the dependent variable, which "future job search methods would you use" is categorical. With discriminant techniques, the formal, semi-formal, and informal methods which would be used, can be compared therefore we can determine whether the respondent choices differ from one another and understand the nature of these differences. Discriminant analysis results present the total effect of the independent variables in combination simultaneously. Further, it shows which of the variables was more important or had the greater impact on the job search method selection.

A direct discriminant function analysis was performed to statistically distinguish among the respondents with different employment experiences and socioeconomic status to predict the future job search methods they would use. Seven opinion and demographic variables were used to predict membership in three categories of the future job searching: informal, semi-formal, and formal. Predictors were full time job, have been laid off in past 5 years, might be laid off in future, age, education, race, and gender (Table 12).

Of the original 505 cases, 382 were dropped from analysis because of missing data, of which 180 had missing or out-of-range group codes, 85 had at least one missing discriminating variable, and 117 had both. One hundred and twenty three (123) cases were used in the analysis. Evaluation of assumptions of linearity, normality, multicollinearity, and homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices
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Table 11

Expected Frequencies and Residuals of Employment Status and Feeling a Job Would be Hard to Get In
Loglinear Analysis: 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Interact</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Residual</th>
<th>Adjusted Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>125 (30.12)</td>
<td>32.58 (7.85)</td>
<td>92.42</td>
<td>20.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>179 (43.13)</td>
<td>77.08 (18.57)</td>
<td>101.92</td>
<td>18.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Self-Employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18 (4.34)</td>
<td>50.37 (12.14)</td>
<td>-32.37</td>
<td>-6.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>27 (6.51)</td>
<td>49.87 (12.02)</td>
<td>-22.87</td>
<td>-4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Unemployed &lt; 1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28 (6.75)</td>
<td>60.21 (14.51)</td>
<td>-32.21</td>
<td>-6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>19 (4.58)</td>
<td>41.71 (10.05)</td>
<td>-22.71</td>
<td>-4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Unemployed &gt; 1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17 (4.10)</td>
<td>63.84 (15.38)</td>
<td>-46.84</td>
<td>-8.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2 (0.48)</td>
<td>39.34 (9.48)</td>
<td>-37.34</td>
<td>-7.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Converge Criterion = .00001 revealed no threat to multivariate analysis.

On the basis of all 7 predictors (Table 19), there was reliable association between groups and predictors, \(X^2(14) = 36.9\), \(P < .01\).

Two discriminant functions were calculated, after removal of the first function, the association between groups and predictors, \(X^2(6) = 11.4\), \(P < .1\). The two discriminant functions accounted for 70% and 30%, respectively, of the between-group variability in discriminating among groups. As shown in Figure 1, the first discriminant function
Table 12


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Networks</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Gender Laid off in Future</th>
<th>Laid off Full Time Before Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-formal</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

separates semi-formal job search methods from the other two groups.
The second discriminant function separates informal media from the formal and semi-formal.

The loading matrix of correlations between predictors and discriminant functions, as seen in Table 13, suggested that the best predictors for distinguishing between semi-formal and the other two groups (first function) are age and education. The primary predictor (loadings of .50 and above for the first discriminant function (separation of semi-formal and the others) is age. More older people tend to use formal (mean = 4.52) and informal (mean = 4.19) than semi-formal (mean = 3.63). Blacks use more formal (mean = 1.36) than semi-formal (mean = 1.22) and informal (mean = 1.27). Higher educated people tend to be more favorable to using semi-formal (mean = 3.88) than informal (mean = 3.45), and formal (mean = 3.35) media.

The primary predictors on the second discriminant function (separation of informal from other two groups) are gender and whether
one had past unemployment experience. Females have more favorable attitudes towards using informal networks (mean = 1.72) than using semi-formal (mean = 1.65) and formal (mean = 1.58). Those who are not afraid of being laid off in the future are more likely to use semi-formal (mean = 1.03) and formal (mean = 1.05) than those who are (mean = 1.19) in their future job search. Those who have not been laid off before also tend to use semi-formal (mean = .98) and formal (mean = 1.03) than informal (mean = 1.21). Those who have a full time job would tend to use formal (mean = .72) and semi-formal (mean = .75) than informal (mean = .82) (Table 12).

1990 data was also used for a direct discriminant function analysis. The same attitudinal and demographic variables were used as predictors on membership in three categories of future job
Table 13

Results of Discriminant Function Analysis of Job Search Media
Would Use in the Future: 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor variables</th>
<th>Pooled within-group correlations of predictor variables with discriminant variable function</th>
<th>Pooled within-group correlations among univariate predictors</th>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>F(2,296)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would Before Age Edu Race Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full -.052 -.291*</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.F. .011 .402*</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.B. .050 .533*</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age .666* -.056</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edu -.481* -.162</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race .106* -.084</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex -.159 .626*</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canonical R
.289

Eigenvalue
.195

.091
.040

(mean = .75) than informal (mean = .82) (Table 12).

searching except that the variable of "full time job" was not available in 1990. Predictors were past unemployment experience, image of future job security, age, education, race, and gender. Of the original 458 cases, 143 were dropped from analysis because of missing data, so 315 cases were used in the analysis. Evaluation of assumptions of linearity, normality, multicollinearity, and homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices revealed no threat to multivariate analysis.

On the basis of all 6 predictors, there was reliable
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Table 14

Results of Discriminant Function Analysis of Job Search Media
You Would Use in the Future: 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor variables</th>
<th>Correlations of</th>
<th>Predictor with discriminant</th>
<th>Univariate</th>
<th>Pooled within-Group</th>
<th>Predictors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>variable</td>
<td>Predictor</td>
<td>function</td>
<td>F(2,315)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>.604*</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.B</td>
<td>.494*</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td>-.393*</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.F</td>
<td>.263*</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>.044*</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>-.394</td>
<td>.553*</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARI</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.250*</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canonical R .240 .160

Eigenvalue .061 .026

association between groups and predictors, \( \chi^2(14) = 26.41, P = .02 \).

Two discriminant functions were calculated, after removal of the first function, the second function is not significant (\( P > .1 \)), therefore the second function will not be used in this analysis. The discriminant function separates semi-formal job search methods from the other two groups.

The loading matrix of correlations between predictors and discriminant functions, as seen in Table 14, suggested that the best predictors for distinguishing between semi-formal and the other two groups are education and "been laid off in the past." The primary predictor (loadings of .50 and above) is education. Semi-formal job
search methods are more likely to be used by higher educated people.
Older people use more formal (mean = 4.99) than informal (mean = 4.48)
and semi-formal (mean = 4.72). Black people are much more likely to
use formal (mean = 1.42) than informal (mean = 1.18) and semi-formal
(mean = 1.19). Gender did not make much difference here.

First discriminant function

Figure 2. Plots of Three Group Centroids on Two Discriminant
Functions Derived From Seven Identifier Variables: 1990

Those who had been laid off before tended to use more formal methods
(mean = 1.76) than semi-formal (mean = 1.89) and informal (mean =
1.86). Those who are afraid of being laid off in future are likely
to use formal (mean = 1.86) than informal (mean = 1.89) and semi-
formal (mean = 1.93) in their future job search (Table 15). Even
though going more formal is not likely to help them.

In conclusion, the subgroup most favorable to formal media in
1991 were older and black, and most favorable to semi-formal were
Table 15

Group Means in Predicting Job Search Media You Would Use in the Future in Discriminant Function Analysis: 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Networks</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Educ.</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Laid off in Future</th>
<th>Laid off Before</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-formal</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

highly educated for both years. What is not consistent was that the informal media were most favored by females and those who had not been laid off in the past in 1991. Overall, females may not be in a predominantly disadvantaged situation in today's labor market compared to men.

Perceived Job Search Effectiveness

In the last section, we tested job search effectiveness in terms of formal and informal media. In the following tests, we are going to analyze the effectiveness of individual job search media.

In both the 1991 and 1990 surveys, in asking people what types of job search methods they used to find their last jobs (V13-23) and what methods they would prefer to use for "the future job search if looking" (V25-37), we have 199 respondents answered both questions in 1991 and 128 in 1990. Both of these questions permitted respondents to list more than one method to find jobs (multiple-response). There
were eight (8) multiple-response questions in both the 1990 and 1991 questionnaire. The difference is that the "other" option was only available in 1991. Each multiple-response question consisted of several choices, which were not read to the respondents. In interviewing, the respondents were asked to name all the job search methods they had used. In this way each mention can be treated as a separate variable while still keeping the order of their selection. Using SPSS MULT RESPONSE procedure, the data on multi-response frequencies were combined with calculated percentages.

Comparing the combined frequencies of "where did you find job leads" in 1991 and 1990 (Table 16), classified ads was rated #1 in 1991 and #2 in 1990. The order was just the other way around in 1990--friends and family was #2 in 1991 and #1. Direct application was #3 in 1991, and was not available in 1990. The MESC was in the third position in both 1990 and 1991. Private employment agencies were also fourth in 1990 and remained about the same in 1991. The rest of the methods were all below a 5% level of utilization.

Overall the major differences between 1990 and 1991 were that more people used classified ads and fewer people used friends and family in 1991 than in 1990. Why the shift within the informal is not clear given the data available.

The same set of questions were compared to the methods respondents would use in a future search (Table 17), which gave us information about the perceived effectiveness of different job search methods. For the job search methods that would be used in the future,
Table 16
Frequencies for Multiple-Response Question on Where Did You Find the Job Leads?: 1990 and 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count 1991</th>
<th>Pct of Responses</th>
<th>Count 1990</th>
<th>Pct of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ads</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends and Family</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESC</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Agency</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or University</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm College</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp Employ Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Application</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They Came After Me</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special and Training</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>286</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

classified ads again was rated #1 in both 1991 and 1990. Friends and family received much more attention (38.4%) in 1990 than in 1991 (10.2%). The MESC was rated #3 in 1990, but dropped down to #4 in 1991. Private agency was rated about the same in 1991 and 1990. College and university placement services were rated higher in 1990 than in 1991.

In 1991 we offered an option of "not know where to go to seek help" at the beginning of the question of "where would you find job leads in future." 22.5% of the respondents responded "yes" to this choice. It suggests that the ineffectiveness of the entire employment service system is partly caused by a lack of information. It may also
reflect the entry into the ranks of the unemployed of people with no recent job searching experience. There was a clear shift from friends and family to classified ads from 1990 to 1991.

Table 17

Frequencies of Multiple-response Question on Where Would You Find Job Leads in Future Job Search?: 1990 and 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ads</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends and Family</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESC</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Agency</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or University</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm College</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Know Where</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Seeking</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>698</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>604</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Those options were not offered in 1990.

Among the various methods listed in the questionnaire plus the open-ended "other," were the choices that first crossed the respondents' mind when the question was asked. Comparing those responses gives us a good measure of the continuity of their preference. A Chi-square test was run to test if the variable of "the methods used before" was related to the variable "the methods that they would use in the future." As result, Pearson Chi² test was significant at .001 level, and Chi² = 143.28 with D.F = 88, Phi = .849 (Table 18). For 1990, Pearson Chi² test was significant at .0001 level, and Chi² =
160.4 with D.F = 36, Phi = 1.17. Both test results suggested the same conclusion that the previous job search experience is significantly related to the preference of future job search methods.

Table 18
Chi-Square Test Results of Job Search Media Used and Would Use in the Future: 1990 and 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th># of Cases</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>D.F. Pearson Chi²</th>
<th>Critical X²</th>
<th>Phi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V13 V25</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>143.28</td>
<td>137.21</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V33 V49</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>160.64</td>
<td>73.40</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The question "Which source was the most useful to you" was asked right after the question "Where did you go to get assistance in finding this job?," therefore, we have an evaluation of usefulness among all the job search media we had listed. The "most useful" can be compared to either "all mentions" or to the "first mention" as alternative expressions of evaluation. The results are shown in Table 19.

In Table 26, we have ranked all methods by the "all choices" tabulation which reveals that all methods were ranked about the same for the first choice as well multiple mentions. Classified ads was the most highly mentioned method followed by friends and family and MESC. Comparing the methods used before and the "most useful" method, we found that the outstanding shift from formal to the informal occurred between classified ads and friends and family. As presented in
Table 19
Pattern of Continuity of Preference and Usefulness of
Job Search Media: 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Search Methods</th>
<th>1st Choice</th>
<th>All Choices</th>
<th>Most Useful Choice</th>
<th>1st Choices</th>
<th>All Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ads</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends and Family</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESC</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Agency</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Know Where</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26, friends and family was ranked highest as the most useful method. On the other hand, fewer people mentioned MESC as the most useful than they used it, which could mean that people used it but did not think it was helpful. Quite the opposite, private agency was ranked higher as the most useful than they were used, which could, in turn, mean that those respondents who had experiences of using private agencies before decided that they were helpful.

The respondents made tentative choices for their future job search. Comparing past experiences and future preferences (Table 20), the highest preferred method was classified ads (52.9%), the next was MESC (38.1%), friends and family (22.0%), and private agency (18.8%).

More respondents would turn to the MESC in the future than used it in the past. The friends and family fell to the third ranking as
first choice although it was still second in all choices.

In order to trace the shifting patterns, the future job search preference was broken down to individual methods. Although the MESC was rated the fifth as the most useful (Table 19), it was rated as the second highest preferred (Table 20). Its unexpectedly high preferred rate may have been generated by the MESC's non-job placement (handing out unemployment checks and job training) functions even though the question referred only to job searching.

Table 20

Pattern of Change in Job Search Methods Used and Would Use: 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Search Methods</th>
<th>Use Again</th>
<th>Preference to Change to in Future</th>
<th>Total Not Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F&amp;F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend/Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESC</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/Univers.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classif. Ads</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Agency</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What happened to the rest of the people who were not going to use the same methods they used before. Had they changed their preferences? In this table we explore the gross movement in and out of
various methods in the context of the distribution of methods of past and future use or preference.

We looked more intensively at the MESC to differentiate three groups—the loyals, the leavers, and those shifting to it. Among those who used the MESC in the past, 38.1% would continue to use it for future job searching, 23.8% would use an "other" in the future, 14.3% would use classified ads, and 14.3% did not know what they would use. Of those who had used friends and family before, 22% would stay, 31.7% would shift to classified ads, 19.5% would use other, and 9.8% did not know. Those who had used ads spread out evenly among all the methods mentioned. About half of those who used private agencies preferred to use ads the next time (Table 20).

Table 21 presents the levels of continuity or loyalty regarding the major job search methods used before and would use in the future.

In summary, friends and family and classified ads were revealed as the most useful media among others, and classified ads was the highest preferred for future job searching. MESC was at the third rank in terms of reuse, but way down in usefulness. In general, the use of job search methods shifted in an informal direction.

Social Inequality

Looking at social inequality, the literature reviewed showed that it reproduces itself during the process of job searching. Chi² tests were performed to test the relationships of employment status and demographic variables. The first result showed that race and
Table 21
Summary of Continuity of Use: 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent Past 1st Mention</th>
<th>Percent Reused</th>
<th>Percent Most Useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ads</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESC</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/Univ</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment status were significantly related at .025, D.F. = 7 with Pearson Chi² = 16.87, critical X² = 16.01, Phi = .19 with 1991 sample (Table 22).

Gender and employment status are significantly related (.0000). D.F. = 7, Pearson Chi² = 47.21, Likelihood Ratio = 63.79, critical X² = 24.32, Phi = .31, (Table 22).

Chi² was used again to test the same hypotheses on 1990 data with the same variables. The result is not significant (a = .1), Pearson Chi² = 46.18, Phi = .32, D. F. = 35, with 455 cases remained in the analysis, (Table 23).

Chi² was used again to test the same relationship of gender and employment status on the 1990 data with the same variables. The test is significant at .0001 with D.F. = 7, Pearson Chi² = 49.57, Likelihood ratio = 68.88, Phi = .33, 458 cases remained, (Table 23).
Another aspect of social inequality is discrimination. One of the options of question "what would make it difficult for you to find a job?" was discrimination. Among those who answered yes (n = 227, 45%) to the previous question "do you feel a job would be hard to get" and then mentioned discrimination (11%) as one of their difficulties. Then the question "what kinds of discrimination did you face?" followed. Surprisingly, the most frequently mentioned employment discrimination was age (74.5%) rather than race or gender (Table 24).

Another crosstabulation was run to identify the age breakdowns with discrimination. The result showed that 95.1% of those reporting age discrimination were 40 years and older. This strongly indicated that age discrimination against older workers has become an important issue in today's employment activity.

As a recent Wall Street Journal article noted, "Americans 35-54
Table 23

Chi Square Test Results of Primary Relationships Among Related Variables: 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th># of Cases</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Pearson Chi²</th>
<th>Likelihood Ratio</th>
<th>Critical X²</th>
<th>Phi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empl Age</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>427.94</td>
<td>384.33</td>
<td>73.40</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empl Edu</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>69.23</td>
<td>72.93</td>
<td>60.73</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empl Mari</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>157.88</td>
<td>126.11</td>
<td>56.89</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empl Race</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46.18</td>
<td>40.52</td>
<td>40.52</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empl Sex</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49.57</td>
<td>68.88</td>
<td>24.32</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24

Frequencies for Multiple-Response on Discrimination: 1991

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

were 10% (35/45%) more likely to have been laid off in the past two recessions than in previous ones" ("Labor Notes," 1993).

Does gender make a difference in whether a job would be hard to get by industry? Because the variable of "industry" was a recoded categorical variable with six categories, a loglinear analysis was performed to test the relationship of feeling a job is hard to get, industry, and gender (Table 25).
In addition to employment status, our 1991 data sets occupational item permitted an industrial classification. This is especially desirable because of the importance of the structural unemployment which was so prominent during the recent recession and is persisting into the current recovery. The analytical focus of the industrial categories is on the direction of change. Those in growing or declining industries are expected to reveal a consistent level of security or anxiety about their job future.

Our categorization of industries consists of:

- growing--health services
- stable--government and education
- deregulated--banking, communications, and transportation
- declining--manufacturing

Two hundred and twenty one (221) weighed cases were used in the analysis. The Likelihood Ratio Chi square(5) = 38.123, p = .000. It was a good fit between observed frequencies and expected frequencies generated by the model. A summary of the model with results of parameter estimates in raw and standardized form is shown in Tables 25 and 25 for 1991.

Table 25 shows that among those who worked in a deregulated industry, more women (4.1%) felt it would be hard than men (2.7%), while 5.0% of male and 4.1% of women believed it would not be hard. In the stable sectors, more women (7.7%) said it would be hard than men (3.2%), and about the same proportions of men (5.9%) and women (6.3%) in the same sectors said it would not be hard.

However, in the growing industries, more women (12.7%) felt a
job would not be hard to get than men (2.3%) did, in contrast to men (0.0%) and women (4.5%) who felt a job would be hard to get.

The conclusion is that in general still more women feel it would be hard to find a job if looking than men, but the growing health industry is an exception for women.

Comparing gender difference in length of primary job between 1990 and 1991 with regression analyses, we got a different pictures for men and women at different times. The slopes were significant at .0000 for both years, and R for 1990 was .31, and for 1991 was .17.

1990: \[ Y' = 4.37 - 1.25\times gender \]
1991: \[ Y' = 4.30 - 0.54\times gender \]

The predicting score of length of primary job for a average female in 1990 would be 1.87 year and in 1991 would be 3.22 years, and for a male would be 3.12 years in 1990 and 3.76 years in 1991. The gaps between men and women, in 1990 were 1.25 years and .54 year in 1991, were getting smaller (Figure 3). It seems that the recession hurt men harder than women, but women were still behind men in terms of length of time in primary job.

Michigan Employment Security Commission and Other Media

In terms of who used and would use MESC services, those who looked for jobs before were pulled out and the variable of "looked for a job before" was recoded into two categories--MESC users and non-MESC users (used media other than the MESC) to compare the
Table 25
Expected Frequencies and Residuals of Feeling A Job Would be Hard to Get On Industry and Gender: 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Observed Frequencies</th>
<th>Expected Frequencies</th>
<th>Residual</th>
<th>Standard Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V45</td>
<td>Hard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V124</td>
<td>Declining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V118</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V118</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>-3.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V124</td>
<td>Deregulate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V118</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V118</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>-1.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V124</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V118</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V118</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20.10</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V124</td>
<td>Growing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V118</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>-4.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V118</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Observed Frequencies</th>
<th>Expected Frequencies</th>
<th>Residual</th>
<th>Standard Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V45</td>
<td>Not Hard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V124</td>
<td>Declining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V118</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V118</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>-3.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V124</td>
<td>Deregulate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V118</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V118</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>-1.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V124</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V118</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V118</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>14.10</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V124</td>
<td>Growing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V118</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>-4.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V118</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>23.59</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: hard: yes = 1, not hard = 2;  
sex: male = 1, female = 2;  
industry: declining = 1, deregulate = 2, stable = 3, growing = 4
differences between these two groups with other selected demographic variables (Table 26). First, significantly more unemployed (40.9%) used the MESC than used other media. Blue collar workers (45.5) used the MESC more than did Clerical (27.3%) and Professional workers (27.3%). More blacks (14.3%) used the MESC than whites (9.8%). In terms of education, MESC users had a far lower college level (4.5%) than non users (13.7%). Whether the residential areas had MESC offices did not make much difference in using MESC services. More males (54.5%) than females (45.5%) used the MESC. Employees in declining industries (50.0) used much more MESC services than did the deregulated sectors (16.7%) or those in stable industries, such as education and government (33.3%).

Finally I looked at the users and non users of the MESC (Table 27) and found, as expected, that the less advantaged workers
### Table 26

Characteristics of the Respondents Who Used the MESC in Contrast to Those Who Used Other Media (%): 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Only the People Who Looked for a Job Used MESC</th>
<th>Used Others</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation</strong></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>Some High</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MESC Available</strong></td>
<td>MESC Yes</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MESC No</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industry</strong></td>
<td>Declining</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deregulated</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(unemployed, black, less educated, etc.) were more likely to use the MESC. The only exception was gender, with women making less use of the MESC than men. Also as expected, those employed in declining industries (largely automotive) make 3 times as much use of the MESC as others. The location of the MESC's 54 offices throughout Michigan's 81 counties did not turn out to be a deterrent.

Most of the literature commented that the informal media, such as friends and family, works best in terms of helping people find jobs. Our data disagrees with this. The low reusal rate (22%) suggests that the much cited virtues of the informal media do not work as well as they reportedly used to.

Formal and Informal Job Search Media

With loglinear analysis we found that, within the group of people who had not been laid off before, those who used formal media to get jobs or job information felt more confident about their future job security than those who got jobs through informal media. This was one of the few cases in which the preference reported in the literature for informal search media was not confirmed.

A discriminant function analysis was performed to predict the job search networks that would be used in future job search activities in terms of the respondents' socioeconomic characteristics and their employment experiences. The results showed that older and black people would be more likely to use formal media than others. The highly educated are more favorable toward semi-formal media than
Table 27

Characteristics of the Respondents Who Would Use the MESC in Contrast to the Total Other Media Users (%): 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>All the Respondents Would Use</th>
<th>Would Use MESC</th>
<th>Would Use Other Media</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Employed</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Some High</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESC Available</td>
<td>MESC Yes</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MESC No</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Declining</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deregulated</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Growing</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the other two. This tendency showed up in both 1990 and 1991 data.
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Females tend to use informal networks more than men, and those who have been laid off before and who are afraid of being laid off in the future are more likely to use semi-formal and formal instead of informal media, although for 1991 only.

In comparing 1990 and 1991 data, we found those who had been laid off before tend to use more formal media than others even though the literature has indicated that those media were less effective. Our findings of a lower preference for informal media than the literature reported, could be explained by the fact that the MESC is multi-functional in handing out unemployment checks and administering training in addition to find jobs for people. Therefore, it has the advantage of familiarity as well as being the media of last resort. Also, it may be that professional service occupations and colleges are moving more into listing job openings through news letters and community college placement offices, our semi-formal category.
CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter opens with a discussion of the statistical data analysis results from Chapter V. The discussion will be conducted at a macro level which will go beyond the detailed statistical findings and try to examine the job search behavior and the employment situation in the State of Michigan from a comprehensive point of view. The remainder of this chapter is devoted to the final conclusion of this research.

Discussion of Findings

The intent of this research was to focus on the general public's opinions and behavioral changes in regard to job search activities in the State of Michigan between 1990 and 1991. Opinions and behavior were measured by the following six aspects: (1) Employment experiences: employment status, occupation, industries they were employed in, full time job, and length in primary job; (2) Unemployment Experiences: "have been laid off in past 5 years," and "might be laid off in the near future"; (3) Job search experiences: previous job search media used, the preferred media which would be used in future job searches, whether they looked for a job, and the most important source of job search information; (4) MESC: what could be done to make the MESC more useful, difficulties in finding a job, sources of discrimination; (5) Socioeconomic factors: age, race, gender,
education, marital status, residential area; and (6) The impact of the recession: feelings about the recession, and feeling a job would be hard to get.

From two separate surveys in 1990 and 1991, respectively, data sets of 459 and 505 were used in the data analyses. Various statistical methods were used depending on the levels of variables and the nature of data.

It was decided to focus primary attention on the 1991 survey given its larger size, exclusion of retirees, and addition of some new items. Therefore 1990 data are reported only if they differ from the responses to the same items in 1991.

Recession and Employment

In March 1990, though the recession was under way, the general public had not fully perceived its personal impact. A year later, the unemployment rate reached its peak in Michigan and moved the state into the group of states that were allowed an unemployment insurance benefit extension from 26 to 39 weeks. Our data revealed the impact of the publicly announced recession by exploring the differences between the two data sets.

Recent economic recessions have been different from the "traditional" cyclical slumps since the Great Depression in the 1930s in terms of their growing level of structural unemployment. Our economic system has been going through a very difficult time. Employment in the auto industry, especially in Michigan, has been declining
during the period of time when this research was conducted. The results from both 1991 and 1990 confirmed that certain occupations and industries were significantly related to having been laid off in the past five years and the fear of being laid off in the future.

As for the difficulties in finding a job, the three most frequently mentioned indicators for both years were "wages were too low," "I need a different skill," and "no job available." The structural feature of the recession was revealed by the second response.

Social Inequality

Unlike most post World War II recessions, in which the young and unskilled were laid off first and older and more experienced workers were more secure, this research found that discrimination against older workers was far more serious than any other kind of discrimination. Among all self-reported discrimination, 71.9% listed "age."

Social disadvantage tends to be exaggerated in a recession. This recession, being broad and structural, also affected every group, but to some extent affected women "less," perhaps because they have long had lower expectations and, on the other hand, are still experiencing a growth in female oriented services, especially health care, while education, and government were fairly stable industries.
**Formal and Informal Job Search Media**

The job search methods used in the past were significantly and also strongly related to the preference for future job search methods. In the literature, there were conclusions about newspaper classified ads: it is the most used but is assumed to be the least effective method, although effectiveness has rarely been studied. In this survey classified ads is the most used as well as the highest preferred media. Compared to the rest, newspaper ads are more convenient, updated, and have more information, even if less accurate.

One of our major hypotheses has been that the primary and official organization set up to assist the general public in finding jobs (the MESC) is one of the least favored and that it is chosen most often by those least advantaged in the labor market. The MESC was not reported to be very "useful" with a big percent of people turning to "other" and ads. Nevertheless, it still has the second highest level of continuity of use. The other side of coin is that the MESC was a lower preferred media in terms of overall preference.

The reasons could be, firstly, that during a recession, people have other business to do with the MESC (such as picking up their unemployment checks and being retrained), therefore they are more acquainted with it, but we need more research on this topic. Also, Michigan is still a relatively prolabor state with, perhaps, a more effective state employment office than in most other states. In addition, most of the other job search surveys were run on very limited samples--youth, mid-sized cities, solely the unemployed, etc. We
surveyed the general population including those who were often screened out in our citations of prior research, i.e., the majority population of the employed and post high school educated adults.

In the case of friends and family, while most of the literature observed that the informal media work best in terms of helping people find jobs, our results showed a low continuity rate (22%), which suggests that it does not work as well as it was reported to have worked in the literature.

This finding suggests that at least for those fortunate enough never to have been laid off and who had used organizations or media explicitly designed to assist in finding jobs, the "system" works. Therefore, they plan to use it in the future. If a more ideal study could be carried out, pin-pointing exactly when the MESC had been used by this group, we might be able to disentangle the effect of its usual problem, that it is most often used when it has the fewest openings to offer during a recession. Those who used it during good times may have had a more favorable experience.

Summary Of Hypotheses

A summary of the test results of the hypotheses stated on page 44 is listed in Table 28.

Conclusion

Early 1990 witnessed an economic recession with a heavy element of structural unemployment in the United States. It affected not
only the unskilled and blue-collar workers, but also, to an unpre-
cedented extent, professional, managerial people and the highly 
educated. Its impact on the general public, especially in the State 
of Michigan, was strong.

The present research focused on job search behavior in the mid-
dle of an economic recession in Michigan in 1990 and 1991. The goals 
of this research have been to measure the general public's evaluation 
of the perceived effectiveness of job search media in terms of the 
literature on the topic.

Table 28
Summary of Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Confirmed/Rejected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. The disadvantaged tended to choose less effective media.</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Informal media are viewed as more useful than formal.</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. The MESC is less effective than other media.</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. The elder, unemployed, black, and less skilled heavily rely on the MESC than other groups did.</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. The continue use rate of the MESC is lower than other media.</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. The utilization rate of the MESC is lower than other media.</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Friends and family are more useful than other media.</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Again we have to note that an objective measure of job search media success rates has yet to be carried out, so all we can refer to is reports by job seekers on what they felt worked for them.

Informal media (e.g., friends and family, classified ads, and "were offered a job") were evaluated as more effective in most of the research literature. However, this study suggests that the situation changed. Informal media were not more useful than the formal, if not less effective, in the State of Michigan in 1991 during the recession compared to 1990. 1990 data was more consistent with the literature.

The issue of effectiveness per se was not settled either in the literature or in this study. It is, however, assumed that job searching is so important an activity for most people that problems of recall are less than in the case of other behavior and that when respondents answer the question "which source of job finding and assistance was most helpful to you?," they are trying to tell us which one was the most effective in getting them their jobs.

It must be admitted, however, that this is only a perception. People do have selective or defective memories and may persist in dysfunctional behavior, such as continuing to use a less effective job search media.

An interesting weakness in the literature is the neglect of our semi-formal media, professional newsletters, college placement offices, etc. This is apparently due to several factors. First, most of the studies focused on the less educated and disadvantaged, while ours studied the general population. Then, more recently these media
have probably become much more developed.

Among various job search media, classified ads are the most used, reported to be the most useful, and most preferred for the future use in this study. Friends and family, though declining, was still rated the second most useful media among others. MESC, though rated low in utilization, had a much higher rate of reuse than the previous study findings, and than in other states.

A large proportion of the respondents did not know where to go to find job information. This indicated that the main problem of job searching in Michigan is the lack of an established job information and training system that could function even in a recession.

In general, social inequality in employment was revealed when occupations and employment status was related to those demographic variables normally indicative of unequal opportunities or conditions namely, age, race, gender, and education. Inequality was also revealed in the choice of media (hypothesis 1) with those in lower status positions generally opting for media rated by the literature as less effective.

Limitations of the Study

Although a sample of 505 valid cases seems adequate for the analysis in general, some variables in the sample have less than 100 cases in some categories of major breakdowns, and less than 20 cases in the minor breakdowns, which affected the selection of methods and testable hypotheses for data analysis. In addition, the author was
unwilling to utilize missing data programs to boost the size of certain tables since, even with relatively low numbers, significant results could be obtained on a number of important hypotheses.

Although a telephone interview survey is known for a higher cooperation rate than other major survey methods, it still has its own biases in sample execution. Women of the household are more likely, in general, to answer the phone than men, hence the 1991 survey ended up with 31.4% more female than male respondents. We, therefore, controlled for gender in many analyses. The rising number of answering machines also biased the sample to some extent, but the effect of this obstacle is unknown as yet. The data is also biased by missing people with no phone service. Under-representation of males and minority groups was a matter of concern in both samples.

It is also recognized that survey data usually does not permit obtaining interval data, therefore, it limits the choices of statistical methods for data analysis.

Suggestions for Future Research

A true test of effectiveness would require a complex design since ideally it would be as near to a perfect experiment as it is ethical to structure for human beings. It would also ideally be a longitudinal study following a panel of people over time as they deal with voluntary or involuntary job searching and go through the media selection process.

Ideally their employers should also be interviewed as to their
view of how they obtained this worker. In the case of media which are also organizations (the MESC, College placement, etc.), interviews with those who dealt with the respondents would be desirable. Some job seekers might denigrate an employment service unfairly if it could be determined that respondents did not follow the procedures this organization recommended. Finally, the state of the Labor market at the time of the study must also be taken into account. In terms of under-representation of male and minority groups, stratified sampling might be used for reducing the generic problems of telephone survey. Finally, a larger sample was needed given the number of demographic categories we wanted to examine.
Appendix A

HSIRB Letter of Approval
Date: April 3, 1991
To: Zhuoyan Gu
From: Mary Anne Bunda, Chair
Re: HSIRB Project Number: 91-04-10.

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research protocol, "Michigan Employment Survey," has been approved under the exempt category of review by the HSIRB. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the approval application.

You must seek reapproval for any changes in this design. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

xc: David Chaplin, Sociology

Approval Termination: April 3, 1992
Appendix B

The 1991 Interview Instrument
Hello, my name is ________ and I'm calling from the Center for Social Research at Western Michigan University in Kalamazoo. The Center is conducting an independent public opinion survey of Michigan residents on the current employment situation. The survey takes just a few minutes.

1. Are you an adult member of this household at least 18 years or older and who is not permanently retired?

[IF THE ANSWER IS NO, THEN SAY: MAY I SPEAK TO AN ADULT MEMBER OF THIS HOUSEHOLD?]

[IF YES:
Are you a member of this household?

[IF YES:
And are you retired?

[IF THEY SAY THEY ARE RETIRED, SAY WE ARE ONLY INTERVIEWING PEOPLE WHO ARE WORKING OR LOOKING FOR EMPLOYMENT, THANK YOU VERY MUCH. HANG UP]

We would like to ask you some questions about finding jobs and about job training. The survey takes about 9 minutes.

2. Let's begin with your opinions on the state of our economy.

The Federal government has declared that we are officially in a recession and that unemployment has reached such a high level that unemployment insurance benefits have been extended from 26 to 39 weeks in Michigan and a few other states.

Which of the following explains how you feel about this recession?

(READ CHOICES)

1. It will be long and deep [LONG TIME AND AFFECT MANY PEOPLE].
2. It will be over in A few months to a year and mild.
3. We have already bottomed out and are recovering.
4. Other (specify).
5. DON'T KNOW.

3. Have you delayed making a major purchase which you very much want to make, because of the recession?

(DO NOT READ CHOICES)

1. Yes.
2. No.
3. Had not planned on one any way.
4. Don't know.
Now, I would like to ask you some questions about your own employment situation.

(2)*
4. Are you currently?: (read choices)
   1. Employed for wages.
   2. Self Employed.
   3. Out of work for less than 1 year.
   4. Out of work for more than 1 year.
   5. Homemaker.
   6. Student.
   7. Retired.
   8. Never Been Employed.
   9. [Refused].

(If Q4<5) (3,4)
5. What is your primary job?

* 1990 Variable Number

(5)
6. How long have you been in your current primary job?
   1. less than 1 year.
   2. 1 - 2.9 years.
   3. 3 - 5.9 years.
   4. 6 - 10 years.
   5. 11 - 20 years.
   6. More than 20 years.
   7. Refused.

7. Is your primary job a full time job (over 30 hours per week)?
   1. Yes.
   2. No.       [SKIP TO Q9]
   3. [NOT SURE].       [SKIP TO Q9]

8. Do you have a second job?
   1. None.
   2. Specify _______________.

Now I'd like to ask a couple of questions about unemployment.

(80)
9. Are you concerned about being laid off in the near future?
   1. Yes.
   2. No.        [SKIP TO Q11]
   3. Refused.    [SKIP TO Q11]
10. In the past 5 years, have you been laid off?
   1. Yes. [SKIP TO Q12]
   2. No. [SKIP TO Q12]
   3. Refused. [SKIP TO Q12]

(IF Q4 NOT EQUAL 3 OR 4, JUMP TO Q12)

11. Were you unemployed for more than three months before you found another job? (DO NOT READ CHOICES)
   1. Yes. [SKIP TO Q13]
   2. Yes, never found another job. [SKIP TO Q13]
   3. No. [SKIP TO Q13]
   4. Refused. [SKIP TO Q13]

Now I'd like to ask you a few questions about looking for a job.

12. Within the past 5 years, have you looked for a job?
   1. Yes. [SKIP TO Q25]
   2. No. [SKIP TO Q25]
   3. Refused. [SKIP TO Q25]

(IF YES)

13-23. Where did you look to get assistance in finding this job? (DO NOT READ CHOICES, RECORD AS MANY AS NEEDED).
   1. Friends or family ("word of mouth").
   2. Union.
   3. Church.
   4. MESC (Michigan Employment Security Commission -- the State Employment Office).
   5. Community college placement.
   6. College or university placement.
   7. Classified ads in newspapers.
   8. Private employment agency.
   9. Other (specify).
   11. Refused. [SKIP TO Q25]

(IF YES IN Q12)

24. For those you just mentioned, which source of assistance was the most useful to you? [RESTORE ANSWERS FROM Q13]
If you were to seek a job in the next few years, where would you look to get assistance in finding a job?

(Do not read choices, record as many as needed)

1. I don't plan to seek a job.
2. Friends or family ("word of mouth").
3. Union.
4. Church.
5. MESC.
6. Community college placement.
7. College or university placement.
8. Classified ads in newspapers.
9. Private employment agency.
10. Other.
12. Don't know where to go.
13. No more remaining/refused.

What could be done to make the MESC (Michigan Employment Office) more useful for you?

(Do not read choices, record as many as needed)

1. never heard of it.
2. list more jobs in my field.
3. career counseling to determine my interests and skills.
4. job training.
5. job search techniques and resume writing.
6. other (specify) ________________.
7. no more remaining/refused.

If you were looking for a job, do you feel it would be hard for you to get one?

1. Yes.
2. No.  [Skip to Q64]
3. [Refused].  [Skip to Q64]
(IF YES)
(69-79)
46-56. Which of the following would make it difficult for you to find a job? (DO NOT READ CHOICES, RECORD AS MANY AS NEEDED)
1. Don't know what jobs are there.
2. Don't know where to go to get job information.
3. No jobs in area where I live.
4. I need different skills to fit with job openings.
5. Wages are too low.
7. Lack transportation.
8. Need child or adult care.
9. Don't have enough time.
10. Other [specify].
11. No more remaining/refused.

57-63. You just mentioned discrimination, could you tell us what type of discrimination you face?
(READ CHOICES, RECORD AS MANY AS NEEDED)
1. Age.
2. Sex.
3. Race/ethnic.
4. Handicap.
5. Other (specify).
6. No more remaining/refused.

(23-31,84)
64-71. Which of the following services do you think might be important to you if you were looking for a job?
(READ CHOICES, RECORD AS MANY AS NEEDED)
1. Help in determining your skills and interests.
2. Help in exploring different career possibilities.
3. Help in improving your skills.
4. Help in developing a resume.
5. Someone to make referrals and set up appointments.
6. Practice interviewing.
7. Other (specify).
8. No more remaining/refused.

When people think about jobs, training is often considered.

(12)
72. Have you been thinking about seeking additional training to improve your job skills? [IF YES, THEN READ 1 & 2]
1. Yes, thinking about more training to keep or improve my current position.
2. Yes, thinking about more training to open new career possibilities.
3. No. [SKIP TO Q74]
4. [Refused]. [SKIP TO Q74]
73. Have you already been seeking additional training to improve your job skills? [READ CHOICES]
   1. Yes, seeking job training.
   2. Currently in job training.
   3. No. [SKIP TO Q75]
   4. [Refused]. [SKIP TO Q75]

74. What kind of skill improvement (job training) is of the most interest to you?
[ENTER A SPECIFIC TYPE OF TRAINING, LIKE: COMPUTER SKILLS, MATH, ENGLISH, PUBLIC SPEAKING, ETC.]

75-83. If you wanted to improve your skills, would you have any problems or difficulties?
[Do NOT READ CHOICES, RECORD AS MANY AS NEEDED]
   1. No problem or no need.
   3. Don't know where to go.
   4. Can't afford training.
   5. Lack transportation.
   7. Don't have enough time.
   8. Other (specify).
   9. [Refused].

84-93. If you were going to seek additional job training, where would you go to get this training?
[DO NOT READ CHOICES, RECORD AS MANY AS NEEDED]
   1. Community or adult education (k-12).
   2. Vocational or skills center.
   3. Area technical school.
   4. Local community college.
   5. Commercial business/trade school.
   6. College or university.
   7. Don't know where to go for training.
   8. Other (specify).
   9. No more remaining/refused.

94. Does your employer provide on-ther job training?
   1. Yes.
   2. No. [SKIP TO Q96]
   3. [Refused]. [SKIP TO Q96]
95. Have you used it?
1. Yes.
2. No.
3. [Refused].

(7)
96. Does your employer provide support to attend training sessions & conferences?
1. Yes.
2. No. [SKIP TO Q98]
3. [Refused]. [SKIP TO Q98]

97. Have you used it?
1. Yes.
2. No.
3. [Refused].

(8)
98. Does your employer provide reimbursement for college tuition?
1. Yes.
2. No.
3. [Refused].

99. Have you used it?
1. Yes.
2. No.
3. [Refused].

(10)
100. Does your employer provide child care or adult care services?
1. Yes.
2. No.
3. [Refused].

101. Have you used it?
1. Yes.
2. No.
3. [Refused].

(11)OE
102. Is there any other service provided by your employer which you used?
1. Yes.
2. No.
3. [Refused].
103-107. Which of the services on this list have you found the most useful?  (RESTORE FROM # 19 AND READ)
   1. On-the-job training.
   2. Support to attend training sessions & conferences.
   3. Reimbursement for college tuition.
   4. Child care or adult care services.
   5. Other (specify).
   6. [Refused].

108. Does your employer provide medical insurance coverage?
   1. Yes.
   2. No.
   3. Not sure.

(IF YES)
109. Do you carry this medical insurance coverage?
   1. Yes.
   2. No.

(IF NO)
110. Then how are you covered?  (READ CHOICES)
   1. On a family member's policy.
   2. I pay for my own individual medical coverage.
   3. I have no medical insurance coverage.
   4. Other (specify).

(If not employed)
112. Do you have medical insurance coverage other than medicaid?
   1. Yes, on a family member's policy.
   2. Yes, I pay for my own.
   3. No, I don't have any medical coverage.
   4. Other.

We have a few final questions about your background to help ensure that our sample represents all Michigan residents.

(85)
113. What is your age?
   (IF THE RESPONDENT HESITATES, ASK: IS IT BETWEEN...?)
   1. 16 - 19 years.
   2. 20 - 24.
   3. 25 - 29.
   4. 30 - 39.
   5. 40 - 49.
   6. 50 - 59.
   7. 60 - 65.
   8. 66 years or older.
   9. [refused].
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114. What is the highest grade or year of school you completed?  
   [READ CHOICES]  
   1. Eighth grade or less.  
   2. Some high school.  
   3. High school graduate or GED certificate.  
   4. Some college or post-high school training.  
   5. College graduate.  
   6. Post graduate or professional degree.  
   7. [Refused].

115. And are you:  [READ CHOICES]  
   1. Married.  
   2. Divorced.  
   4. Widowed.  
   5. Never Been married.  
   6. [Refused].

116. What is your race or ethnicity?  [READ CHOICES]  
   1. White.  
   2. Black.  
   3. Hispanic.  
   4. Asian, Pacific Islander.  
   5. Aleutian, Eskimo, or American Indian.  
   6. Other.  
   7. Don’t know/Not sure.  
   8. [Refused].

117. What county do you live in?  ________________

That was my last question. Thank you so much for participating in this survey. We really appreciate your cooperation.

118. Sex of respondent:  1. Male.  2. Female.  3. No response.

119. The panel case, type in old respondent number. If not panel, type in 0.

120. Did respondent remember being called last year?  1. Yes.  2. No.

121. The interviewer number.

122. The area code of the phone number.

123. The first 3 digits of the phone number.

124. The number of the computer.
Appendix C

The 1990 Interview Instrument
Hello, I'm _________ calling for the Michigan Department of Management and Budget. Your telephone number has been selected as part of a random sample of Michigan residents. Are you an adult member of this household?

[IF YES, CONTINUE. WITH TEENAGERS, ACCEPT 18-YEAR OLDS OR OLDER. IF NO: ]

1. May I speak to an adult please?

[IF NO ADULT IS AVAILABLE, TRY TO SCHEDULE A TIME TO CALL BACK.]

We would like to ask you some questions about finding jobs and about job training to help us revise our services for Michigan residents. The questions will only take about 10 minutes and your answers will be used to show how different groups of people feel about employment and job training issues.

First, I would like to ask you some questions about employment. [WITH MULTIPLE JOBS, USE PRIMARY OCCUPATION]

2. Are you currently? [READ CHOICES]
   1. Employed for wages.
   2. Self employed.
   3. Out of work < 1 year.
   4. Out of work > 1 year.
   5. Homemaker.
   6. Student.
   7. Retired.
   8. Never been employed.

[IF Q2 < 3]

3. What is your occupation? ____________________________

4. Occupational Type
   1. Profession and tech.
   2. Managers and admin.
   3. Sales.
   5. Craftsmen .... laborers.
   6. Farmers and farm managers.
   7. Service workers.
   8. Other.
5. Time in Current Job
1. Less than 1 year.
2. 1-2 years.
3. 3-5 years.
4. 6-10 years.
5. 11-20 years.
6. Over 20 years.
7. Refused.

6-11. Provided by Employer? [MULTIPLE-RESPONSE QUESTION]
[READ CHOICES, APPLY AS MANY AS NEEDED]
1. On-the-job training.
2. Support to attend training.
3. Tuition reimbursement.
6. No more remaining/no response.

12. Thinking about or seeking job training? [READ CHOICES]
1. Yes, thinking to keep job.
2. Yes, thinking to move ahead.
3. Yes, seeking.
4. Yes, in job training.
5. No.
6. Refused.

13. Skills Improvement of Most Interest

14-21. Sources of Job Training [MULTIPLE-RESPONSE QUESTION]
[APPLY AS MANY AS NEEDED]
1. Comm or adult education.
2. Vocational or skills center.
3. Area tech school.
4. Community college.
5. Commercial bus-trade school.
6. College or university.
7. Do not know where to go.
8. No more-refused.

22. Other Training Source

23-30. Skill Improvement Barriers [MULTIPLE-RESPONSE QUESTION] [APPLY AS MANY AS NEEDED]
1. No.
3. Do not know where to go.
4. Can not afford training.
5. Lack transportation.
7. Lack enough time.
8. No more-refused.
31. Other Barrier

32. Looked for a job in past 5 years?
   1. Yes.
   2. No.
   3. Refused.

33-36. Where did you go to find job leads or to get assistance in finding a job?  [MULTIPLE-RESPONSE]
   [DO NOT READ CHOICES, RECORD UP TO 4 CHOICES]
   1. Friends - family.
   2. Union.
   3. Church.
   4. Special program.
   5. MESC.
   7. College-university placement.
   8. Classified ads.
   9. Private employment agency.
  10. No more-refused.

37. Other job leads

38-42. How would you rate the assistance you received from [RESTORE THE PREVIOUS ANSWERS HERE]
   1. Very helpful.
   2. Somewhat helpful.
   3. Not very helpful.
   4. Refused.

43-47. What could have been done to make the services of [RESTORE THE PREVIOUS ANSWER HERE] more useful to you?

48. Do you have any plans to look for a different job within the next few years?
   1. Yes.
   2. No.
   3. Refused.

49-59. If you were to seek a new job, where would you go to find job leads or to get assistance in finding a job?  [MULTIPLE-RESPONSE QUESTION, RECORD AS MANY AS NEEDED]
   1. Friends - family.
   2. Union.
   3. Church.
   4. Special program.
   5. MESC.
   7. College-university placement.
   8. Classified ads.
   9. Private employment agency.
  10 No more-refused.
60. How important do you think each of the following might be to you if you were seeking a different job?

Help in determining your skills and interests:
1. Very important.
2. Somewhat important.
3. Not very important.
4. Refused.

61. Help in exploring different career possibilities:
1. Very important.
2. Somewhat important.
3. Not very important.
4. Refused.

62. Help in developing a personalized plan of action to improve skills or find a job:
1. Very important.
2. Somewhat important.
3. Not very important.
4. Refused.

63. Help finding job openings:
1. Very important.
2. Somewhat important.
3. Not very important.
4. Refused.

64. Someone to make referrals and set up interviews:
1. Very important.
2. Somewhat important.
3. Not very important.
4. Refused.

65. Help in developing a resume:
1. Very important.
2. Somewhat important.
3. Not very important.
4. Refused.

66. Practice interviewing:
1. Very important.
2. Somewhat important.
3. Not very important.
4. Refused.

67. Other Desired Services:
68. If you were looking for a job, do you feel it would be hard for you to get a different job?
   1. Yes.
   2. No.
   3. Refused.

69-79. Which of the following would make it difficult?
   [READ CHOICES, RECORD AS MANY AS NEEDED]
   [MULTIPLE-RESPONSE QUESTION]
   1. Do not know where jobs are.
   2. Do not know how to get job information.
   3. No jobs in area.
   4. I need different skills.
   5. Wages too low.
   7. Lack transportation.
   9. Lack time.
   10. No more/refused.

80. Now I would like to ask a couple of questions about unemployment. Are you concerned about being laid off in the near future?
   1. Yes.
   2. No.
   3. Refused.

81. In the past 5 years, have you been laid off?
   1. Yes.
   2. No.
   3. Refused.

82. Unemployed for more than 3 months?
   [DO NOT READ CHOICES]
   1. Yes.
   2. Yes - never found another job.
   3. No.
   4. Refused.

83. Reemployment Assistance?
   1. Yes.
   2. No.
   3. Refused.

84. What kind of Assistance?
85. We have a few final questions about your background to help ensure that our sample represents all Michigan residents.

Into which of the following ranges does your age fall?
1. 16-19.
2. 20-22.
4. 25-29.
5. 30-39.
6. 40-49.
7. 50-59.
8. 60-69.
9. 70 and over.
10. Do not know.
11. Refused.

86. Are you:
1. White.
2. Black.
3. Hispanic.
4. Asian - Pacific Islander.
5. Aleutian, Eskimo, or Indian.
6. Other.
7. Do not know.
8. Refused.

87. What is the highest grade or year of school you completed?
1. Eighth grade or less.
2. Some high school.
3. High school graduate or GED certificate.
4. Some college or post high school training.
5. College graduate.
6. Post graduate or professional degree.
7. Refused.

88. And are you:
1. Married.
2. Divorced.
4. Widowed.
5. Never been married.
6. Refused.

89. Do you have any dependent Children living in your home?
1. Yes. 2. No. 3. Refused.

That was my final question. Thank you so much for participating in this survey. We really appreciate your cooperation.

91. [INDICATE SEX OF RESPONDENT-- ASK IF NECESSARY]
1. Male. 2. Female. 3. No response.
Appendix D

Variables Compared - 1990/1991
### VARIABLES COMPARED 1990/1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1991 Description</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v4 Employment Status</td>
<td>v2</td>
<td>v5</td>
<td>v3, v4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v5 Primary Job</td>
<td>v5</td>
<td>v6 Full Time Job</td>
<td>v5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v6 Length of Primary Job</td>
<td>v8 Have a Second Job</td>
<td>v7</td>
<td>v5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v8 Have a Second Job</td>
<td>v9 Being Laid Off in Future</td>
<td>v10 Have Been Laid Off</td>
<td>v81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v9 Being Laid Off in Future</td>
<td>v11 Unemployed over 3 Months</td>
<td>v12 Have You Looked for a Job</td>
<td>v32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v11 Unemployed over 3 Months</td>
<td>v13-23 Where did you go to get assistance in finding this job?</td>
<td>v13-23 Where did you go to get assistance in finding this job?</td>
<td>v33-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v12 Have You Looked for a Job</td>
<td>v24 Which source was the most helpful to you?</td>
<td>v24 Which source was the most helpful to you?</td>
<td>v38-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v24 Which source was the most helpful to you?</td>
<td>v25-37 Where would you go to find job leads if you were looking in the future?</td>
<td>v25-37 Where would you go to find job leads if you were looking in the future?</td>
<td>v49-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v25-37 Where would you go to find job leads if you were looking in the future?</td>
<td>v38-44 What could be done to make MESC more useful for you?</td>
<td>v38-44 What could be done to make MESC more useful for you?</td>
<td>v43-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v38-44 What could be done to make MESC more useful for you?</td>
<td>v45 Do you feel a job would be hard to get if you were looking?</td>
<td>v45 Do you feel a job would be hard to get if you were looking?</td>
<td>v68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v45 Do you feel a job would be hard to get if you were looking?</td>
<td>v46-56 Which of the following would make it difficult for you to find a job?</td>
<td>v46-56 Which of the following would make it difficult for you to find a job?</td>
<td>v69-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v46-56 Which of the following would make it difficult for you to find a job?</td>
<td>v57-63 Could you tell us what type of discrimination you face?</td>
<td>v57-63 Could you tell us what type of discrimination you face?</td>
<td>v23-31, v84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v57-63 Could you tell us what type of discrimination you face?</td>
<td>v64-71 Which of the following services do you think might me important to you if you were looking for a job?</td>
<td>v64-71 Which of the following services do you think might me important to you if you were looking for a job?</td>
<td>v23-31, v84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v64-71 Which of the following services do you think might me important to you if you were looking for a job?</td>
<td>v113 What is your age?</td>
<td>v113 What is your age?</td>
<td>v85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v113 What is your age?</td>
<td>v114 What is the highest grade or year of school you completed?</td>
<td>v114 What is the highest grade or year of school you completed?</td>
<td>v87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v114 What is the highest grade or year of school you completed?</td>
<td>v115 Marital Status</td>
<td>v115 Marital Status</td>
<td>v88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v115 Marital Status</td>
<td>v116 What is your race or ethnicity?</td>
<td>v116 What is your race or ethnicity?</td>
<td>v86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v116 What is your race or ethnicity?</td>
<td>v117 What county do you live in?</td>
<td>v117 What county do you live in?</td>
<td>v84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v117 What county do you live in?</td>
<td>v118 Gender</td>
<td>v118 Gender</td>
<td>v91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v118 Gender</td>
<td>v119 Panel Case</td>
<td>v119 Panel Case</td>
<td>v91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v119 Panel Case</td>
<td>v120 Respondent Remember Being Called Last Year</td>
<td>v120 Respondent Remember Being Called Last Year</td>
<td>v120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v120 Respondent Remember Being Called Last Year</td>
<td>v121 Area Code of Phone Number</td>
<td>v121 Area Code of Phone Number</td>
<td>v121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v121 Area Code of Phone Number</td>
<td>v122 The First 3 Digits of the Phone Number</td>
<td>v122 The First 3 Digits of the Phone Number</td>
<td>v122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v122 The First 3 Digits of the Phone Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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