
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
FRANCES PERKINS, Secretary
CHILDREN'S BUREAU . . . KATHARINE F. LENROOT, Chief



JUNIOR PLACEMENT

*A Survey of Junior-Placement Offices in Public
Employment Centers and in Public-School
Systems of the United States*

BY
JANE H. PALMER



Bureau Publication No. 256

United States
Government Printing Office
Washington : 1940

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C. Price 15 cents

**This page is blank in the
original document.**

CONTENTS

	Page
Letter of transmittal.....	v
Introduction.....	1
Scope and method of the study.....	4
Questionnaire survey.....	5
Field survey.....	6
Junior-placement offices in the United States.....	7
Auspices.....	9
Functional organization.....	10
The youth served.....	11
The offices visited—their organization and the youth they served.....	14
Organization.....	16
Character of the applicant group.....	18
Recruiting policies.....	19
Registration procedure.....	21
Purpose of the interview.....	21
Classification for placement.....	23
Interviewing facilities and division of responsibility.....	25
Maintenance of active registration status.....	26
Supplementary information on the applicant.....	27
Proof of age.....	27
Personal-interest blanks.....	28
Tests.....	28
School records.....	32
Employer references.....	36
Health records.....	38
Records of other agencies.....	40
Registration records.....	42
The registration card.....	42
Registration files.....	49
Cross-references.....	49
Classification records.....	51
Supplementary files.....	51
Supplementary lists.....	52
Visible-index files.....	53
Relation to registration files.....	53
Clearance of files.....	54
Removal and transfer of records.....	56
Guidance program.....	58
The role of the junior counselor.....	58
Use of the interview.....	59
Counseling resources.....	60
Use of guidance specialists.....	62
Use of school facilities.....	64
Other guidance and training facilities.....	66

	Page
Solicitation of employers' orders.....	67
Methods.....	68
Maintenance of contacts with employers.....	69
Policies and problems of coordination.....	70
Records.....	72
Receipt and filling of employers' orders.....	78
Receipt and routing of orders.....	78
Records of employers' orders.....	81
Investigation of establishments.....	81
Substandard jobs.....	85
Selection of applicants.....	85
Initial selection.....	86
Final selection.....	87
Other methods of selection.....	89
Clearance of orders.....	90
Notification of the applicant.....	91
Referral.....	92
Verification of placement.....	94
Follow-up of placements.....	95
Purpose of follow-up.....	96
Methods of follow-up.....	98
Follow-up through employers.....	98
Follow-up through applicants.....	101
Special applicant groups.....	105
Applicants for housework.....	105
Handicapped applicants.....	109
Applicants associated with the schools.....	112
High-school graduates.....	112
Pupils enrolled in the schools.....	113
Applicants placed as apprentices.....	114
Applicants placed in the Civilian Conservation Corps.....	115
Other types of applicants.....	116
Services other than placement.....	117
Services in regard to curriculum changes.....	117
Special guidance services.....	119
Assistance to law-enforcing agencies.....	120
The counseling staff.....	121
Personnel.....	122
Salaries.....	123
In-service training.....	124
The public-school system and the public employment office in a program of junior placement.....	127
Summary.....	129
Appendix A.—Junior-placement and counseling services within public employment offices, 1937-39.....	133
Appendix B.—List of selected readings on junior placement.....	134

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
CHILDREN'S BUREAU,
Washington, March 25, 1940.

MADAM: There is transmitted herewith Junior Placement; a survey of junior-placement offices in public employment centers and in public-school systems of the United States. The survey was undertaken at the request of the United States Employment Service. The work was begun early in 1937, during a period of rapid expansion in the number of special placement services for young and inexperienced applicants. It follows an earlier survey in the same field which was made in 1922 and reported in Children's Bureau Publication No. 149, Vocational Guidance and Junior Placement.

The Children's Bureau acknowledges with appreciation the assistance and cooperation given by the officials in charge of junior-placement services and their staff members who furnished information to the Children's Bureau concerning the operation of these services. The Bureau is indebted also to the National Youth Administration and to the Employment Service Division of the Bureau of Employment Security in the Social Security Board (formerly the United States Employment Service) for advice and suggestions on the plan of study and the presentation of the material.

The survey was planned and carried on under the general direction of Beatrice McConnell, Director of the Industrial Division of the Children's Bureau, and was supervised by Elizabeth S. Johnson, Assistant Director in Charge of Research in that Division. The field work was conducted and the report written by Jane H. Palmer.

Respectfully submitted.

KATHARINE F. LENROOT, *Chief.*

HON. FRANCES PERKINS,
Secretary of Labor.

▼

JUNIOR PLACEMENT

+

INTRODUCTION

The young person who has left school and must soon assume the responsibilities of adult life needs the opportunity to exercise and develop his abilities and to carry the responsibility that a job can offer him if he is to achieve a full and satisfactory life. But if his job is to offer this opportunity it must be one that will bring personal satisfaction through being in line with his interests, ambitions, and abilities; that will not impose an undue burden on his health and strength; and that will afford him an adequate wage.

The search for suitable employment, never an easy one for the inexperienced worker, has become more and more difficult during recent years; many young persons, failing to find a place in the working world, have been faced with a situation at best perplexing and often tragic. The gravity of this problem of unemployment among the youth of the country is suggested by figures available from the 1937 national census of unemployment. This census indicated that almost 4 million young persons 16 and under 25 years of age were unemployed in November 1937 and that these young persons comprised more than one-third (37 percent) of all unemployed persons 16 and under 65 years of age. The proportion unemployed among all young persons 16 and under 25 years of age employed or available for employment (30 percent) was nearly twice as high as was the case among persons 25 and under 65 years of age (17 percent).¹

Concern over the employment needs of youth during the past decade not only has focused attention on the need for more jobs for young workers but has also brought increasing interest in the need for placement services through which they can be helped to obtain employment that it suited to their interests and abilities. Moreover, the contractions and shifts in employment opportunities during this period have led to increased interest in vocational guidance, not only for young persons still in school but for young men and women entering upon occupational life. This growing concern over the need

¹ These figures have been calculated from data presented in the Census of Partial Employment, Unemployment, and Occupations: 1937, Final Report, vol. 4, Enumerative Check Census, p. 12, table 7; p. 22, table 7; and p. 141, table 72. The census estimated the number of totally unemployed persons (including emergency workers) 15 and under 25 years of age as 3,923,000. Correction of this figure to eliminate the 15-year-old group gives an estimated total of 3,844,000 unemployed persons 16 and under 25 years of age.

to assist young persons to find employment that is particularly suited to their capacities and interests has resulted in a marked increase in the number of services set up expressly for the purpose of placing young applicants in employment.

Junior-placement work as a special service for young applicants had its beginning more than 20 years ago. The earliest offices were established under the supervision of private agencies concerned with helping young people make the transition from school to work. Placement programs started in this way were the forerunners of at least two large junior-placement offices (in Boston and New York City) which were operating at the time of this study. In each of these cities the placement program was later taken over in whole or in part by the local public-school system or by the local public employment service. In other cities also public schools and public employment offices have been responsible for most of the junior-placement work done during the past 15 or 20 years.

Before 1930 much of the junior-placement work carried on throughout the country was sponsored by public-school systems. The first of these were established in 1915 in Boston and in 1916 in Philadelphia. Public employment services entered the field in 1917 when a junior division was established in Cleveland, Ohio, and when a law was passed in New York State providing for the organization of juvenile employment bureaus in the State department of labor. It is estimated that by 1930 public-school systems and public employment services of at least 30 cities in the United States had developed or were in the process of developing specialized junior-placement offices.²

It was after 1930 that the number of these specialized offices began to assume its present proportions; during 1936 alone it more than doubled. Most of the expansion during these 6 years occurred within the public-employment-office system and was due largely to funds which became available through two Federal agencies during this period. The Wagner-Peyser Act, approved June 6, 1933, contained a provision that funds appropriated by States or their local subdivisions for public-employment services might be matched with money from Federal sources and so made it possible for employment offices to enlarge the sphere of their activities and improve the caliber of their service by introducing special placement techniques for juniors and for other applicant groups presenting special placement problems. Later, in 1936, further expansion was made possible through the guidance and placement program of the National Youth Administration, which cooperated with many public employment offices and assisted them by adding to their staffs special placement workers

² This estimate is based on information obtained by the Children's Bureau in the course of the present study and on the report of an earlier survey of junior placement made by the Children's Bureau in 1922 (*Vocational Guidance and Junior Placement*, Children's Bureau Pub. No. 149, Washington, 1925).

whose full time could be given to the registration and placement of junior applicants.

The staff members of these and other junior-placement offices have found that the immaturity and inexperience of the average junior applicant create many problems that are different from those presented by adults and that special procedures are therefore necessary if the placement office is to serve its junior applicants effectively. In the case of most adult applicants maturity and previous work experience furnish reliable evidence of the kinds of work in which suitable placement may be made. Many junior applicants, on the other hand, are lacking in both these respects; others, who have had a limited amount of previous work experience, have been employed on jobs unrelated to their real interests and abilities. Since comparatively few junior applicants have any substantial amount of work experience to serve as a guide in placing them, placement workers find it desirable to give special attention to abilities, personality characteristics, education, and plans for the future. And since going to work is an entirely new experience for many young applicants, placement workers are concerned also in following up the young worker's progress on the job and in helping him to adapt himself to this new situation. It is the emphasis placed on these aspects of the placement program that most distinguishes junior- from adult-placement work.

SCOPE AND METHOD OF THE STUDY

The present study was undertaken by the Children's Bureau at the request of the United States Employment Service.¹ Its purpose is to report on the specialized techniques which placement workers have developed in their work with junior applicants and to ascertain the extent to which specialized junior-placement services have been organized throughout the country. It is concerned with the placement programs and the employment-office procedures that have been developed expressly for junior applicants as distinct from adults.

At the outset it was apparent that a survey of the junior-placement work that was being carried on under all kinds of auspices would not be feasible because of the difficulty of canvassing all the various types of agencies that might sponsor such placement programs. Inasmuch as most of this work was under the direction of State and federally supervised public employment offices and public-school systems, the survey was directed only toward offices operating under the auspices of one or the other of these two types of agency and does not include the limited number of specialized placement services sponsored by various types of social agencies.

The criterion adopted for identifying these specialized junior-placement programs was one of staff. Inasmuch as staff members whose major responsibility was junior placement were considered most likely to have developed specialized procedures for this group of applicants, the survey was limited to employment offices in which one or more staff members devoted full time to work with juniors. Accordingly, it does not touch upon the junior-placement work done by public employment offices in which each interviewer registered and placed applicants of all ages, usually according to the same general procedures, nor upon the work done in many public schools in which

¹ The U. S. Employment Service was formerly in the Department of Labor. In July 1939 its functions were transferred to the Social Security Board in the Federal Security Agency. It is now the Employment Service Division of the Bureau of Employment Security in the Social Security Board.

placement of young persons was incidental to the established programs of those agencies.²

Two methods of approach were used in making the study: First, information was obtained in regard to the location and the nature of specialized junior-placement services by means of a questionnaire distributed on a Nation-wide basis; and second, through observation and consultation in a group of selected offices, a study was made of the special problems encountered in junior-placement work and the procedures that placement workers have developed to meet these problems.

Questionnaire Survey

The questionnaire was distributed in February 1937 to superintendents of public-school systems and, through directors of State employment services, to managers of all public employment offices maintaining separate divisions for junior registrants. These officials were asked to report on any junior-placement services, staffed by persons giving full time to this work, that were operating under their supervision during all or a part of the year 1936. This information was solicited from all cities with a population of 10,000 or more and from all school districts of the same size. It did not seem practicable to canvass smaller communities since it seemed unlikely that they would have felt a need to establish full-time placement offices.³

Replies to the questionnaire were received from the public employment services in all 48 States and the District of Columbia and from public-school systems in 908, or 92.2 percent, of the 985 cities in which public-school superintendents were asked to furnish this information. Full-time junior-placement offices were reported by 21 public-school systems, or 2.3 percent of the 908 answering the inquiry, and by 51, or 7.9 percent, of the 645 public employment offices which were operating at that time in cities with a population over 10,000. In addition, 1 public employment office reported a service for junior applicants operating in a suburban county area with a population of

² It is recognized that the number of public-school systems and public employment offices whose junior-placement programs fall within the scope of this survey represents only a small proportion of the total number of public schools and public employment offices offering placement assistance to young applicants.

In practically all public schools, teachers and other staff members were placing at least some young persons in employment. In many cases this work was incidental to other programs and was confined almost entirely to occasional referrals made at the request of prospective employers. In addition, there were unquestionably some schools with well-organized placement programs which were outside the scope of this survey because the staff members doing placement gave a substantial amount of their time to other activities also—educational and vocational guidance of pupils, coordination of part-time vocational education with part-time employment in related trades, and enforcement of school-attendance laws.

Almost all public employment offices without separate junior divisions also placed junior applicants in employment, and the interviewers in those offices gave varying amounts of their time to this applicant group. In a few of these offices, special programs for juniors had been developed by assigning the registration of all juniors to one interviewer who gave a part of his time to this work and the rest of it to work with adult registrants.

³ The U. S. Employment Service reported no community of less than 10,000 population in which the public employment office maintained a special division for junior applicants during the year 1936.

60,000 just outside New York City, where the junior-placement worker conducted the program on an itinerant basis.

The questionnaire included inquiries about the organization of each of these placement offices and the procedures followed in registering and placing junior applicants. Much of the information obtained from each office in this way was necessarily lacking in detail and, in some cases, lacking also in comparability with information returned by other offices. In the latter connection it was apparent that junior-placement workers sometimes differed among themselves in the meanings they ascribed to some terms commonly used in placement work, as for instance, "follow-up."⁴ In other cases differences in methods of statistical reporting made it impossible to obtain data on a comparable basis even for such important items as the number of new applicants registered and the number of placements effected.

For these reasons this report places little emphasis on the procedural and statistical information obtained through use of the questionnaire. Nevertheless, these data have been invaluable in furnishing an over-all picture of junior-placement work in the country at large and have proved useful both as a guide in selecting the offices to be visited for further study and as a check on the degree to which the procedures followed by those offices were representative of practices elsewhere in the country.

Field Survey

The major part of the findings of this report are based on a field study of 12 offices visited in the fall and winter of 1937 and early 1938, after the questionnaire survey. These offices were the junior divisions of the public employment services of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Cincinnati, Ohio, Concord, N. H., District of Columbia, Durham, N. C., New York, N. Y., Rochester, N. Y., Rockland County, N. Y., the school placement services of Atlantic City, N. J., Detroit, Mich., and Essex County, N. J., and the junior-placement service in Philadelphia, Pa., which was operated under the joint supervision of the Pennsylvania State Employment Service and the public-school system of Philadelphia.⁵

⁴ In referring to different phases of employment-office procedure this report adheres to the terms generally used by placement services affiliated with the U. S. Employment Service.

⁵ Visits were made as follows: Fall and winter of 1937, Atlantic City, Concord, District of Columbia, Durham, Essex County, New York City, Rochester, Rockland County; winter and early spring of 1938, Cedar Rapids, Cincinnati, Detroit, Philadelphia.

JUNIOR-PLACEMENT OFFICES IN THE UNITED STATES

The Children's Bureau received, through its questionnaire survey, reports from 73 public-school systems and public employment offices which were operating junior-placement services of the type that came within the scope of this study, namely, offices in which one or more junior counselors¹ devoted substantially all their time to the placement of young people who were about to leave school or had already done so. These 73 offices represent all junior divisions that were functioning as a part of public employment services on December 31, 1936, and all full-time offices being operated on that date by public-school systems that returned questionnaires. Inasmuch as 92.2 percent of the public-school systems canvassed reported to the Children's Bureau on their placement programs, it may be assumed that the 73 offices constitute virtually all services of this type in the United States at the time of this survey.²

The cities in which these 73 offices were located and the number of staff members reported for each office are given on pages 8 and 9. The offices ranged in size from agencies in which 1 junior counselor assumed entire responsibility for all phases of junior-placement work (19 offices) to the large city organizations in Philadelphia and New York City, each of which was staffed with more than 25 workers. Inasmuch as a few of the 73 services operated several branch offices for junior applicants within a city-wide placement system, the separate offices maintained for junior applicants numbered approximately 100. For the purposes of this report, however, each city placement system is termed a single junior-placement service or office irrespective of the number of its branch offices.

Two-thirds of these offices were in metropolitan areas reported by the census of 1930 to have a population of 100,000 or more. Even so, junior applicants were offered this kind of assistance in placement in less than half of the 93 cities of that size in the country. Less than a tenth of the 283 cities with a population of 25,000 to 100,000 and only a fraction of 1 percent of those smaller than that were provided with similar services.

¹ The term "junior counselor" was most generally used to designate the staff members working with junior applicants in these placement services and accordingly has been adopted throughout this report. Other titles such as "adviser" and "interviewer" were also used.

² The results of a later survey of the extent to which junior counseling and placement services had been developed within public employment offices are given in appendix A (p. 129).

JUNIOR PLACEMENT

PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT OFFICES

<i>City</i>	<i>Number of staff members (full time and part time) working with junior applicants</i>	<i>City</i>	<i>Number of staff members (full time and part time) working with junior applicants</i>
Cities with 100,000 or more population:		Cities with 25,000 to 100,000 population: ¹	
Albany, N. Y.....	2	Binghamton, N. Y.....	1
Birmingham, Ala.....	3	Cedar Rapids, Iowa.....	1
Boston, Mass.....	7	Charlotte, N. C.....	4
Bridgeport, Conn.....	2	Concord, N. H.....	2
Buffalo, N. Y.....	10	Council Bluffs, Iowa.....	1
Chicago, Ill.....	17	Danville, Ill.....	2
Cincinnati, Ohio.....	7	Davenport, Iowa.....	2
Cleveland, Ohio.....	4	Decatur, Ill.....	3
Columbus, Ohio.....	1	Dubuque, Iowa.....	1
Des Moines, Iowa.....	1	Durham, N. C.....	3
Fort Worth, Tex.....	3	East St. Louis, Ill.....	5
Hartford, Conn.....	2	Joliet, Ill.....	4
Indianapolis, Ind.....	6	Little Rock, Ark.....	2
Jacksonville, Fla.....	3	Manchester, N. H.....	1
Jersey City, N. J.....	3	Nashua, N. H.....	2
Louisville, Ky.....	5	Pawtucket, R. I.....	1
Miami, Fla.....	2	Rockford, Ill.....	3
New Haven, Conn.....	2	Rockland County, N. Y.....	2
New Orleans, La.....	3	Sioux City, Iowa.....	1
New York, N. Y.....	62	Springfield, Ill.....	2
Omaha, Nebr.....	2	Waterloo, Iowa.....	1
Rochester, N. Y.....	8	Cities with 10,000 to 25,000 pop- ulation:	
San Francisco, Calif.....	16	Fort Dodge, Iowa.....	1
Springfield, Mass.....	3		
Syracuse, N. Y.....	5		
Tampa, Fla.....	2		
Tulsa, Okla.....	1		
Utica, N. Y.....	3		
Washington, D. C.....	13		
Worcester, Mass.....	4		

¹ Includes Rockland County, N. Y., where the junior counselor worked on an itinerant basis in each of the county high schools.

JUNIOR-PLACEMENT OFFICES IN THE UNITED STATES

9

PUBLIC-SCHOOL OFFICES

<i>City</i>	<i>Number of staff members (full time and part time) working with junior applicants</i>	<i>City</i>	<i>Number of staff members (full time and part time) working with junior applicants</i>
Cities with 100,000 or more population: ²		Cities with 100,000 or more population—Continued.	
Baltimore, Md.....	2	Portland, Oreg.....	12
Boston, Mass.....	13	Providence, R. I. ²	8
Chicago, Ill.....	1	St. Paul, Minn.....	1
Detroit, Mich.....	10	San Francisco, Calif.....	2
Indianapolis, Ind.....	2	Seattle, Wash.....	3
Los Angeles, Calif. ²	7	Cities with 25,000 to 100,000 population:	
Milwaukee, Wis.....	5	Atlantic City, N. J.....	2
New Orleans, La.....	1	Mount Vernon, N. Y.....	1
New York, N. Y.....	33	Rockford, Ill.....	1
Newark, N. J. (Essex County).....	8	Cities with 10,000 to 25,000 pop- ulation:	
Philadelphia, Pa. ²	35	Royal Oak, Mich.....	1
Pittsburgh, Pa.....	1		

² Affiliated with the U. S. Employment Service.

Auspices

Fifty-two, or nearly three-fourths of the 73 services, were organized as junior divisions of local public employment offices and 21 operated as special services of local public-school systems, 3 of the latter being affiliated also with their respective State employment services. In all, these 73 placement offices served 66 county or municipal areas; in 59 of these areas the work was conducted either by the public-school system or by the public employment service or as a joint undertaking of both agencies, and in the remaining 7 areas separate and independent placement offices serving approximately the same districts were maintained by each of these 2 agencies.³

Junior-placement work, organized directly under the auspices of one or the other of these two agencies, was often financed in part or wholly by funds received from outside sources, and to some extent the counselors in these offices were responsible to other agencies as well as to the organization which exercised immediate supervision over their work. Thus, the work of all junior divisions in public employment centers was supervised by the managers of those employment centers and through them by the directors of their respective State employment services and by the United States Employment Service, and a large proportion of these junior divisions were subject also to supervision and guidance from other agencies which furnished a part of the funds for their work. The National Youth Administration was the outside agency making the largest contribution to this work; 33, or almost two-thirds, of the 52 junior divisions in public employment

³ Boston, Mass., Chicago, Ill., Indianapolis, Ind., New Orleans, La., New York, N. Y., Rockford, Ill., San Francisco, Calif.

offices received financial support and guidance in their junior programs from this source. Other Federal agencies such as the National Re-employment Service and the Works Progress Administration also financed some of the work in public employment offices.

To a somewhat lesser extent, public-school offices also were financed by and responsible to agencies other than the local public-school system. In most of them the junior-placement program was under the ultimate direction of the superintendent of the city public-school system, with immediate supervision exercised most frequently by the school director of guidance or the principal of the school in which the office was located. The placement services in Los Angeles, Philadelphia, and Providence operated under affiliation agreements with the United States Employment Service, which matched school appropriations for junior placement with funds from Federal sources and which shared in the supervision of the placement program.⁴ The work in five other school offices⁵ also was financed in part by agencies other than the local school system, by Federal agencies such as the National Youth Administration, and by private agencies in the community.

Functional Organization

Functionally the 73 offices represented two types of placement service for junior applicants. The great majority operated as complete placement units with responsibility for all phases of the junior-placement program. Each registered its own junior-applicant group and maintained a special file of its junior registrations, solicited openings from employers in its community, selected and referred applicants for job orders received, and handled whatever special follow-up of applicants was undertaken after placement. Replies to the questionnaire indicated that all but 6 of the 73 junior services operated in this way. Although those that were affiliated with public employment centers did, to some extent, share employers' orders and information about establishments and agencies in their communities with the other placement divisions of the employment centers with which they were affiliated, each assumed responsibility for placing its junior applicants in employment, and basically each operated as a complete placement unit.

The six junior services⁶ that did not function in this way were all junior divisions in public employment offices that indicated on their questionnaires that they carried only part of the responsibility for placing their junior applicants. The junior counselors in each of

⁴ The placement programs in Los Angeles, Philadelphia, and Providence are classified as school services because, although financed in part by the public employment system at the time of this survey, they were initiated by the school systems of those cities and have continued to operate in close relationship to those school systems.

⁵ Atlantic City, N. J., Detroit, Mich., Portland, Oreg., St. Paul, Minn., Seattle, Wash.

⁶ Chicago, Ill., Cincinnati, Ohio, Danville, Ill., Decatur, Ill., Indianapolis, Ind., District of Columbia.

these junior divisions were responsible for determining the interests and abilities of junior registrants, but staff members in other divisions of their respective employment centers were in charge of a part or all of the placement procedure itself. Thus, in these six public employment centers the regular procedures followed for applicants of all ages were supplemented, in the case of juniors, with special services which the staff of the junior division rendered chiefly in connection with counseling and registration. These junior services have been called "functional junior divisions," and in this report they will be distinguished as such from the complete placement units. While the relationships between functional divisions and other divisions of their employment centers varied somewhat from one office to another, no functional division carried responsibility for all aspects of junior placement to the same degree as did the complete junior-placement unit.

The Youth Served

Most of the 73 offices accepted all applicants who resided within the districts they served and whose age qualified them to register as juniors. The area served by each public employment office usually included several counties adjacent to the city in which the office was located; school offices, on the other hand, were usually organized to serve residents of their city school districts. Almost without exception the juniors registered by both types of placement service were young persons above the minimum legal age for employment (14 or 16 years) and under 21 or 22 years of age; half of the 73 offices extended their services to young persons up to 25 years of age as well, particularly when applicants in this upper age group had had no substantial amount of previous work experience.

Sixty of the seventy-three junior offices accepted all registrants who met their age and residence requirements. Twelve, or approximately one-sixth of the total number, imposed further restrictions. Six public employment offices limited the specialized services of their junior divisions to boys, or to white applicants, and persons not qualifying in these respects were registered and placed by adult interviewers according to the usual adult procedures. The other six offices, which were operated by public-school systems, limited the groups served on the basis of educational background or race; two had been organized primarily for the purpose of placing the graduates of their respective school systems who had completed vocational-training courses and they confined their work almost entirely to this particular Group.

The questionnaire included an inquiry about the nature of the applicant group reached and a request for statistical information on the

numbers registered and placed during 1936. Unfortunately, comparable data were not always available, and any statistical report of the work of these offices must necessarily be far from complete. Public employment offices and the public-school office in Philadelphia, all of which were affiliated with the United States Employment Service, did report uniformly on certain aspects of their placement work,⁷ but other public-school offices, which were without this kind of central affiliation, had developed a variety of reporting methods. Furthermore, many of these school offices were very closely coordinated with school programs of guidance and vocational training, and a statistical report of their registrations and placements therefore falls far short of representing the services they were performing in their respective communities.

Statistical information reported by 67 public-school and public employment offices shows 200,198 new applicants and 93,361 placements during 1936. The distribution between boys and girls is shown in table 1 for each type of office. Although a slight difference was apparent in the percentage of each sex served by public employment offices and public-school offices, boys made up a majority of the young people registered in both types of office. In the 51 public employment offices reporting, 58 percent of the total applicant group were boys and 60 percent of all placements made were for boys. In the 16 school offices reporting, boys constituted 51 percent of all applicants and 44 percent of all placements made were for boys. Thus school offices appeared not only to be reaching a slightly larger proportion of girl registrants than were public employment offices but also to be making a greater proportion of their placements for this applicant group.

TABLE 1.—*New applicants and placements reported by 67 junior-placement offices, 1936*

New applicants and placements	Total		51 public employment offices		16 public-school offices	
	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution
New applicants.....	200,198	100.0	128,786	100.0	71,412	100.0
Boys.....	111,979	55.9	75,205	58.4	36,774	51.5
Girls.....	88,219	44.1	53,581	41.6	34,638	48.5
Placements.....	93,361	100.0	62,552	100.0	30,809	100.0
Boys.....	50,964	54.6	37,332	59.7	13,632	44.2
Girls.....	42,397	45.4	25,220	40.3	17,177	55.8

⁷ Complete statistical reports of the service extended junior applicants by all public employment offices affiliated with the U. S. Employment Service, including those without separate junior divisions, are presented in the publications of that agency: *Who Are the Job Seekers* (1937) and *Filling Five Million Jobs* (1937).

The difference in the type of applicant served by these two types of office was considerably greater with respect to the amount of time elapsing between the youth's withdrawal from full-time day school and his registration at the placement service. Owing no doubt to the fact that they were operated in conjunction with their school programs of guidance and vocational training, school offices were attracting comparatively large numbers of young people who were about to withdraw from school or had recently done so. Public employment offices, which are less closely linked with public-school systems, tended to register a correspondingly large number of young people who had been out of school for some time. Fourteen school offices and 48 junior divisions of public employment services reported by questionnaire on the proportions of their registrants who had recently withdrawn from school. Ten of the fourteen school offices estimated that 80 percent or more of these juniors had been enrolled in school within 9 months before registration. Only 6 of the 48 public employment offices reported such a large proportion. Five public employment offices estimated that this group made up less than 20 percent of their applicants, while none of the school offices placed their estimate at such a low figure. This difference in the recency of withdrawal from school appeared to be the most significant difference between applicants served by schools and those served by public employment offices.

THE OFFICES VISITED—THEIR ORGANIZATION AND THE YOUTH THEY SERVED

The major part of this report deals with the procedures followed in the 12 offices studied in the field. The development of the placement programs in these selected offices was undoubtedly influenced to a great extent by the character of the communities and of the applicant groups they served and by the manner in which they were organized, and a knowledge of these basic factors is necessary to a full understanding of the procedures which they had developed. Information about the size of each office visited, the agency sponsoring it, and the community in which it was located is presented briefly in table 2. Other characteristics of each of these 12 offices should be noted also before considering the procedures which each had developed.

TABLE 2.—*Junior-placement offices and branch offices visited*

Location of office	Population of city ¹	Date of organization of specialized junior service	Number of new applicants, 1936	Number of placements, 1936	Number of full-time staff members, 1936	
					Junior counselors	Clerical workers
Public employment offices:						
Cedar Rapids, Iowa.....	56,097	1936	1,012	460	1	3
Cincinnati, Ohio.....	451,160	1934	7,447	1,796	3	1
Concord, N. H.....	25,228	1936	520	638	1	1
Durham, N. C. (2 branch offices).....	52,037	1936	1,910	1,373	2	1
New York, N. Y. (2 branch offices).....	6,930,446	1918	17,011	7,024	17	6
Rochester, N. Y.....	328,132	1929	3,558	3,485	5	1
Rockland County, N. Y.....	59,599	1934	569	459	1	1
Washington, D. C.....	486,869	1935	3,803	1,403	3	3
Public-school offices:						
Atlantic City, N. J.....	66,198	1932	638	402	1	1
Detroit, Mich. (1 branch office).....	1,568,662	1921	² 12,304	² 6,746	6	2
Newark, N. J. (Essex County).....	442,337	1925	5,619	2,595	3	5
Philadelphia, Pa. ³ (4 branch offices).....	1,950,961	1916	15,932	3,683	12	15

¹ According to the 1930 census. Population of the county is given for Rockland County, N. Y., where the junior counselor worked on an itinerant basis in each of the county high schools.

² Includes applicants served in both branch offices, only one of which was visited.

³ Affiliated with the U. S. Employment Service.

All but 4 of the offices had been operating for at least 3 years at the time they were visited. Since their programs were the result of a longer period of practical experience in junior-placement work than was the case in many junior offices elsewhere, their procedures may be well considered among the most effective in use at the time this

study was made.¹ However, the methods found effective by any one of these offices cannot necessarily be applied with equal success to all types of junior-placement organizations. The communities in which these 12 offices were located differed in population, in industrial composition, and in the service agencies available for work with young people. The individual offices visited were affiliated with two types of supervising organizations, functioned in different capacities within those organizations, and maintained applicant files which ranged from a few hundred in some offices to more than 10,000 in others. At one extreme was Atlantic City, with a population of approximately 70,000, commercial activity that centered around the resort trade, and a junior-placement office located in the boys' vocational school, where the counselor had frequent contact with many students who later came to him for placement. At the other extreme was New York City, a metropolitan center with a great variety of business and industrial enterprises, where the public employment system maintained 6 large branch junior-placement offices and had access to the services of many other agencies working with young people in the city.

In these and in other cities visited the nature and resources of the community sometimes exerted a marked influence upon the program of the placement office. Thus in the school office in Detroit the special procedures followed for applicants being considered for apprenticeship in large industrial establishments were unlike any procedures observed elsewhere. In other cities, where special services such as psychological clinics were not available through other agencies in the community, placement offices themselves had found it necessary to assume responsibility for those services; and in still other cities, where exceptionally useful records such as school guidance records were available through other agencies, some counselors placed considerable emphasis on the procedures necessary to effect a transfer of these records to the placement office.

In adapting their placement programs to the communities they served, counselors in some of the offices visited had developed methods and procedures which were entirely dissimilar. This was particularly true of the independently organized school offices, which were without centralized supervision that might have served to unify their placement programs; but even in those offices that were a part of local and national public employment systems and that followed the same basic policies and reporting methods counselors were usually free to adapt their programs to the special needs of the communities they served.

¹ Where procedures observed in the course of the field study appeared to be markedly different from the methods which other placement services reported by questionnaire, that fact is noted in later sections of this report.

Only within certain limits, therefore, may the placement procedures followed by the offices visited be considered typical of junior-placement practices throughout the country. The communities which these 12 offices served were representative of urban centers in the country at large, and counselors on their staffs found themselves dealing with much the same kinds of problems as counselors elsewhere. The 12 offices were representative also of practically all types of organizational set-up reported by offices elsewhere which returned questionnaires; and many of them, as members of State- and Nation-wide public employment services, were following the same basic policies and procedures as outlined by their supervising agencies and as developed with the aid of the field representatives of those agencies.

Organization

Seven² of the twelve offices visited operated as junior divisions of public employment centers and through them were affiliated with their respective State employment services and with the United States Employment Service. An eighth junior office was a part of the District of Columbia public employment center, which was under the direct supervision of the United States Employment Service. These eight offices followed basic policies and procedures outlined for public employment offices by the United States Employment Service, and some of them in which junior-placement work was financed by the National Youth Administration conformed also to the procedures outlined by that agency. Some offices, like those in New York State, operated under the direction of State supervisors of junior placement and followed special junior procedures developed for use in all offices throughout the State area.

The four other offices visited were sponsored by public-school systems, and each operated somewhat more independently than was generally the case in public employment services. Of these, the junior services in Atlantic City and in Detroit were conducted by the boards of education of these cities, while a third office, located in Newark, was supervised and financed by the board of education of the Essex County vocational schools. The fourth school office visited was the junior-employment service of Philadelphia. Originally established and conducted by the public schools of that city, in 1934 this junior service entered into an affiliation agreement with the United States Employment Service, and although it continued to operate in close relationship with the city public schools thereafter the Pennsylvania State employment service also exercised supervision over its program.

² Cedar Rapids, Cincinnati, Concord, Durham, New York City, Rochester, Rockland County.

The 12 offices included both types of functional organization that have been discussed. Ten³ operated as complete placement units and were responsible for all phases of the placement procedure. Two served as functional junior divisions in the public employment centers in Cincinnati and in the District of Columbia, other divisions of those employment centers sharing some of the responsibility for the placement of junior applicants. Since these 2 offices differed in their relationships with other divisions of their respective employment centers, and since reference will be made to their special problems and procedures in later sections of this report, the organization of each is outlined briefly at this point.

In the Cincinnati employment center the registration divisions, of which the junior division was one, were separate from the divisions through which applicants of all ages were placed. Thus the junior division was responsible for the registration of young applicants only. All selections of persons qualified to fill employers' orders and all referrals and placements were subsequently made by staff members in other divisions responsible for placement, each of which handled applicants of all ages seeking employment in a specified field of work. The registration records of junior applicants were therefore filed, not in the junior office itself as they were in the complete placement unit, but in a central registration file which also contained the records of adult applicants.

A somewhat different division of responsibility for junior applicants existed in the District of Columbia public employment center, where the junior division was essentially a counseling service through which junior applicants were given the guidance to which their youth and inexperience entitled them before they were referred for registration and placement to other divisions, known as operating divisions, which handled applicants of all ages.⁴ Whereas in Cincinnati all records were filed centrally, in the District of Columbia each operating division kept its own records. The records of junior applicants which were filed in each operating division contained only that information about the applicant which was especially useful in view of the type of placement made by each operating division. In addition, the junior division maintained a file of master records giving full information on each junior applicant; these the counselors used mainly for

³ Atlantic City, Cedar Rapids, Concord, Detroit, Durham, Essex County, New York City, Philadelphia, Rockland County, Rochester.

⁴ In January 1938, when unemployment compensation went into effect in the District of Columbia and shortly after the office there was visited, the relationship of the junior division to the operating divisions of the public employment center changed somewhat. Since that date, junior counselors in the District of Columbia have been responsible for completing the registrations of all junior applicants, assigning them to suitable classifications, and then routing their records to the operating divisions responsible for placement. The District of Columbia procedures described in this report, therefore, are not the same, in all respects, as those being followed at the present time.

counseling purposes and occasionally when asked to do so by operating divisions, for selecting applicants to fill job orders.⁵

Character of the Applicant Group

The 12 selected offices were organized to serve applicant groups substantially the same as those registered by most junior-placement services in other parts of the country. The usual restrictions in regard to the residence of applicants were observed. None of these services as a whole made sex, race, or education a qualifying factor in connection with their acceptance of registrants, but the separate branch offices maintained by some of them did so. Branches in Philadelphia and New York served areas which were districted; the 2 offices in Durham served white and Negro applicants, respectively; and of the 2 Detroit school offices 1 served applicants from Wayne University and the other, considerably larger in size, served a junior group drawn from the city as a whole and generally younger and less highly specialized in educational background.

All 12 offices had set up certain age requirements. Registration as a junior applicant was open usually to young persons between 16 and 21 years of age. In many offices there was also provision for handling the registrations of inexperienced young persons who were above this age.⁶ A few offices also placed registrants 14 and 15 years old, particularly in part-time and temporary employment.

It was evident that many counselors felt it undesirable to adhere too closely to age and residence requirements. In the actual conduct of their work almost all had occasion to register and place young people who did not meet their stated requirements and, in the case of public employment offices, to transfer to adult divisions at least some of the young people who fell within the age limits regularly handled by the junior office. Undoubtedly, the particular group served by the junior office was often described in terms of age and residence because it was most expedient to explain the function of the junior office to the general public in these terms. Moreover, age furnished an indication of the maturity and experience of the prospective applicant himself and attracted to the junior office those who were likely to be most in

⁵ According to information obtained by questionnaire, functional junior divisions of a somewhat different type were operated in Indianapolis and in at least three of the public employment offices in Illinois. None of these were visited in the course of the field survey, but their response to the questionnaire indicated that in these offices, too, the actual referral of junior applicants on job openings was done by staff members who handled registrants of all ages. In each of them, however, junior counselors registered all junior applicants, maintained their own registration file within the junior division, and used it for selection, not occasionally as in the District of Columbia, but as a regular procedure whenever staff members in charge of placement felt that the opening available was suitable for a junior applicant.

⁶ In order to reach older, inexperienced applicants the junior service in New York City had organized one of its six branch offices as a special counseling service (undistricted) for inexperienced applicants between the ages of 21 and 25 years who were placeable in commercial, retailing, and professional work. A plan to establish a similar special service for young applicants desiring work in other fields had not yet been put into operation at the time the New York public employment service was visited in the field.

need of its service. In public employment centers age also proved to be the distinguishing characteristic which was most practical from the point of view of receptionists and other clerical workers who directed applicants of all types to the proper registration divisions.

School offices usually registered all applicants who were within the age range that they served. Inasmuch as these registrants were for the most part lacking in any substantial amount of previous work experience, counselors in some of the offices visited considered it desirable to have in their files also the names of a limited number of older and more experienced applicants who could be referred on openings which they occasionally received for experienced workers. For this reason counselors in school offices registered a limited number of qualified persons above the specified age limits or kept on hand the registrations of former applicants who had passed the upper age limits.

The type of applicant that junior divisions in public employment centers registered and placed was somewhat different from that served by school offices. Junior divisions responsible for the placement as well as the registration of their applicants handled only job orders calling for beginning workers, all orders for jobs requiring experience or skill in trade processes being filled in adult divisions. Thus, the applicant group qualified to fill job orders received by the complete junior division of the public employment office was not an age group, primarily, but rather a group qualified to fill unskilled and beginning jobs. This being the case, counselors in most complete junior divisions not only redirected to adult interviewers a limited number of exceptionally well-qualified juniors who had originally come to the junior division because of their age but also registered in the junior division a few inexperienced older applicants referred to them by adult-placement workers. In this way the applicant group served by many junior divisions in public employment offices was limited to persons who were lacking in any substantial amount of previous work experience and who were placeable only in openings calling for beginning or inexperienced workers.

Recruiting Policies

Most counselors felt it desirable to have among their registrants a wide representation in age, educational background, ability, and experience. Practically all employers with whom they dealt had occasion at one time or another to use a variety of types of junior applicants, and certainly all inexperienced young people, irrespective of background and training, could profit by the specialized service available in the junior-placement office. Most counselors therefore considered that recruiting policies aimed to bring all types of applicants in touch with the junior office were essential to an effective placement service.

At the time of this survey there had for some years been a general scarcity of jobs and a corresponding abundance of applicants. Many counselors had more applicants than they could hope to place within a reasonable period of time and no great effort was necessary to attract persons of varied backgrounds, interests, and training. Frequently, however, an unduly large proportion of these registrants were of mediocre ability—young persons likely always to experience difficulty in obtaining employment. Consequently the limited amount of time counselors gave to organized recruiting was often confined to an effort to reach applicants with somewhat more satisfactory experience or training and with ability that was average or above average. Counselors with whom the matter was discussed reported that they had found that this type of young applicant could best be reached through the graduating classes of the local academic and vocational high schools. Moreover, these prospective graduates were most apt to be lacking in previous work experience and therefore in special need of the kind of placement service available in the junior office.

Each year counselors in the four school offices visited and in five of the eight public employment offices⁷ went into the schools for the purpose of explaining their services to high-school principals and graduating classes and encouraging registration. Many also distributed announcements to be posted in the schools and supplied principals and teachers with cards of introduction and descriptive material to be given young people planning to register at the placement office. In Rockland and Essex Counties the placement service was presented to students in school handbooks and in other literature as part of the school program.

Talks were given before adult groups as well as before school pupils. Indeed, it was the opinion of the counselor in one small community visited that prospective applicants could often be reached much more effectively through their parents than through the schools. Many junior-placement workers therefore found it desirable to explain their services to parent-teacher associations, church groups, and fraternal organizations.

Other methods used to reach potential applicants included newspaper feature articles about the placement office, talks to C. C. C. enrollees at the time when their enlistment periods were about to expire, agreements with employers for referral to the placement office of young people applying at their establishments for work, and the use of the radio for general publicity. In these ways counselors sought to increase their field of usefulness to employers as well as to young people by making their programs known to a diversified group of potential registrants.

⁷ Atlantic City, Cedar Rapids, Detroit, District of Columbia, Durham, Essex County, Philadelphia, Rochester, Rockland County.

REGISTRATION PROCEDURE

The applicant's registration at the placement office is primarily a fact-finding procedure. The counselor needs information that will enable him to determine the kinds of work in which the applicant may be suitably placed, and the applicant on his part needs information about the routine followed by the employment office and his own obligations as a registrant.

Counselors who were interviewed in the course of the field study reported that much of this information was given in the course of interviews with junior registrants at the placement office; in addition, many counselors made it a policy to obtain further data about the applicant's qualifications through the reports of other agencies and individuals in the community who had known him in the past and through objective tests of ability and achievement.

Purpose of the Interview

The applicant's first contact with the placement office usually takes place at the time of his first interview with the counselor. In most cases, therefore, counselors devote considerably more time to the initial interview than they find necessary for subsequent conferences with the applicant, when he is better known to them.

Before registering applicants as available for employment, counselors in the offices visited usually explained to them the services of the placement office and their obligations as registrants. Some also supplied leaflets, which young applicants could read when waiting to be interviewed or could take home and study. The mimeographed folder used for this purpose in Durham is reproduced on page 22; it illustrates the kind of information and suggestions which counselors have found helpful in acquainting applicants with placement services and procedures.

The initial interview also provided the counselor with his first opportunity to ascertain the kind of work the applicant was qualified to do. On the basis of facts obtained from the applicant about his education, past work experience, vocational and avocational interests, and physical and personality characteristics, he was assigned to occupational classifications which would later guide the office in placing him in employment. Occasionally the information supplied by the applicant was too meager to enable the counselor to make an assignment of occupational classification at the time of the first interview,

Information About Junior Service

I. What Is the State Employment Service?

A. The North Carolina State Employment Service is organized for the purpose of helping people to find jobs. No fee is charged, for the State believes in bringing together employers and applicants without cost to either.

B. The State employment service has several divisions each specializing in placing certain kinds of workers, such as professional, commercial, industrial, labor and service, and junior. The junior division is devoted entirely to placing young men and women under 21.

II. What Is Expected of You?

A. The first time you come to the office between the hours of 9 and 1 o'clock you will be registered for work. You will be asked to report on a certain day thereafter so that we may be able to keep in touch with you. It is very necessary that you have a *telephone number* at or near your home so that we can reach you quickly in case we get a job for you. Make arrangements with someone to call you and bring that number in so that it may be placed on your application card.

B. After you get a job, you will be asked to come in some evening to talk it over with us. We want to keep in touch with you even after you are placed so that you may give us accurate information

concerning the nature of your work and we may discuss with you any difficulties in connection with your job.

III. How Do We Work?

You are considered for the job you are best qualified to fill. The applicant who can do best what the employer wants done is given first consideration. If two of you are equally qualified we send the one who has been coming to the office longer and more regularly. This rule must be broken if you cannot be reached by telephone.

IV. General Information.

Although there are more jobs now than there have been in the past few years, you must realize that it will probably take a while for you to get one. You should look *everywhere you can*, but you should also keep in touch with us regularly, no matter how long it takes, until through some source you get a position.

You should keep on preparing yourself for the job you are interested in, even though the possibility of getting that particular job at the present time is remote.

We will be glad to talk over your future work plans with you; and if you are in doubt as to what you want to do, we will be glad to make arrangements for you to take some vocational tests to find out more about your own abilities.

but in most cases some assignment, even though tentative or of a very general nature, could be made at that time. Most counselors made it a policy to discuss these assignments carefully with all applicants and to refrain from assigning any occupational classifications that were not mutually acceptable.

Needless to say, classifications assigned at this or at any other time were always subject to change if additional information on the applicant's abilities made it advisable. Unlike the classification of adult applicants, which could usually be determined readily on the basis of previous work experience, the proper classification of junior applicants often required an investigation of the records of agencies that had dealt with them in the past and several interviews with the counselor at the placement office. Sometimes it was only by the use of these outside sources of information and repeated conferences with the applicant that his inherent interests and abilities could be ascertained.

Classification for Placement

One of the fundamental differences between junior- and adult-placement procedures lies in the systems of occupational classification which have been found useful for these two types of applicants. Many junior counselors have felt that the job categories used in connection with applicants of all ages are better suited to adult registrants than to inexperienced young applicants whose occupational skills are comparatively undeveloped and who may be placeable in a wide variety of beginning jobs.

For this reason junior counselors often classified their applicants in occupational categories that were considerably broader than those generally used by adult interviewers. A young girl classified as a "kitchen worker," for instance, would be assured of consideration for a greater number of job openings than would be the case had she been assigned to a more specialized classification such as "salad girl." For much the same reason counselors found descriptive classifications useful. Thus an applicant listed as having a "good sales personality" would be assured of consideration for a larger variety of openings than if he were classified as "gasoline-station attendant."

Broad occupational categories and descriptive categories were used particularly in the smaller offices visited. In selecting those applicants qualified to fill employers' orders, counselors in small offices had little need for finely differentiated occupational classifications. The number of applicants usually available in any one of the general categories was seldom so large that a consideration of the whole group interfered with efficiency in filling an employer's request for a specific type of worker within that field. It was only in the case of the limited number of juniors whose training or abilities were exceptionally

specialized that counselors in the smaller placement offices used specific occupational categories comparable to those generally used for adult applicants.

Most offices handling large numbers of registrants made comparatively little use of broad occupational categories and descriptive categories. Among thousands of registrants, hundreds might well be classified for kitchen work or saleswork, for instance, and such categories would be of little assistance in enabling the counselor to make a reasonably quick selection. By using more detailed classifications within each of these major groupings counselors in large offices were able to make selections from panels that were less cumbersome and at the same time contained the names of those applicants who most closely met the specifications for the opening in question. In this way the classification system followed by the junior divisions of the New York City public employment service divided all sales occupations into the three fields of promotion, commission, and retail-store work; each of these was further broken down into specific occupations which, in the case of promotional sales work, ranged all the way from window trimming to impersonating Santa Claus during the Christmas season. Insofar as possible, all applicants registering with the New York City placement service were assigned to specific occupational categories such as these. In order that applicants might be considered for all jobs for which they were qualified, they were assigned to as many classifications as seemed justified by their ability—in most cases at least three, and frequently more. Only those who were notably lacking in special interests and abilities were given general descriptive classifications, such as "factory type." Counselors in large placement offices endeavored to keep such general classifications at a minimum because, unless they did so, their files tended to become unwieldy for selection purposes and applicants who were classified in this way stood small chance of placement.

In New York City, as in most other large placement services, the specific categories used were those which experience had proved to be best adapted for the selection of applicants for the types of orders which the office was accustomed to receiving. These categories varied considerably in different cities, depending partly upon the size of the community and the nature of the employer clientele and partly upon the training and previous work experience of the applicant group served. Often those used by junior counselors in public employment offices were quite unlike those used by adult-placement workers in the same organization.

Interviewing Facilities and Division of Responsibility

Interviews for registration purposes were usually held at the offices of the placement service, most of which were located so as to be accessible to registrants throughout the areas they served. Occasionally, as in Rockland County and Durham, other arrangements were necessary for registering applicants living in county areas who found it difficult to reach the placement office. The public employment center in Durham, which served five neighboring counties, had on its staff a traveling representative who interviewed junior as well as adult registrants living in the outlying districts. The registration records of any junior applicants interviewed by this representative were turned over to the junior division of the Durham office, where they were placed in the junior registration files. In Rockland County the junior counselor kept scheduled office hours in a central placement office and in each of several localities elsewhere in the county, the high schools furnishing space for this purpose.

Where one junior counselor was in charge of all work with juniors he was, of course, responsible for the registration of all junior applicants. In offices staffed by two or more counselors it was customary for each to handle the registrations of a different applicant group. Usually these groups were distinguished either wholly or partly on the basis of sex¹ or race.² Less frequently, as in Philadelphia and Detroit, the applicant's educational background or the field of work for which he desired to register also determined which staff member handled his registration.

Interviews were conducted privately in most offices. Counselors with whom the subject was discussed considered privacy essential to the establishment of a satisfactory relationship with the applicant. Nine of the twelve offices visited furnished private interviewing rooms or booths for all counselors, and in the three where those facilities were not available, as much privacy as possible had been achieved by the arrangement of the counselors' desks.

The situation in regard to the length of time available for individual conferences with applicants was much less satisfactory than provisions for privacy. Many counselors stated that they often found it necessary to complete a registration interview in 15 minutes or less, particularly when unusually large numbers of applicants happened to appear at the office. Staff members in 2 large offices reported that they sometimes interviewed 40 or more applicants in a single morning, including some, of course, who were not new to the office and who therefore could be interviewed more briefly than new registrants; in a third office it was not uncommon for each counselor to hold 25 regis-

¹ Essex County, Detroit, New York City, Philadelphia, Rochester.

² District of Columbia, Durham.

tration interviews in a morning in addition to a number of briefer reinterviews. Counselors were fully aware of the disadvantage of such interviewing schedules but had found them unavoidable if all applicants were to be registered when they first came to the office.

In order to provide somewhat more adequate time for each interview, the counselors in Cedar Rapids, Cincinnati, and the Brooklyn branch of the New York City public employment service had adopted an appointment system for interviews. By spacing conferences at regular intervals throughout the week, counselors in these three offices were able to exercise some control over the numbers of registrants coming to the office each day and thus make more efficient use of their interviewing time. Recognizing that any procedure which delayed registration might sometimes work an unwarranted hardship on the applicant, they made an effort to single out for immediate interview those individuals whose circumstances appeared to justify special attention at the time they first came to the office.

Maintenance of Active Registration Status

In the interest of efficiency counselors found it necessary to keep informed of subsequent changes in the applicant's employment status; otherwise time would be lost in considering for placement young persons who proved to be no longer available. In order to keep their registration active, therefore, applicants of most of the offices visited were required to report to the placement office at monthly or bimonthly intervals. It was possible for the applicant to make this report either by coming to the office in person or by mail or telephone.

Personal visits were usually encouraged as a means for the applicant to keep his registration active. It was a policy in most of the offices visited for counselors to reinterview personally all those who came to the office for this purpose, and whenever practicable each counselor saw those whom he had originally registered. In spite of their crowded interviewing schedules counselors felt that this time was well spent, because repeated contacts enabled the applicant to become better acquainted with the staff and the procedures of the placement office and at the same time placed the counselor in a position to check on changes in the applicant's qualifications that might have occurred since the time of registration and that might not otherwise have become evident. Moreover, these later contacts with the applicant were a valuable supplement to registration interviews, which were often necessarily brief. It was only in a few offices where the time available for the initial interview was somewhat more adequate, as in Cincinnati and Cedar Rapids, that applicants returning to make a routine report on their registration status were seen by receptionists rather than by junior counselors; counselors themselves usually reinterviewed only

those applicants who specifically requested this conference or whose registration presented special problems.

Supplementary Information on the Applicant

Counselors often found it advisable to verify and supplement some of the basic information obtained from the applicant at the time he registered. Young people seldom know how to make the best or the most accurate presentation of their experience and qualifications, and any additional information that may be obtainable through psychological tests and personal-interest blanks and the records of other agencies in the community constitutes a valuable check on the applicant's own statements and on the counselor's judgment of his capabilities.

Policies followed in obtaining supplementary information varied considerably, depending on the amount of time that staff members could devote to this work and on the resources of the community and the resourcefulness of the counselor. Counselors in most of the offices visited obtained additional information only for the few applicants for whom it seemed particularly desirable. There were, however, a number of offices that made it a practice to obtain supplementary records either for all registrants or for special groups such as high-school graduates, for whom the data seemed most likely to be useful or accessible. Usually the data requested were not available until after the initial registration interview, and any decisions arrived at in regard to the applicant's plans or occupational classifications were considered tentative until the desired information was at hand.

Proof of Age.

Practically all offices required proof of age from at least those applicants whom counselors suspected to be below the legal minimum for full-time employment. A few offices required every registrant to present proof of age,³ accepting for this purpose birth or baptismal certificates, passports, or the records of local offices in charge of issuing employment certificates. The definite knowledge of the applicant's age thus obtained enabled counselors to guard against making any placements not in accordance with the protective restrictions of their State child-labor laws and to assure an employer that the applicant was legally permitted to do the work required. Especially in States where the workmen's compensation law provided double compensation for minors injured when illegally employed, it was to the advantage of employers to know that a check had been made of the ages of all applicants referred to them by the placement office.

³ Detroit, New York, Philadelphia, Rochester, Rockland County.

Personal-Interest Blanks.

In the public employment office of Cincinnati a questionnaire or personal-interest blank was filled in by the junior applicant and filed as a part of his registration record. This blank, which is reproduced on page 29, was so worded as to encourage a free statement of likes and dislikes, interests, plans, and recreational activities. The applicant generally filled it in while waiting at the office for his registration interview, and the information was therefore available to the counselor at that time. Counselors reported that it often served to disclose significant information about the applicant's tastes, maturity, and level of understanding, with a minimum expenditure of time on their part.⁴

Tests.

Almost all junior counselors consulted scores from at least some psychological and other types of tests in order to check their impressions of the applicant's ability as well as the applicant's own statements in regard to the kind of work he was able to do. Some of these tests were trade or achievement tests designed to show the degree of skill that the applicant had already acquired in trade processes and in clerical work, and they were used chiefly in connection with the immediate problem of job placement; other tests of individual aptitudes and intelligence, used somewhat less extensively, furnished more general information about the applicant's abilities and were useful to counselors primarily when they were assisting young persons to formulate vocational and educational plans that would be in line with their abilities.

Many of the tests used for these two purposes were of questionable significance in the hands of anyone but a trained psychologist.⁵ Consequently, relatively few psychological tests were administered by placement offices that did not have special testing facilities of their own or access to the psychological clinics of other agencies in their communities. Most of the test information that counselors in these offices obtained for junior applicants came from other agencies that had tested them in the past, largely from the public schools that the young persons had attended.

⁴ The Cincinnati office was the only one of those visited that regularly made use of interest blanks; other offices, including several of the public employment services in Illinois and those in Indianapolis, Ind., and Worcester, Mass., indicated on the questionnaires they returned that they also made it a practice to obtain this kind of information from all or from selected groups of their junior registrants.

⁵ This report does not propose to evaluate the different tests used by placement offices at the time of this study. Most of them required careful interpretation of the applicant's performance by a trained examiner and some were admittedly experimental. For information on specific tests, see Bingham, Walter V.: *Aptitudes and Aptitude Testing* (Harper & Bros., New York, 1937); Stead, Shartle, and associates: *Occupational Counseling Techniques* (American Book Co., New York, 1940).

Personal-Interest Blank

Counselor _____	
Name _____	Age _____ Sex _____ Date _____
1. What do you do that you like best outside of work or school hours?	10. What have you often thought that you would like to do for a living?
Outdoors _____	Indoors _____
1. _____	1. _____
2. _____	2. _____
3. _____	3. _____
2. Have you any hobbies? What are they?	Why?
3. What things outside your job would you now like to learn to do either in connection with work or with recreation?	How long have you been interested in this field?
4. What school subjects did you like best?	11. What occupations or fields of work would you like more information about?
5. What school subjects did you find most difficult?	12. What kind of work are you trying to get now?
6. Which of the following subjects, if you had them, did you like better? English or mathematics _____ Science or history _____	13. Do you read newspapers? Which ones? What parts?
7. What have you studied outside your regular school course that you liked?	14. What magazines do you read often?
8. What course of training or special subjects would you like to take if you could?	15. What three books outside of school books that you have read do you especially like?
9. Where did you hear about the Employment Center?	16. Where do you meet your friends?
	17. What club meetings or athletic groups do you attend frequently?
	What do you like best to do there?

(Use other side if necessary)

Form used in Cincinnati

Tests administered by the schools and used by counselors in these junior-placement offices were usually designed to measure the individual's general level of ability and were useful primarily for guidance purposes; in most cases these tests did not give information about any specific trade or clerical skills which the applicant might have acquired or for which he showed aptitude. Many counselors have felt that for the purposes of the placement office the latter type of test information was the more significant. Inasmuch as such information was not generally available to placement offices through the schools and since, as a matter of fact, trade tests are of limited value unless administered at the time the applicant is considered for placement, counselors in most of these offices have felt it necessary to arrange for a limited number of young applicants to be tested specifically at the request of the placement office. A few have been able to obtain this testing service through the cooperation of business schools and other agencies, which have agreed to administer specific tests to applicants referred by the placement office. The majority of counselors, however, have found it necessary to make provision within their own organization for the administration of those tests that they considered essential. Since they undertook such testing without the aid of trained examiners, they limited it largely to tests that were relatively simple to administer and score and that required a minimum of interpretation of the applicant's performance. By far the most widely used tests were speed tests in shorthand and type-writing. The United States Employment Service has sought to insure the proper administration of these speed tests by providing the services of a field psychologist to public-employment-office counselors and receptionists who wish instruction in administering and scoring them.

Six junior-placement offices visited in the field ⁶ limited their testing programs to tests of the kinds that have been discussed. In none of these offices did counselors consult scores from more than two or three kinds of tests, and those were available for a limited number of applicants only. Counselors stated that the information thus acquired was useful chiefly in connection with determining whether or not the applicant was qualified for immediate placement in a specified type of work. They made no attempt to analyze the fundamental interests and aptitudes of the individual through the medium of this information.

Six of the twelve offices visited, all of which were located in or near large metropolitan centers, had developed their psychological testing programs beyond this point.⁷ Counselors in each of these offices

⁶ Atlantic City, Cedar Rapids, Concord, Durham, Essex County, Rochester.

⁷ Cincinnati, Detroit, District of Columbia, New York City, Philadelphia, Rockland County. Less than 10 of the remaining 61 offices reporting by questionnaire but not visited in the field indicated that their testing programs were equally comprehensive.

had access to the services of comprehensive testing units which were supervised by trained psychologists and were equipped to make an intensive study of the abilities of selected applicants. In the Philadelphia school office and in the public employment offices of Cincinnati and the District of Columbia these units functioned as one of several special activities carried on by the placement service as a whole. In Detroit, New York City, and Rockland County testing units under the supervision of agencies other than the placement office extended their services without charge to applicants whom junior counselors referred to them for special testing.

Tests to determine proficiency already acquired, like those which were administered primarily for placement purposes by counselors in offices without special testing facilities, made up only a small part of the work of psychological testing units. Most of their test procedures were directed toward aiding the counselor in advising the applicant about the fields of work in which he seemed most likely to succeed, and they included tests measuring the applicant's ability in as many fields of work as possible as well as tests designed to measure general intelligence, interests, and personality. Such comprehensive testing programs required a careful observation of the applicant's performance while the tests were in progress and interpretation of the performance by trained examiners. The results of these tests were generally used for purposes of general vocational prediction rather than for immediate job placement.

Comprehensive testing of this sort was in no case a routine procedure followed with all applicants. Applicants were usually singled out for special testing because of their need for individual guidance or because their classification for employment presented problems to the junior counselor that might be clarified by test performance. Special testing was arranged for those who appeared reasonably capable but who were vocationally undecided, those who were planning to prepare for or enter occupations for which they were apparently unsuited or for which the training necessary was so extensive that it seemed advisable to check their aptitudes, and those who, although experienced, had found their work uncongenial and wanted to make a change.

Most counselors made no attempt to refer an applicant for psychological testing unless they were assured of his understanding and cooperation. The psychologists in charge of the testing program determined the kinds of tests to be given on the basis of the problem as outlined by the junior counselor and the applicant's performance as the testing procedure progressed. In reporting the results of the tests they placed special emphasis on giving to the counselor who had originally referred the applicant a careful interpretation of test performance, preparing for his use written reports which were incor-

porated into the applicant's record. In New York City and the District of Columbia the report of each applicant's test performance was discussed in conference by psychologists, counselors, and placement workers, and plans satisfactory from all points of view were thus developed for handling the applicant's registration. In the District of Columbia this conference was followed by an interview to which the applicant himself was invited so that he might participate in the analysis of his own registration problem. This procedure served not only to define the problem for the applicant but also to render him more receptive to suggestions for improving his plans and making the greatest possible use of his special interests and abilities.

School Records.

The schools formerly attended by junior applicants were a source of information which many counselors felt to be second in value only to information furnished by the applicant himself. The contact which teachers and advisers maintain with a pupil over a number of years enables them to give an estimate of his personality, interests, and abilities which is sometimes of great help to the counselor in classifying him for employment.

Placement officers sponsored by public-school systems made considerably more use of the records available in the schools than did most junior divisions connected with public employment centers. Inasmuch as these school offices were operating as a part of their city school systems and were frequently quartered in the school buildings, the counselors on their staffs were in closer touch with teachers and other school officials and were familiar with the kinds of pupil records kept and with their significance. Moreover, many of the public-school systems that supervised these placement offices had assumed responsibility for educational and vocational guidance, and they kept the sort of pupil records which were especially helpful for the purposes of the junior counselor.

An increasing number of public employment offices have come to recognize the importance of this close relationship between the school and the placement office. It has been somewhat more difficult for public employment offices to effect a transfer of records from the schools, however, partly because the two agencies are independently organized and partly because many of the school systems in their communities lacked guidance programs and even, in some cases, adequate record-keeping systems.

Of the 12 junior-placement offices visited, 4⁸ requested school information on all types of applicants, 7⁹ confined their investigation to selected groups, and 1¹⁰ was in the process of drawing

⁸ Atlantic City, Essex County, District of Columbia, Rockland County.

⁹ Cedar Rapids, Cincinnati, Concord, Detroit, Durham, Philadelphia, Rochester.

¹⁰ New York City.

up plans for a routine inquiry into the school records of junior applicants, although at the time of this survey it was making contacts with the local schools only in connection with a very few applicants for whom school information seemed particularly desirable.

Several counselors who did not check the school records of all applicants indicated that they would unquestionably have done so had the necessary clerical assistance been available. Lacking facilities for investigating the records of all applicants they made inquiries for those groups for which they felt this information would be most significant. Some counselors believed that the schools became less valuable as a source of information as the applicant's school days become more remote, since the records of young persons who had been out of school for several years were sometimes difficult to locate and teachers' recollections of their abilities and characteristics were likely to be less reliable. Hence, in Concord and Durham school records were checked only for applicants who had graduated during the current school year, and in Cincinnati for applicants who were under 18 years of age and who, because of their youth, were likely to have been enrolled in the schools recently. Other counselors felt that the school records of applicants who progressed no further than the elementary or early high-school grades were likely to prove less useful for placement purposes than the records of better-trained applicants, and accordingly they made inquiries only for high-school graduates¹¹ or for applicants who had completed at least some high-school work.¹²

Information requested of the schools included at least the grade completed by the applicant, a record of his ability and the quality of his work, and teachers' comments about his personality. Attendance records also were requested by some offices,¹³ because counselors felt that they were indicative of health, of habits of regularity, and of possible causes for school failure. In Rochester and Atlantic City, and somewhat less systematically in other offices visited, an effort was made to obtain the year-book picture of each high-school graduate; this was attached to the applicant's registration card in the placement office and served as a reminder of the applicant which was sometimes helpful when counselors had occasion to consult his record in his absence.

Many junior counselors obtained this school information informally, by correspondence or by telephone. Where the group investigated was of any considerable size, however, placement workers had developed school-information forms on which school authorities could record the desired information. Counselors in Cedar Rapids, Concord, Durham, and the District of Columbia used a standard school-information card prepared by the United States Employment Service for use in public

¹¹ Concord, Durham, Cedar Rapids, Detroit, Rochester.

¹² Cincinnati.

¹³ Detroit, New York City, Cincinnati, Atlantic City.

(See other side of journal)

(Reverse side)

TEACHER'S RATING (PLEASE RATE ONLY THOSE STUDENTS YOU HAVE KNOWN WELL)
INDICATE YOUR OPINION OF THE STUDENT IN THE FOLLOWING CHARACTERISTICS. CONSIDER CAREFULLY DESCRIPTIVE PHRASES BEFORE RECORDING YOUR OPINION.
CHECK ONLY THOSE CHARACTERISTICS YOU HAVE ACTUALLY OBSERVED AND MAKE ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS IN "REMARKS COLUMN."

(1) DOES HE KEEP AT ASSIGNED WORK UNTIL COMPLETED IN SPITE OF ITS DIFFICULTY?	DOES NOT TACKLE A DIFFICULT TASK. <input type="checkbox"/>	COMPLETES WORK ONLY IF ENCOURAGED. <input type="checkbox"/>	COMPLETES USUAL ASSIGNMENTS PUNCTUALLY. <input type="checkbox"/>	DEPENDABLE IN COMPLETING ALL ASSIGNMENTS. <input type="checkbox"/>	SEEKS SUPPLEMENTARY WORK. <input type="checkbox"/>	REMARKS
(2) DOES HE COOPERATE WILLINGLY IN GROUPS WITH OTHER STUDENTS?	NOT ADAPTABLE. OBSTRUCTS GROUP WORK. <input type="checkbox"/>	WORKS BEST ALONE. <input type="checkbox"/>	WORKS WITH OTHER STUDENTS IF NECESSARY. <input type="checkbox"/>	FORWARDS WORK OF THE GROUP. <input type="checkbox"/>	USUALLY HELPFUL IN WORKING WITH OTHERS. <input type="checkbox"/>	
(3) DOES HE DISPLAY ACTIVE INTEREST AND ALERTNESS IN SCHOOL WORK?	REPEATS MISTAKES. GRASPS INSTRUCTIONS SLOWLY. <input type="checkbox"/>	SLOW IN IMPROVING ON MISTAKES. <input type="checkbox"/>	AVOIDS REPETITION OF MISTAKES. <input type="checkbox"/>	QUICK TO GRASP INSTRUCTIONS. <input type="checkbox"/>	GRASPS INSTRUCTIONS INSTANTLY. SEEKS FURTHER INFORMATION. <input type="checkbox"/>	
(4) DOES HE MAINTAIN CONTROLLED BEHAVIOR AND AN EVEN TEMPER AT MOST TIMES?	VERY EASILY ANGERED OR DEPRESSED. <input type="checkbox"/>	ERRATIC AT TIMES. <input type="checkbox"/>	USUALLY EVEN TEMPERED. <input type="checkbox"/>	CONTROLS BEHAVIOR ALMOST ALWAYS. <input type="checkbox"/>	SHOWS UNUSUAL EMOTIONAL AND NERVOUS STABILITY. <input type="checkbox"/>	

1. DID HE MAKE ANY OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTIONS IN SCHOOL ACTIVITIES? YES..... NO..... WHICH ONES?.....

2. DID HE PURSUE ANY HOBBIES OR DEVELOP ANY SKILLS DURING SPARE TIME TO A MARKED DEGREE? YES..... NO..... WHICH ONES?.....

CONTACTS WITH GUIDANCE DEPARTMENT.

PLEASE NOTE ANY OCCUPATIONAL PLANS DISCUSSED WITH STUDENT, AND INDICATE OCCUPATIONS IN WHICH YOU BELIEVE HE IS MOST LIKELY TO SUCCEED.....

GENERAL REMARKS (ATTENDANCE, ETC.).....

SIGNATURE..... TITLE.....

Form (developed by New York State Employment Service) used in New York City and Rochester

employment offices; all school offices visited as well as the public employment offices in Cincinnati and New York State had developed special forms adapted to the particular schools with which each cooperated. Many of these special forms had been developed jointly by schools and employment offices. The school form used by most junior offices throughout New York State (see pp. 34-35) was drawn up late in 1937 by a committee composed of representatives of the advisers in the public schools and of the counselors in the public employment offices; it covered the kind of information which the schools were equipped to supply and which at the same time would be useful to the employment service. Counselors in other offices had drawn up their own forms and then submitted them to school authorities for approval or, as in Rockland County, the school principals themselves had worked out the form in which they found it most satisfactory to relay this information to the placement office.

Usually counselors obtained these records by sending school-information forms directly to the school the applicant had attended. The public employment offices in Rochester and Cincinnati followed a somewhat different procedure and, instead of dealing directly with officials in each of several city schools, had arranged for the transfer of all school records through the administrative offices of their school-guidance department. Junior counselors in these two offices reported that this arrangement enabled school-guidance supervisors to keep in touch with the type of information being relayed to the placement office and in many cases resulted in a great saving of the counselor's time and more prompt and complete reporting of the records of applicants.

Employer References.

For those young people who had previously been employed, junior counselors had an additional source of information on character traits and special abilities. Counselors interviewed expressed some difference of opinion on the actual usefulness of references obtained from former employers, however. Many felt that the kinds of jobs held by young and inexperienced workers were for the most part too incidental to supply valuable reference information. They had found that the work which young boys and girls were likely to have obtained, such as selling newspapers and caring for small children, often bore no relation to their fundamental vocational interests. Furthermore, much of this previous employment was temporary, such as store work during the Christmas season, and some counselors felt that more often than not employers were unable to make a reliable estimate of ability and personality under these circumstances. Other placement workers interviewed were convinced that any past employment experience was well worth investigating for the purpose of

gaining insight into character qualities and attitudes if for no other reason. They felt that any additional information on occupational skills that might be acquired in this way was particularly helpful in the case of juniors who were in the upper age ranges but who could not properly be called experienced workers.

Many of the offices visited reported that they made no attempt to obtain information on previous work records as a regular procedure; most of them did so only occasionally when the counselor had reason to doubt the applicant's statement about past work experience, when prospective employers asked for such references, or when placements which they contemplated demanded exceptional honesty and reliability. Other offices regularly investigated employer references only for young people who had worked as cashiers or P. B. X. operators, or had done other specialized work which might qualify them for future placement in the same type of employment. Counselors in still other offices regularly investigated the work records of all registrants or of a considerable number; thus in Atlantic City references were obtained from the last two employers of each applicant, and in Cincinnati the placement office got in touch with all employers for whom the applicant had worked a month or more.

The Concord office, which made no regular investigation of work records on its own account, did assemble the necessary information for any employers who might later wish to obtain references. The counselor in Concord obtained from each junior applicant the names of two previous employers or, if he lacked sufficient experience for this, the names of two character references, and those names were made available to any prospective employer wishing them. This was done because the junior counselor had found that employers in that small community, who often knew each other personally, were more likely to obtain an unqualified estimate of the applicant's ability from each other than the placement office could obtain for them.

In most offices all references checked were obtained informally by telephoning directly to the employer or by calling on him. In five offices,¹⁴ all of which investigated the employment records of a large number of their applicants, references were usually obtained by mail and much of the work entailed was handled by the clerical staff. Under the counselor's instructions, clerical workers mailed to former employers, usually those for whom the applicant had worked a month or more, a form letter inquiring about the kind of work he had done, why he had left, and his efficiency and personality. Some of these letters, like that used in the District of Columbia (see p. 39), bore the applicant's written consent to the inquiry.

¹⁴ Atlantic City, Cincinnati, District of Columbia, Essex County, Philadelphia.

Health Records.

Most junior counselors made it a policy to obtain at least a minimum of information about the state of the applicant's health when he registered since even ailments that appear to be of minor importance may, if they are neglected, lead to loss of time on the job, seriously impaired efficiency, and irritability and other characteristics that make the employee an unsatisfactory worker. Furthermore, some physical disabilities impose important limitations on the kind of work that it is prudent for the individual to undertake.

Notwithstanding the importance attached to health, placement services rarely made provision for medical inspections to check on the general physical condition of any considerable group of applicants. The Philadelphia office was the only one visited that was equipped to give this service to most of its registrants. The placement work of the public schools in that city had always been carried on in connection with the issuance of employment certificates, and the medical inspectors who examined children under 18 years of age who were applying for work certificates were also available to examine others whom the junior counselors might refer to them. In this way it was possible to make a routine check on the general physical condition of about 75 percent of the young people who came to the school placement office to register.

None of the placement offices in the other communities visited was able to approximate so complete an investigation into the health of their registrants. Most of these communities, it is true, maintained free clinics to which individuals could be referred for general physical examinations, X-rays, dental care, and other services, but such agencies were already overburdened with patients, and it was necessary for them to confine their work almost entirely to those who were already known to be in need of treatment.

Under these circumstances placement counselors found it necessary to depend almost entirely on information about the applicant's health that was already available. Usually they obtained it directly from the applicant himself, less frequently from other agencies in the community. In the latter connection, inquiry was hampered by the fact that there was seldom any one agency to which they might go for this kind of information as they could to the schools for data on education and ability, and by the fact that much of the data available either was superficial or was based on examinations that had been given several years before registration. At best, health information from agencies such as schools and clinics or from physical examinations required by State laws for employment certificates and other purposes was available for only a very small proportion of the total applicant group. Consequently, most counselors found it impracticable to undertake any routine investigation of health records for all

Employer's Letter of Reference

-----, who was previously in your employ, has recently applied to this office for placement.

Some knowledge of his past employment record will be helpful in placing him. We shall appreciate your cooperation in checking the statements he has given us and in completing the information requested below. A franked envelope, which requires no postage, is enclosed for the return of the form.

This information will be regarded as strictly confidential.

Very sincerely yours,

-----,
Junior Counselor.

This form is being sent at my request, and it is agreed that I shall not hold you liable in the event that your reply is to my discredit.

Signature ----- Date -----

Name of former employer -----

Dates of employment -----

Nature of work done -----

Reason for leaving -----

Valuable characteristics:

Weak points:

Other comments:

Signature -----

Position -----

Form used in the District of Columbia

applicants; instead they themselves assumed responsibility for determining which applicants presented health problems serious enough to warrant further investigation or special consideration in connection with placement. Their usual practice was to inquire about the applicant's health in the course of the registration interview.

The success which counselors achieved in detecting health problems in this way was difficult to estimate. Many serious health handicaps, such as some types of heart conditions, are not apparent even to a careful observer, and at times it is undoubtedly a difficult task to elicit reliable information from the applicant himself. In the first place, the young person does not always understand the significance of his own health problem, and in the second, he is naturally guarded in making any statement which he feels might disqualify him for a job. Where direct inquiries about health have seemed likely to be unproductive, some counselors reported they found it possible to obtain significant information indirectly through routine questions on height and weight, and inquiries into the kind of school attended, the applicant's reasons for absence or withdrawal from school, and physical examinations taken in connection with insurance policies. Obviously such an approach presupposes time for unhurried conferences with individual applicants.

Records of Other Agencies.

Occasionally counselors found it desirable to get in touch with various social agencies in the community in order to supplement their information on applicants. Social agencies were much less extensively used than the other sources of information that have been discussed, partly because of the limited time which counselors had at their disposal to make these inquiries and partly because of the fact that these agencies dealt with only a very small proportion of the total applicant group. Nevertheless, practically all counselors had occasion from time to time to obtain the records or recommendations of social agencies that had had previous contact with their junior registrants. Included among the records used were those of group-work agencies like the Y. M. C. A., Y. W. C. A., and Boy Scouts, those of correctional institutions such as industrial schools, juvenile courts, and probation departments, and those of relief and case-work agencies such as county welfare departments and private social agencies.

In a few of the communities visited the various social agencies maintained central clearance services with which they registered the names of individuals and families with whom they were working. The counselor in Rockland County automatically referred to a clear-

ance service of this sort the names of all junior registrants. Upon receipt of the clearance office's report of the agencies in the community with which the individual or his family were active, the counselor was in a position to get in direct touch with those organizations that were most likely to have significant information on the applicant's background and interests. In much the same way counselors in Cincinnati and Philadelphia regularly cleared by mail or by telephone those cases that they felt justified special handling.

REGISTRATION RECORDS

Inasmuch as counselors do not find it possible to place each applicant in employment at the time that he first comes to the office, there must be some provision in the placement office for retaining his name, together with pertinent information about his ability and experience, until a placement can be effected. It is the function of the record-keeping system to organize and arrange this kind of information to meet the needs of the counselor who later has occasion to consult it.

The record-keeping systems that served this purpose varied considerably, particularly among the independently organized school offices. Even public employment services, most of which used the same types of forms, filed and used those forms in a variety of ways. Counselors serving a few hundred registrants had little need for the extensive and sometimes complex records which the counselors of larger offices found necessary in order to keep track of the registrations of thousands of applicants.

Notwithstanding differences due to size, the record-keeping systems of all offices had been set up to serve two fundamental purposes. They were arranged in such a way as to enable a counselor who was interviewing a junior registrant to locate the record of that registrant among several hundred registrations and also to enable a counselor who was filling an employer's order to locate the records of all registrants who might be qualified for placement in the type of work specified by the employer. Hence, the record-keeping systems of these offices permitted counselors to identify applicant records either by the name of the applicant or by a specific occupational classification that had been assigned, as the situation might demand.

The Registration Card

The applicant's registration card was the core of the record-keeping system. It contained substantially all the basic information available on each junior registrant, together with the counselor's appraisal of his qualifications and the specific classifications assigned him, and it determined to a large extent the kinds of job openings for which he would later be given consideration.

Most counselors have felt that the information which is especially significant in connection with the placement of junior applicants is not adequately provided for on many of the registration forms developed for use with applicants of all ages. In placing inexperienced

young people they have found it desirable to give special attention to the applicant's educational and family background and to his interests and future plans—considerations that are of considerably less importance in adult-placement work. For this reason, counselors in most junior offices entered the registrations of boys and girls on special junior-registration forms.

The registration card most widely used at the time of this study was developed in 1935 by the United States Employment Service for use in public employment offices.¹ (See pp. 44-47.) The same form was used for boys and girls except that the cards were of different colors. The card was 8 by 9½ inches, folded to 8 by 5; it provided almost twice as much space for the applicant's record as did the 8- by 5-inch registration cards commonly used for adult applicants by public employment centers. It was an adaptation of the forms used for adults, but by omitting a few items inapplicable to juniors and by making use of a double rather than a single card it provided additional space for the types of inquiries that counselors felt to be significant in connection with the placement of junior applicants.

Six other offices visited also used special junior-registration forms, somewhat different from the form of the United States Employment Service but providing for essentially the same type of information. The three public employment services visited in the State of New York used a registration folder developed for junior applicants by the New York State Employment Service, and each of the school offices in Atlantic City, Essex County, and Philadelphia used single cards, somewhat less detailed, which they had developed independently.

The junior-registration forms used by counselors in the public employment offices in Cincinnati and the District of Columbia were the same as those used for adult applicants.² Both of these offices were functional junior divisions which filed the registration records of junior applicants with those of adults and, for the sake of uniformity, used the same kinds of registration cards for applicants of all ages. Inasmuch as the card used by the Cincinnati office was a 9- by 12-inch folder and was the equivalent of an unfolded card twice that size, space was available to record a considerable amount of additional information pertinent to the younger-applicant group. In the District of Columbia, as has already been noted, a master file of all junior registrations was kept in the offices of the junior division, the United States Employment Service junior-registration card being used for this purpose.

¹ This special junior-registration form was used by 4 of the offices visited and by 26 of the 43 public-school and public employment offices elsewhere in the country for which this information was available.

² The junior divisions of the public employment offices in Cleveland, Columbus, Hartford, New Haven, Jersey City, and the branch office in New York serving older inexperienced applicants also entered junior registrations on the forms used for adult applicants in those offices.

[Boys - white card; girls - buff card]
[Actual size: 8 by 9 1/2 inches]

PRINT YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS

Last name	First name
-----------	------------

Local address[illegible]

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS BLOCK

Last name		First name		Middle name		Age		Date		Classification	
Local address		Telephone No.				W		M		Div.	
						N		F			
						U		Emp.			
						Previously employed		Yes		No	
						Citizen		Yrs. U. S.		Yrs. city	
						Parents' nativity		Catholic		Jewish	
						Check religion:		Protestant		Other	
						Give number of dependents, if any:		Total		Partial	
						State mother's occupation, if any		How many brothers and sisters have you?		Older	
						What office machines can you operate?		Younger			
						Can you read blueprints?		State drafting experience, if any			
						Can you read millimeters?		Have you done laundry work?			
						Have you served meals?		Hand?		Machine?	
						Have you cooked?		Can you live at the place where you work?			
						In full charge?		Ass't?			
						Name brothers and sisters over 16		Occupation			
						3					
						4					

EDUCATIONAL RECORD

Circle highest grade completed	Name of last grammar or high school attended			Date left	Age left	Reason for leaving
Grammar or grade school 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	What course did you take?			Names of teachers who knew you best		
High school 1 2 3 4	Subjects liked best			Subjects liked least		
College 1 2 3 4	Grad. study			List below any vocational subjects (stenography, woodshop, etc.) you have studied		
1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	Name of school	Subjects	Number of semesters		
What languages, besides English, do you Speak? Read? Write?						
Are you willing to leave the city?						
State physical handicaps						
Extra-curricular activities (sports, school paper, etc.) and special honors						
Name of college	Course	Years completed	Degree	Date left	Reason	
Name of evening school	Course or subjects			Months		
Further school plans	Hobbies					

JUNIOR-REGISTRATION CARD

(Reverse side)

EMPLOYMENT RECORD

Employer - Last regular job		Position held and duties		Length of employment		Renewal Dates
Address		Under whom did you work?	Reason for leaving	Date left	Rate of pay	
Kind of business						
Employer		Position held and duties		Length of employment		
Address				Date left		
Kind of business		Under whom did you work?	Reason for leaving	Rate of pay		
Employer		Position held and duties		Length of employment		
Address				Date left		
Kind of business		Under whom did you work?	Reason for leaving	Rate of pay		
What other kinds of working experience have you had?						

DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE

47

[illegible]

Remarks:

Junior Counselor

Form (developed by the United States Employment Service) used in Cedar Rapids, Concord, Detroit, District of Columbia, and Durham

The information called for on the applicant's registration card was filled in as completely as possible at the time of his first visit to the office. Counselors reported that while some of their applicants could enter the factual data requested quite satisfactorily, younger persons were likely to encounter difficulties. For this reason most counselors themselves filled in the registration card in the course of their first interview and then obtained the applicant's signature on the card. This assured the office of a complete, uniform, and legible record for the applicant, together with a sample of his handwriting. On the other hand, counselors who requested each applicant to make out his own registration card pointed out that that arrangement saved them time and also provided them with a valuable indication of the applicant's general level of understanding. Items entered by the applicant himself were always discussed with him by the counselor in the course of the registration interview in order to make certain that he had understood the kind of information desired.

Since the interviewing record itself and the counselor's appraisal of the applicant's appearance, personality, and qualifications for specific kinds of work are fully as important as previous experience in selecting applicants for many types of junior job openings, counselors in most offices endeavored to enter this kind of information as fully as possible on the registration card. Especially in Cincinnati and in the District of Columbia, where information had to be relayed from the junior counselors to placement workers in other divisions of the public employment center, an effort was made to have full and complete records. In New York City also the importance of complete records was emphasized because several counselors often dealt with a single individual during the time that he was registered in one of the large branch offices of the city.

It is not to be inferred that full and up-to-date registration records were the rule in all the offices visited, however. Undoubtedly the pressure to keep such records was considerably less in small offices, where counselors were personally acquainted with many of their applicants, than in metropolitan centers, where memory could not be depended on in dealing with the large number of young people registered. Although full records were undoubtedly the aim of most offices, there was a tendency, inherent in any individualized approach to an applicant, for counselors to refrain from entering on the registration card those impressions and judgments that were difficult to crystallize in record form and to rely instead on their recollection of the applicant when the time came to consider him for placement. This tendency was often exceedingly difficult to avoid in offices where counselors' schedules were full and there was little or no clerical assistance available for keeping even the most routine kinds of records. Nevertheless, full records are unquestionably a desirable form of in-

insurance against the minor catastrophes which unexpected staff changes or absences might otherwise precipitate and a guaranty that all applicants will receive full and fair consideration, independent of tricks of memory, whenever suitable job openings occur.

Registration Files

When completed, the applicant's registration card was filed so that it would be available to anyone in the junior-placement office who might have occasion to interview the applicant further or to consider him for placement. In all the offices visited, with the exception of that in Cincinnati, this was done by means of a registration file maintained in the junior office, arranged alphabetically according to the name of the applicant and separated into two sections according to sex. In Cincinnati all junior registrations were filed with adult registrations and the file was arranged according to the identification number assigned the applicant; the record of an applicant was located in this numerically arranged registration file by the use of a supplementary file of index cards arranged alphabetically and giving the applicant's name and registration number.

The registration files of most of the offices visited contained not only the registration card of each junior applicant but any supplementary information in regard to his qualifications which the office might have obtained. Whenever available, reports and recommendations of psychological-testing units, schools, social agencies, and employers were either inserted in the registration folders which most of these offices used or, in the case of the Philadelphia placement service, secured to the registration card by means of a flapless envelope open along two sides, which was slipped over a lower corner of all records assembled on each applicant. While arrangements like these sometimes tended to make the file bulky, they had the real advantage of centralizing all records on each individual so that they could be located quickly.

In a few offices supplementary records were not filed in this manner; instead, brief notations giving a limited amount of the additional information obtained from sources outside the placement office were either stapled to the registration card itself or else noted directly upon it in as much detail as possible. While files kept in this way were often more compact than those which contained all supplementary material assembled, nevertheless they did not in most instances contain the full information on each applicant that was available in the registration files of other junior offices.

Cross-references.

Junior-registration files maintained within the junior division itself were useful mainly in connection with filling job orders handled by

the junior division. In public employment centers, where most of the job orders filled by the junior division were those calling for beginning workers, counselors sometimes found it desirable to have the records of at least some junior registrants available for action in adult-placement divisions also. These registrants were, for the most part, limited to a few whose youth and inexperience properly entitled them to the special handling given to juniors but who also possessed some degree of previous work experience. While many of the positions which such applicants were qualified to fill were beginning jobs handled by counselors in the junior division, others were openings requiring occupational skills on an adult level which would automatically be allocated to adult-placement workers.

In order to assure these applicants consideration for the maximum number of jobs that they were qualified to fill, their registrations were cross-referenced in the appropriate adult-placement divisions. Two registration cards were provided. One, usually the primary registration card, was entered on the form regularly used by counselors for junior applicants and was filed in the junior division, and the other, known as the secondary registration card or cross-reference card, was entered on the adult-registration form by an interviewer in that division and filed for his use in the adult-registration file. Both cards were marked to indicate this duplication in records, and subsequent changes in the applicant's employment status which became known to one division were cleared with the other division, usually by means of interoffice memoranda.

In a similar manner the registrations of a limited number of juniors living in Rockland County were cross-referenced in the nearby New York City junior offices, where suitable work was more likely to be available than in the suburban district in which they resided.

In all public employment offices visited which operated as complete placement units, with the exception of the office in Concord, cross-references were given to a small group of junior registrants only. In Concord the registration of each junior was cross-referenced in the adult-registration files, irrespective of the type of work in which he had been classified.³ Much the same effect was achieved in the functional junior service in the District of Columbia, where the central placement file was supplemented by a separate file in the junior division.

Where the registrations of all junior applicants were cross-referenced in this fashion, a considerable amount of clerical work was necessary in order to keep the applicants' records in each division up to date. Counselors who handled the registrations of junior applicants in this way pointed out that many orders could be filled equally

³ The complete placement unit in Hartford, Conn., reported by questionnaire that all junior applicants were also given cross-references in adult divisions.

well by adult or by junior applicants and that the advantages of having the registrations of all junior applicants available for action on all employers' orders received outweighed the clerical work necessary to maintain up-to-date records in all divisions holding the applicant's registration.

In public-school offices the problem of cross-references seldom arose because insofar as possible all types of orders received were filled with junior applicants. School placement workers did, however, encourage many qualified young persons to register with their local public employment services when it appeared likely that this would materially improve their chances of obtaining work.

Classification Records

If the alphabetically arranged file was small the counselor could, by skimming through the limited number of cards, quickly locate the records of all applicants possessing the qualifications necessary to fill an employer's order. But this method of identifying applicants assigned to a specific occupational classification was far too time consuming to be efficient in offices with large numbers of junior registrants, and counselors in such offices found it necessary to maintain supplementary records to provide a speedier method of identifying applicants according to the classifications assigned to them. Although the form in which these classification records were kept varied somewhat in the different offices visited, in all cases the records themselves were so set up that information on registrants was made available, not according to the name of the applicant but according to the occupational classifications which had been assigned to him. Thus, classification records provided the counselor with a quick means of identifying the names of all applicants assigned to a specific occupational category, and enabled him to locate in the alphabetically arranged registration file the full registration record of each of these applicants.

The supplementary classification records kept were of three types, and since these three types of records were used somewhat differently by counselors selecting applicants to fill employers' orders, each will be described briefly.

Supplementary Files.

Most offices using supplementary classification records kept them in the form of a file which was arranged occupationally and served the needs of all junior counselors on the staff who might have occasion to consult it in filling employers' orders.⁴ Each applicant's name, together with other identifying information, was entered in these files under each of the occupational categories in which he had been classi-

⁴ Cincinnati, Durham, Essex County, and one of two branch offices visited in New York City.

fied. For this purpose, some offices used individual filing cards containing a brief summary of the information given in the registration file (see below); others used somewhat larger cards on which were listed in chronological order the names of all registrants classified in a given occupational category. By consulting all entries in the desired occupational category, counselors were able to ascertain the names of all applicants classified in that category and thus locate the complete record of each of these applicants in the alphabetical registration file.

CLASSIFICATION-FILE CARD

[Actual size: 5 by 8 inches]

Name		Class
Date of birth	Education	Experience
Remarks:		

Form used in Durham

Supplementary Lists.

Supplementary classification records were kept as lists in Detroit and in Philadelphia. Entries on these lists were made chronologically as each applicant appeared at the office to register and included brief notations about the specific classifications which had been assigned him. Inasmuch as each counselor in these two school offices was responsible for the registration and placement of a clearly defined applicant group, each kept his own supplementary classification list in the manner that seemed most expedient for the particular applicant group with which he dealt. In some instances, separate lists were kept according to the academic background, or the age, or the amount of previous work experience of the applicant; in others, according to broad occupational groupings which were considerably more inclusive than the specific occupational categories in which the applicants themselves were classified. Although an applicant might have been classified in several occupational categories it was seldom necessary to enter his name on more than one list, either because the list itself included all those of a specified age or educational background or because the broad occupational groupings used covered all fields of work in which the applicant might be suitably placed.

Visible-Index Files.

For a part of its applicant group, the Philadelphia office kept its supplementary classification records as visible-index files, which permitted greater flexibility in use than the classification lists that have been discussed. The device was made up of separate visible-index cards, giving identifying information on each applicant and the classifications that had been assigned to him. These cards were slipped into holders in such a way that a completed panel resembled a classification list. Visible-index files had the advantage, however, of enabling the counselor to add the names of new applicants, not necessarily in chronological order, as classification lists were kept, but in alphabetical order or any other order that seemed most useful.

Relation to Registration Files.

It should be noted that in almost all the offices using occupationally arranged classification records the registration file was arranged alphabetically. This was the direct opposite of the arrangement commonly used for the registration records of adult applicants in most public employment offices. These were usually filed occupationally, an alphabetical index file being used for finding purposes and the listing of an individual applicant under more than one occupational category being achieved by the use of duplicate or secondary registration cards inserted in the proper section of the registration file.

Junior counselors had not found the arrangement used by adult-placement workers to be practicable for their applicant group. Whereas the occupational abilities of the adult applicant tend to be fairly well established, and he may usually be assigned to one or to a very few specific occupational categories, the inexperienced junior applicant may often be qualified for placement in a variety of beginning jobs and accordingly may be classified in several occupational categories. Were junior-registration files arranged occupationally, therefore, they would require a considerably larger number of secondary registration cards than would be necessary for adult applicants. The number of secondary registration cards necessary in such a junior file would require fairly expensive office supplies and a considerable amount of clerical work for copying the data from the applicant's primary registration card, and it would, in any case, tend to make the registration file itself unwieldy. Most junior counselors therefore have preferred to maintain their registration files alphabetically and to supplement them with separate classification records arranged occupationally. Since the latter were supplementary to the registration file, it was necessary that they contain only the brief information necessary to identify the applicant, and the duplicate entries necessary for applicants classified in several categories could be made with a minimum of clerical work and expense for supplies.

It is partly because of the fact that a different arrangement of the registration file has seemed desirable in the junior division of the public employment office that many proponents of the complete placement unit have preferred that type of organization. Since the registration files of the complete junior division were maintained separately from the files of the adult divisions with which it was associated, they could be set up in the manner that best met the needs of the junior division.

This criticism of the functional type of junior division did not apply in all respects to the two functional junior divisions visited. In neither Cincinnati nor the District of Columbia was the record-keeping system of the employment center as a whole organized according to the usual methods followed by public employment offices. In Cincinnati the junior and adult records contained in the registration file were arranged numerically rather than occupationally and were supplemented by separate classification records which served the same purposes as separate classification records in the offices that have been discussed, and in the District of Columbia junior counselors maintained for their own use a master file of junior registrations arranged alphabetically as were junior-registration files in most other offices. In both Cincinnati and the District of Columbia, therefore, placement workers were able to avoid the inconvenience incident to keeping the records of junior applicants in occupationally arranged registration files.

Clearance of Files

Counselors removed promptly from the active registration files all records of applicants whom they knew to be no longer available for employment. In all offices the records thus removed were those of young people who notified the office that they no longer wished to be considered for placement as well as those of applicants placed by the office in permanent employment. A few offices handled in the same way the registrations of applicants placed in temporary employment; counselors in other offices considered such applicants as still available for employment and accordingly continued to keep their registrations in the active file.

The records of applicants who failed to keep the office informed of their employment status were removed from the active registration files also. This was usually done at regular intervals, varying from 1 or 2 months in some offices, to a year or more in others. Before taking this action, counselors in four of the offices visited⁵ made it a practice to notify the applicant in order to make doubly sure that he had understood his obligation to keep in touch with the office. For this purpose, three of these offices used the standard United States

⁵ District of Columbia, Durham, Philadelphia, Rockland County.

Renewal Card

[Return post card]

[Message to applicant]

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Telephone _____

In order to bring our records up to date, may we know if you are still looking for work?

Please fill out the attached card and mail it to this office. No postage is required.

If you do not reply within the next 10 days, we shall assume that you no longer desire our assistance in seeking employment.

Yours truly,

Manager.

By: _____

Date _____

[Message returned by applicant]

Date _____

Please check:

I am still looking for work _____ ☐I am employed _____ ☐

Name and address of employer _____

Comments: _____

(Signature)_____
(Address)

Form (developed by the United States Employment Service) used in District of Columbia, Durham, and Rockland County.

Employment Service form (see p. 55), which was printed on a return post card and so provided the applicant with a ready means of reply. Counselors in other offices periodically transferred all lapsed registrations to the inactive files without communicating with the applicants concerned or they sent notification that this action was about to be taken only to those whose registrations it was particularly desirable to keep on hand because they possessed skills and abilities for which there was likely to be demand on the part of employers.

Clearance was effected by transferring the applicant's registration card to an inactive registration file, where it was kept available should the applicant later renew his registration. Where the classification records of each applicant were entered on separate cards in a supplementary file, these supplementary cards also were transferred to an inactive file. Where classification records were kept as lists or where they were entered on lists used in occupationally arranged classification files, however, they were somewhat less convenient for clearance purposes. Counselors cleared these lists of the names of inactive registrants by crossing names off the lists. Inasmuch as entries thus eliminated tended to accumulate in large numbers in the less recent sections of the list, those sections became increasingly difficult to use and eventually it was necessary to recopy the active entries into current sections of the list. Several counselors interviewed referred specifically to this shortcoming but felt it was outweighed by the economy in office supplies and in clerical work that was achieved when classification records were kept in this form. The visible-index panels used in Philadelphia were much better adapted for clearance purposes since each entry was made on a separate card and inactive entries could be removed and new entries added at will without impairing the compactness of the entire classification record.

Removal and Transfer of Records

The registrations of applicants who reached the upper age limits served by these junior offices, usually 21 years, also were removed from the active files. Before taking this action most counselors made it a point to reinterview each registrant concerned in order to explain the reason for closing his registration in the junior division, and, particularly in public employment offices, to encourage his transfer to the adult division. In some public employment offices, also, the junior division's records of applicants making this transfer were routed to adult-placement workers for their information before being placed in the closed file of the junior division; most junior offices routed their records to adult-placement workers only when asked to do so, but a few, notably the junior divisions in Cedar Rapids and Rochester, sent automatically to adult divisions all records of applicants trans-

ferring their registrations. In these and in a few other offices, joint conferences between applicants and junior- and adult-placement workers were sometimes held at the time of transfer.

It was unnecessary, of course, to arrange for a transfer of records in the functional junior divisions of the Cincinnati and District of Columbia public employment centers, which maintained central placement files for registrants of all ages, or in the Concord offices, which achieved a similar relationship by cross-referencing all junior registrations. In these offices junior counselors and adult-placement workers shared information on the applicant's status throughout the period in which he was registered with the junior division. Nor did school placement offices find much occasion to transfer their records to adult-placement agencies. Counselors in the public-school offices visited did, however, hold themselves ready to furnish whatever information adult-placement workers in public employment services might request from them on their former applicants.

GUIDANCE PROGRAM

The registrations of most junior applicants were completed when they first came to the office or shortly thereafter, in order that placement might be made as soon as suitable job openings occurred. Counselors found, however, that many of these young persons failed to make the most of their abilities and opportunities unless time and attention were given also to problems of guidance, problems which varied considerably among different individuals but which were often of just as much importance as the more immediate need for a job; were this not the case, the term "junior counselor" would be a misnomer.

Counselors reported that many young applicants came to the placement office quite unprepared to appraise their interests and training in terms of the various employment opportunities that might be open to them in their communities. They needed a background of information about those employment opportunities and about the possibilities they had to offer the experienced adult worker. Other applicants, because they were unfitted or inadequately trained for work they wished to do, needed to reevaluate their abilities and interests and to plan needed training programs. Still others, who had never worked before, needed advice on such essentials as the importance of personal appearance in getting and holding a job and on how to conduct themselves as employees.

Consequently counselors in most offices spent a substantial amount of their time in helping young applicants to increase their employability. Under most circumstances, advice and information available in the placement office and mutual understanding between applicant and counselor sufficed to meet the situation; in a few cases in which problems were particularly urgent or complex counselors found it necessary to refer applicants to other agencies in the community better equipped to give the necessary service.

The Role of the Junior Counselor

Many of the guidance problems that counselors handled were common to a considerable proportion of the applicants with whom they worked. Regardless of differences in temperament and experience, most young people need information on how to conduct themselves when they apply for a job and when they obtain one, and many of

them have a common interest in learning about certain types of occupations.

Counselors in a few of the offices visited met some of these basic needs with guidance projects designed to reach their junior applicants as a group. In the District of Columbia, for instance, selected junior applicants were invited to attend a series of lectures and discussions sponsored jointly by the Young Men's Christian Association, the National Youth Administration, and the local employment center. University professors, employers, and representatives of the employment center gave talks on selected vocations and led discussions which covered such subjects as choosing a vocation and applying for a job. In Durham also, conferences on similar subjects, in which all junior registrants were invited to participate, were held under the auspices of the local employment center.¹

Use of the Interview.

Often the development of satisfactory attitudes and of suitable vocational and educational plans involves individual problems of temperament, financial responsibility, and family attitude. Problems of this sort can be clarified only through individual conferences between the applicant and the counselor, repeated as often as necessary. Undoubtedly most of the guidance given to young people in the placement office takes this form.

Good personal relationships between applicant and counselor are essential to the success of any counseling program, since the applicant as well as the counselor must have a desire to share and cooperate in any plans that may be developed. Most of the counselors interviewed felt that applicants could be counseled most effectively, not when they first came to the placement office as strangers, but when they returned for later interviews and were more familiar with their surroundings and with the counselor. Moreover, this arrangement also gave the counselor an opportunity to add to his knowledge of the applicant before reinterviewing him by inquiring into his training, work record, and character traits through other agencies that had known him in the past. Thus the placement staff in New York City made it a policy to use the initial interview chiefly for the more routine processes of registration and relied on frequent reinterviews for counseling and for the development of such special plans as might seem desirable in individual cases. In order to gain a good understanding of the applicant's placement problem and to initiate further plans with the least possible delay, counselors in the New York City junior-

¹ The school placement office in Portland, Oreg., reported by questionnaire that it conducted a work-application class to instruct registrants how to sell their services to employers. Other offices, notably those operated by the public-school system in Boston, Mass., and by the public employment service in Chicago, Ill., and Worcester, Mass., reported that their applicants were given similar suggestions in printed form.

placement service requested applicants to report for reinterviews at weekly intervals during the first month after their initial registration; after this they were usually required to report to the office only at monthly intervals, although if they desired to come more frequently they were welcome to do so.

The quality of the counseling undertaken by many junior-placement workers was undoubtedly hampered by the limited amount of time available for interviews. While the schedules which many counselors found it necessary to maintain were usually sufficient for registration purposes, often time did not permit the free discussion necessary for identifying any but those who most obviously needed counseling assistance. Undoubtedly, less obvious but not necessarily less urgent cases went undetected when interviews had to be conducted hurriedly; and even when detected it was of course all but impossible for many counselors to deal with complex situations in the time at their disposal.

This difficulty had led the junior counselor in Cedar Rapids to use his interviewing time somewhat differently from counselors elsewhere. In that office applicants kept their registrations active by reporting directly to the receptionist; the counselor himself held no reinterviews for this purpose unless applicants asked to see him. The time saved in this way made it possible for him to hold more leisurely registration interviews with all new applicants. These initial conferences often lasted three-quarters of an hour or longer and usually sufficed to bring to the surface any problems which might warrant special consideration. Thereafter, only those young people who were found to be in need of special counseling were requested to return directly to the counselor for reinterviews. Undoubtedly this arrangement worked as well as it did because in a community the size of Cedar Rapids a counseling relationship was comparatively easy to establish. Even under these circumstances, however, the counselor often found it inadvisable to initiate any extensive counseling programs at the time of the applicant's first visit to the office.

Counseling Resources.

The guidance programs of some junior offices were restricted almost as much by the training and experience of the counselors who carried on those programs as they were by the limited time available for interviews. The backgrounds of the counselors in the offices visited are discussed more fully in a later section of this report. It is enough to remark at this point that only one-third of the staff members of these 12 offices were college or university graduates with training in guidance techniques. Most counselors drew largely on their native common sense and alertness to the problems of young people, reinforced

by practical knowledge of work opportunities acquired through their daily contact with the employers in their communities.

Many counselors made use of reference material on occupations in their work with individual applicants. To meet the need for such material the United States Employment Service was, at the time of this study, engaged in assembling a series of technical job descriptions for use in public employment offices. This research program had not progressed far enough to make job-description materials available for more than a few major industries,² but to this extent at least it was furnishing counselors in public employment offices with job specifications useful for placement purposes and with a background of occupational information useful in counseling junior applicants.

The job descriptions prepared by the United States Employment Service were designed for the use of placement workers and were for the most part too technical to be useful to most young applicants whom counselors wished to refer to literature on occupations. For the latter purpose counselors found more suitable material in the type of occupational information that has been assembled by many public-school systems, fraternal organizations, private research agencies, and by the National Youth Administration. The material of this type that was available in some of the offices visited consisted of two or three miscellaneous pamphlets placed in the waiting room for the use of any young people who wished to read them. Counselors in other offices had assembled rather complete libraries of such occupational information; some of the branch offices in Philadelphia listed this reference material so that it could be consulted readily by applicants waiting to interview the counselor. In Philadelphia and elsewhere this kind of material was used also as a source of information to which many applicants were referred after their interviews with counselors. Especially in communities where public schools stressed vocational guidance, many young persons were more than ready to take advantage of such opportunities for obtaining occupational information.

Most of the occupational material used by each junior office had originally been compiled for general use throughout the State in which the office was located or throughout the country at large. Some counselors with whom the matter was discussed emphasized their need for further information dealing specifically with the local employment situations affecting their own placement services. A few counselors met this need by sending a limited number of their applicants to local business and industrial leaders who had expressed a willingness to give young persons information on local conditions. Others, notably the public employment center in the District of Columbia, had

² Automobile-manufacturing industry, cotton-textile industry, construction industry, laundry industry.

undertaken research programs in order to bring together in written form a fund of information about opportunities for young persons in their own communities which could be used by the placement office for guidance purposes. Occupational information assembled in this way included general information already available through published sources as well as data on the wages and working conditions prevailing in the community served by the placement office, the training facilities available there, and the establishments where employment opportunities for young workers were most likely to exist. Counselors obtained much of their information on local conditions by visiting workers in the occupations being studied, establishments in which they were employed, and the schools in which they received their training; occasionally they assembled it through questionnaires and by analyzing census material.

Use of Guidance Specialists

Recognizing that some types of guidance problems require specialized techniques and a greater expenditure of time by the guidance worker than most counselors are in a position to give, counselors in a few of the offices visited had so organized their programs that substantial numbers of applicants could be offered specialized guidance services through other channels. For the most part, these offices were large placement organizations where the size of the staff and the services available through other agencies in the community permitted a relatively high degree of specialization in the work of the various staff groups.

As has already been said, the junior office visited in the District of Columbia was organized in such a way that each junior applicant was provided with a specialized counseling service to the extent necessary. Inasmuch as the primary function of the junior-counseling division there was guidance rather than registration and placement, the junior counselors had been appointed primarily because they were qualified as guidance workers and had a knowledge of guidance techniques. Inasmuch as the more routine procedures by which each applicant's registration was completed and kept active were usually handled by other staff members in the operating divisions of the employment center, the time of the staff members in the junior-counseling division could be kept relatively free for counseling services. The young persons whom the junior counselors in the District of Columbia reinterviewed were not primarily those who returned to the office to keep their registrations active, but rather those who returned to the counseling service for occupational and school information, those who were encountering difficulty in finding work through the employment center, or those who wished consideration given to

their qualifications for work other than that in which they had been originally classified.

A somewhat smaller proportion of junior registrants were given a similar counseling service in three other offices visited. In the Cincinnati public employment center, staff members of the junior division as well as staff members of other divisions referred all applicants in need of counseling to consultants in another division of that center; in Detroit and in New York City junior counselors had access to independent agencies which maintained offices adjacent to the junior-placement service and had been organized to give selected applicants the specialized treatment sometimes necessary.³

In all three of these offices there was a clear-cut division of responsibility between the junior counselor and the specialist in the consultation service. The junior counselor was primarily responsible for the registration and, in Detroit and New York, for the placement of all junior applicants as well as for such development of vocational and educational plans as could be achieved in the limited time at his disposal. Although counselors in these offices were responsible also for detecting problems requiring more intensive work, they usually made no attempt to handle such problems themselves. On the other hand, the consultation workers to whom selected applicants were referred, acted only in an advisory capacity to the placement office and seldom undertook responsibility for placement. They were concerned primarily with the type of problem that involved long-term planning and training programs, and they worked mainly with young persons with personality or home problems that interfered with placement, those who were vocationally undecided, and those whose plans were at variance with their apparent abilities and who stood in need of counseling, psychological testing, or retraining before placement could be undertaken. The staff members of most consultation services undertook no work with persons whose problems were primarily due to mental deficiency, who were in need of psychiatric care, or who were already being served by other guidance or social case-work agencies in the community.

Care was exercised in the selection of applicants whom junior counselors recommended for special counseling services. Final decisions regarding which cases came within the sphere of the consultation service and regarding the special treatment which each individual should receive were left entirely in the hands of the consultation specialists themselves. This policy of careful selection, together

³ The Council for Youth Service in Detroit and the Junior Consultation Service of the Vocational Service for Juniors in New York City extended consultation services to applicants of the junior-placement offices in those cities. The junior service in Rockland County, which was within commuting distance of New York, also referred a limited number of junior applicants to the New York City Junior Consultation Service.

with the close contact maintained between counselors and consultation workers, made it possible for the latter to do intensive work when it seemed likely to be helpful. The junior applicants with whom consultants worked made up only a small proportion of the total number of registrants in these large offices, but even so the number served was considerable and the technical assistance which counselors were thus able to obtain was an invaluable aid to them in their placement work.

Consultation workers were able to devote considerably more time to each individual in this selected group than were the junior counselors who handled comparatively large numbers of registrants daily. They held careful and repeated conferences with the applicant himself and made extensive use of the supplementary material already discussed—interest blanks, school records and recommendations, social-agency records, and psychological tests. Data obtained from these sources, together with the record of the consultant's conference with the applicant, were usually entered on special forms, which provided more space for this kind of information than did the registration cards used by the junior counselor.

In Cincinnati the complete consultation record was usually filed in the applicant's registration folder and any staff member who had occasion to deal with the applicant therefore had access to all pertinent information available. In New York City and in Detroit, where counselors and consultation specialists maintained separate files, the findings and recommendations of the consultation worker were submitted to the junior counselor in written form at the time each consultation case was closed, and this report was filed in the junior office with the applicant's registration record. In both of the latter cities also plans acceptable to both the consultant and the placement worker were worked out for each applicant in joint conferences at which the recommendations of the consultation workers were related to the practical placement problem as seen by the staff of the placement office.

Use of School Facilities

Frequently the study of an applicant's placement problem pointed to the advisability of his obtaining further training in order to equip himself for work in which he was interested. In this connection, counselors made particular use of the evening schools in their communities. In Philadelphia, for instance, many registrants were requested to come to the placement office for reinterviews at the beginning of the night-school term so that supplementary training could be discussed; letters were written to other applicants suggesting enrollment in the evening schools.

Unemployed young persons were referred also to short-unit vocational courses given during the day and planned in such a way that training could be completed within a brief period of time. In some communities where short-unit courses were not available counselors themselves had been instrumental in inducing public-school systems and other agencies to develop such training programs, the staff of the placement service sometimes furnishing all or part of the instruction. Again in Philadelphia speed classes in shorthand, typewriting, and office machine work had been started by the public schools at the suggestion of the placement service and many applicants registering for office work were referred by counselors to those classes in order that they might have an opportunity to increase their proficiency. The teachers in charge of the instruction worked closely with the placement counselors, often recommending pupils whom they considered best qualified for openings received by the placement office.

Counselors in almost all offices also persuaded many applicants who were too young or too poorly prepared to make immediate placement desirable to return to full-time day school. The junior counselor in the Cedar Rapids public employment office estimated that during the 2 years his office had been in operation he had been instrumental in returning well over a hundred applicants to full-time day school. Some of these were young persons beyond the compulsory-school-attendance age who had intended to stop school, while others were pupils who had been referred to him by school-attendance officers in the hope that he could, through his practical knowledge of employment opportunities, convince them of the importance of continuing their education in order to equip themselves better for work.

Less frequently, placement workers referred applicants to the public schools for guidance. Thus in Rockland County junior applicants were from time to time sent to see the county director of guidance in order to obtain occupational information or to discuss the wisdom of dropping out of school to go to work. Apart from this, however, school guidance workers seldom served the immediate counseling needs of placement offices. The guidance programs of most school systems were generally keyed to serve the educational rather than the placement needs of their pupils; the guidance program of the placement office, on the other hand, was intended to orient the young applicant to a practical work situation at the particular time when he became available for employment—a situation with which school vocational counselors were often unfamiliar because they had little opportunity to observe current employment conditions at first hand. In view of this situation, many placement counselors have felt that the school's greatest field of service in connection with placement counseling lies in the guidance which it offers to young

persons still attending the schools. It was perhaps significant that counselors in two communities with very limited school guidance facilities mentioned with regret that many of their young applicants were unprepared even to state the kind of work they wanted to do, whereas placement workers in a third community with an outstanding school guidance program stated that many young applicants came to the placement office well prepared to discuss their interests and to evaluate their qualifications.

Other Guidance and Training Facilities

As result of the counseling procedure, a limited number of applicants were referred to individuals and agencies in the community other than those already discussed. For the most part, such referrals were for short-unit training courses conducted by social agencies or adult-education councils. Less frequently they were for specialized counsel necessary in handling some types of health, social, and home problems. A few offices handled applicants who had serious health problems somewhat differently from other registrants; the special procedures used with this group are discussed in a later section of this report which deals with the registration and placement of handicapped applicants (see pp. 109-112). Frequently the arrangements between the placement office and cooperating agencies provided for an exchange of reports and recommendations, as in Cedar Rapids, where the instructor of a speed class in typing offered by the Young Women's Christian Association regularly reported to the placement office on the speed attained by the various students enrolled in the course, all of whom had been selected and referred through the junior counselor.

SOLICITATION OF EMPLOYERS' ORDERS

Almost all counselors spent a scheduled proportion of their time in soliciting job openings suitable for their registrants. Contacts with employers, made initially in order to explain the purpose of a placement service for juniors which was new to the community or to the employer, were continued at regular intervals in order to maintain cooperative relationships thus established.

In outlining the basic policies which lay behind solicitation, a supervisor of the New York State Employment Service voiced the feeling of many counselors elsewhere in stating that solicitation of jobs for inexperienced young applicants should be directed toward finding a suitable job for each registrant rather than toward a general search for any job openings that could be located. This had been a policy difficult to put into practice, however, because of the scarcity of jobs and the abundance of applicants at the time of this study. Consequently, much of the solicitation done constituted a general search for jobs suitable for all or for special groups of junior registrants.

Solicitation was most likely to be productive of job orders when it was timed to coincide with seasons of greatest business activity. Many enterprises such as stores, garment factories, and resort hotels periodically take on seasonal workers, and counselors in practically all offices found it profitable to emphasize solicitation from establishments of this sort at those times of the year when they were most likely to be needing additional workers.

Job solicitation was governed to some extent also by the fluctuations which took place from time to time in the character of the applicant groups registered in the junior-placement office. Thus counselors anticipating a large registration of high-school graduates at the end of the school year made it a point at that time to solicit firms with which they were most likely to place that type of applicant, and some offices occasionally used, as a guide to the types of establishments solicited, the particular occupational classifications in which they had a preponderance of well-qualified registrants at a given time.

There was considerably less solicitation of a particular job suitable for a given junior registrant than solicitation for all or special groups of junior registrants. Solicitation on behalf of individual registrants was usually confined to those applicants who possessed characteristics in which employers had previously indicated they were interested or to individuals, such as operators of power sewing machines, who were

qualified to do work for which there happened to be a current demand. Many of the employees with whom counselors got in touch under these circumstances had already expressed their willingness to interview at any time those applicants who were found by the placement office to meet their specifications. Other applicants for whom counselors occasionally undertook special solicitation included those whose physical handicaps made this necessary and those whose social background made their lack of employment a particularly acute problem. Although jobs sought for these various types of individual applicants did not always materialize at the time they were solicited, placements often resulted eventually.

In addition to this direct solicitation, counselors sometimes interested other individuals in the community in helping exceptionally capable applicants to locate suitable employment. One counselor with whom this matter was discussed had enlisted the help of members of a local fraternal organization who by means of their contacts in the community attempted to locate employment opportunities for the more gifted applicants.

Methods

The counselors in all the 12 offices visited considered personal calls on employers more productive of job orders than any other method of solicitation. Insofar as possible, therefore, office managers arranged interviewing schedules which would allow time for counselors to make these outside contacts.

The amount of time which counselors actually found available for solicitation by personal visit was necessarily limited by pressure of other duties connected with placement, notably by the number of registrants it was necessary for the office to handle. Time spent in visits to employers ranged from more than 30 percent of the counselor's time in one office visited to less than 5 percent of the counselor's time in others.¹ In general, counselors in those offices that had been recently organized devoted considerably more time to visits to employers than counselors in offices that had been operating over a period of several years. Particularly when the placement service was new in the community and there was a need to build up an adequate employer clientele as quickly as possible, counselors found it necessary to devote a considerable proportion of their time to making these visits. Thus, when the junior-placement office was organized in Rockland County more than half of the counselor's time was given to calling on employers in order to acquaint them with the service and solicit job orders; by the end of a year the major part of this canvass of employers in the district had been completed and the time

¹ In public employment offices, solicitation was done by adult-placement workers as well as by junior counselors, and some orders obtained by the former were eventually routed to junior divisions for handling.

given to visits to firms had been cut to approximately one-tenth of the counselor's time. In this office, as in other offices, the counselor continued to solicit job orders by calling on employers who were unacquainted with the placement service as well as by renewing contacts periodically with those who had already been approached. The total time necessary for solicitation was diminished, however, because most employers already knew of the placement service available and calls made to renew previous contacts were comparatively brief.

Letters of solicitation also were used to inform employers about the services of the placement office. Newly established placement services found it particularly necessary to supplement their visits with this less time-consuming method of reaching employers unacquainted with the service; otherwise they would have been forced to depend for their job orders on a comparatively limited group of employers until counselors could call on all employers who were prospective users of the service. These letters of solicitation were sent, in some instances, to general mailing lists drawn up from the directories of State labor departments, from city and telephone directories, and from information supplied by local chambers of commerce; in others, they were addressed to employers known to have had young workers on their pay rolls, according to the records of factory inspectors or of work-certification offices, and according to the statements of junior applicants themselves whom they registered at the placement office. Less frequently, counselors wrote to employers who advertised for workers in the newspapers, suggesting that they consider making use of the facilities of the placement office.

Through feature articles published in local newspapers and in bulletins of merchants' associations, through talks given by counselors before fraternal organizations and other groups, and through radio programs, many junior offices obtained other effective publicity. None of those methods, with the exception of the last, was used regularly in any of the offices visited, however. In the District of Columbia a series of radio broadcasts sponsored by the public employment center had proved effective in giving the community an understanding of its work. Brief programs, scheduled each morning over a period of several months, featured talks by various staff members on the operation of the service and interviews between the radio announcer and selected registrants which served to demonstrate the types of applicants available for placement.

Maintenance of Contacts With Employers

Several of the offices visited had been in operation for a considerable period of time, and most of their contacts with employers were with those who already knew about the placement service. Insofar as

possible, counselors endeavored to get in touch with all such employers at regular intervals and their solicitation was planned with this end in mind. For the most part, they did not find it practicable from the point of view of the placement office or desirable from that of the employer to rely entirely on visits to employers to accomplish this purpose. Once a satisfactory working relationship had been established between the employer and the placement office—and this might or might not have necessitated several visits—the relationship could often be maintained in other ways.

Some counselors renewed their initial contacts periodically by sending employers letters, fliers, or monthly news bulletins reporting the activities of the employment service. Other counselors left with employers business cards, leaflets, blotters, or guide cards for filing cabinets which bore printed material advertising the placement office and served as reminders of the services available. In still other offices, it was a practice to follow up all or some firm visits within a week or 10 days with a publicity folder or a letter thanking the employer for the courtesy extended the representative of the placement office and reminding him again of its services.

Policies and Problems of Coordination

In soliciting orders each junior counselor tended to concentrate on employers who were most likely to have openings for the particular type of applicant that he registered and placed. Employers seldom use one type of worker exclusively, however, and most of them think of the placement service as an agency able to supply them with all types of workers. Employers are usually unaware of the distinctions made by the placement office when it assigns to different staff members the registration and placement of different age groups, such as juniors or adults, or of special occupational groups, such as industrial, clerical, or domestic workers.

Because of the light in which most employers regard the placement service, staff members in most school and public employment offices avoided calling on employers who had recently been visited by other staff members and, in soliciting orders, they acted not only as representatives of their own branch of the service but also as representatives of the service as a whole. If a counselor was one of several in a school office, he presented the services of all counselors in that office to the employer; if he was on the staff of a public employment service, he solicited orders for adult applicants as well as for the younger group registered in the junior division. This policy called for a minimum of self-interest on the counselor's part, and the degree to which he followed it was naturally influenced by the degree to which he could be confident that all orders suitable for his applicant group would later be routed to him for filling.

In the public-school offices visited it had not been difficult to put this policy into practice. Except for occasional openings in which teachers in the schools placed their pupils, no placement and no solicitation was done by staff members of the public schools other than the junior counselors themselves. Even where branch offices were operated, as in Philadelphia and Detroit, the employer clientele served by each branch was sufficiently distinct to make it unlikely that the staff members of different branches would have occasion to have any contact with the same employers. Hence, most school counselors serving the same employer clientele usually worked side by side in the same placement office and could readily keep themselves informed about the solicitation being done by all staff members of their offices; and since the applicant groups which each school counselor handled were distinguished by sex, educational background, or the type of work for which they were registered—differences marked enough to make it improbable that two or more counselors would hold the registrations of persons qualified to fill a given job order—each counselor could solicit orders for the entire office with the assurance that he would have an opportunity to place his own applicants in any suitable openings that might be forthcoming.

In the public employment centers visited, the districting of branch offices in New York City and the different racial groups served by each of the offices in Durham also made it unlikely that staff members of one branch would duplicate solicitation done by staff members of other branches. This was not always the case within a single branch or center of public employment services, however. Several of the public employment agencies visited were large organizations with junior and adult-placement workers occupying separate quarters in the same building. Since the junior counselors in some of these offices had comparatively little daily contact with the staff members of adult-placement divisions, and since both staffs served the same employer groups it was necessary to take special precautions to avoid duplication in job solicitation. Furthermore, many of the orders resulting from solicitation by junior counselors could be filled equally well by adult or by junior applicants; junior counselors could not always be assured, therefore, that all orders which might be filled by junior applicants and which might result from their solicitation would be routed to them for filling.

This situation made some degree of competition for orders inevitable whenever staff members became absorbed in the placement of their own particular applicant group without due regard for the placement service as a whole. It was a problem which was shared to some extent by all junior divisions operating as complete placement units in public employment centers. Particularly in large centers of this type, where the volume of work was great and where staff members in one division

had little informal contact with staff members in other divisions, careful coordination was necessary in order to avoid competition for orders and unwarranted duplication in visits to employers.

Supervisors in many of these offices have sought to unify and coordinate the activities of their various divisions by obtaining quarters for them on the same floor of the building and by bringing all staff members together at regular intervals in joint meetings. In Cincinnati and in the District of Columbia the problem of coordination has been met by delegating major responsibility for the solicitation of all types of job openings to special divisions of promotion or of public relations. Junior counselors in these two functional services did comparatively little solicitation, and the limited number of calls which they made on employers were in all cases cleared through the special division responsible for solicitation. This arrangement solved the problem of duplication of visits but at the same time it tended to limit the counselor's knowledge of local employment conditions and so deprived him of an opportunity to acquire some of the background of information needed for counseling. Particularly in the District of Columbia, however, counselors kept informed about the kinds of employers' orders being handled by the office because they frequently selected applicants for referral on typical junior job openings and because they also visited employers for the purpose of obtaining occupational information in connection with the research program carried on by that office.

Records

Two types of records were generally used to systematize the solicitation done by various staff members of the placement organizations visited. Counselors maintained files containing information on firms visited by staff members as well as other files, usually known as "contact files," containing the names of employers not yet solicited by visit.

The cards which went into the "firm-information file" provided for data about the physical set-up of the establishment, information about employment policies and personnel, and a description of the work performed with particular emphasis on work done by young people. All the public employment offices visited, with the exception of those located in the State of New York, used a standard United States Employment Service card prepared for placement offices handling applicants of all ages; other offices had adopted special forms expressly suited to the kinds of openings usually handled by junior counselors.

These special forms differed from the standard United States Employment Service form in that they provided more space for items which seemed particularly important in connection with openings for young workers, such as the employer's preferences in regard to education, experience, and personality traits, and his attitude toward employment of part-time workers and continuation-school pupils. The forms used in New York State (see pp. 74-77) are somewhat more detailed than the forms used in other offices visited but they serve to illustrate the kinds of information that that office had found particularly useful in this connection.

Information obtained on the first visit to an establishment was entered as completely as possible on the firm-information card. Further entries were made on the same card whenever job orders were filled for the establishment or whenever it was again visited. Each card thus provided a running record of the placement office's contact with each employer visited or served.

Firm-information cards were usually filed centrally where they were accessible to all staff members in the junior office who might have occasion to consult them. In public employment offices they often contained information on establishments visited by adult-placement workers as well as by junior counselors. In most cases these cards were filed alphabetically; less frequently they were filed numerically, industrially, or occupationally, with alphabetical cross-files for finding purposes. Counselors in some offices coded or tabbed the cards in such a way that they served as a guide in planning revisits and letters of solicitation that would coincide with the season of the year when a contact would be most likely to result in job orders.

The cards in the second type of file, the "contact file," contained the names of employers who had not yet been canvassed by representatives of the placement service. In several large offices this file was arranged according to the location of the establishments in order to assist counselors in planning visiting schedules that would involve a minimum of time spent in transportation; in other offices cards were filed industrially, to facilitate plans for soliciting specific types of job openings; and in some of the smaller offices these records were kept as alphabetical lists. Particularly in the large offices, the contact records sometimes carried notations of busy seasons or of the types of work for which orders were most likely to be forthcoming.

FIRM-INFORMATION CARD—INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS [Actual size: 8 by 5 inches]

RECORD OF INDUSTRIAL PLANT									
Name		Address		Phone	Product	Date of visit		Refer applicant to	
Building (type):				Floor	Type				
Kind of stairs		Elevator		Workroom (general comment):					
Fire protection				Space	Lighting	Ventilation			
Sanitation (wash rooms, etc.)				Noise	Safety appliances	Cleanliness			
				Liability to accident	To poisoning				
Total daily		Total weekly		Union shop: Yes		No		What union	
				Impression of management					
Seasons: Busy mos.		Max. force							
Dull mos.		Min. force							
Number of employees									
Total	Male (all ages)	Female (all ages)	Boys 14-20 yrs.	Girls 14-20 yrs.	Part-time workers				
Minimum age		Predominating age							
Predominating nat.		Nat. refused							
Handicapped		Cont. school							
Colored		Source of labor supply							
Impression of workers									

(Reverse side)

DESCRIPTION OF PROCESSES							
General description (machines used, etc.):							
Occupations for adults (list):							
Name of junior occupation	Number employed		Wage		Description of job Heavy, light, clean, dirty, standing, sitting, lifting, monotonous, method of training, etc.	Qualifications Age, experience, education, height, neatness, manual dexterity, etc.	Opportunity for advancement (In occupation or in wages)
	M	F	Min.	Max.			

Visitor Source of information

Form (developed by the New York State Employment Service) used in New York City, Rochester, and Rockland County

FIRM-INFORMATION CARD—OFFICES AND STORES

[Actual size]

RECORD OF OFFICE									
Name	Address		Phone	Business	Refer applicant to				
Type of building General comment:			Office conditions General comment:						
Elevator: Pass.			Freight	Stairs: Stone	Wood				
Hours			Ventilation						
A. M.			P. M.	Lunch	Sat.	Total weekly			
Predom. nat.			Min. age						
Impression of employer			Normal office force						
			Men	Women	Juniors	Total			
			Cont. sch.	Part time	Handicapped	Colored			
			Impression of workers						
Kind of work			M	F	Wages		Possibilities for advancement		
					Min.	Max.	Special qualifications desired		

(Reverse side)

Remarks (bonus, vacations, overtime, welfare, education, and plant cont. sch.):

Position

Source of Inform

Date of visit

Visitor

Form (developed by the New York State Employment Service) used in New York City, Rochester, and Rockland County

RECEIPT AND FILLING OF EMPLOYERS' ORDERS

Most job orders placed with employment offices did not materialize until some time after they were solicited and often they called for various kinds of workers. Coupled with the necessity for locating openings suitable for junior applicants, therefore, was the necessity for instituting within the placement office procedures for routing orders to the various staff groups who handled different types of registrants and for selecting and referring to the employer the registrant best qualified to fill the opening in question.

It was fully as essential for the entire placement organization to handle all incoming orders as a single placement unit as it was for it to handle solicitation in that fashion. As in the case of solicitation, this was made necessary by the fact that most employers were unable to specify the particular division or staff member with whom their orders should properly be placed.

The procedures followed in filling orders for junior applicants were of immediate concern only to junior divisions that functioned as complete placement units. It has already been noted that the junior offices in Cincinnati and the District of Columbia, both of which were organized as functional junior divisions, had little or no direct contact with employers in connection with the receipt and filling of orders. In Cincinnati selection of applicants to fill orders was always made by staff members of the placement divisions from a central registration file containing the records of applicants of all ages, and all referrals of applicants to employers were made by the same staff members. In the District of Columbia also, where counselors occasionally selected applicants to fill employers' orders, direct contacts with employers were almost always made by placement workers in the operating divisions of the employment center. In both these offices, then, the procedures of selection and referral were basically the same for applicants of all ages. The following discussion of the special procedures developed by junior counselors for the receipt and filling of orders suitable for junior registrants is based, therefore, on the experience of the remaining 10 junior-placement offices visited, which were operating as complete placement units.

Receipt and Routing of Orders

With the exception of a limited number of job orders which counselors obtained at the time they solicited employers or which employers

placed in person at the employment office, orders were usually telephoned to the office. Whenever possible, the employer's specifications for each opening were taken by the staff member who would eventually select a qualified applicant for referral. Telephone operators and receptionists, therefore, transferred each call directly to the placement worker who would be responsible for filling the order.

Incoming orders could be routed without difficulty in the few cases in which employers were sufficiently well acquainted with the personnel of the placement office to know the name of the division or of the individual with whom they wished to place their orders. When this was not the case, definite policies governed the allocation of all incoming orders. Any placement worker to whom an employer happened to be referred could of course make a record of his requirements and relay the order to the proper staff member, but such an indirect relationship between the placement worker filling the order and the employer whose preferences and wishes were to be considered was avoided whenever possible.

Within the junior office itself, the allocation of telephone calls from employers seldom presented difficulties. In most offices where two or more counselors were responsible for placement, each was assigned exclusively to the registration and placement of a specified junior-applicant group and consequently each tended to handle only certain types of employers' orders. In the New York City public employment service, where the staff was too large for responsibility to be divided among individual staff members in this manner, orders received by each branch office were handled by having counselors take turns at acting in the capacity of order taker and placement worker for the office. In the case of certain types of openings, chiefly those received from large department stores, there was provision for allocating orders among the several branch offices within the New York City placement system, regardless of whether the establishment was located within the district served by the branch office to which the order was routed.

The allocation of orders between junior- and adult-placement divisions of public employment services was considerably more difficult than their allocation among the several counselors or branch offices of a single junior service. Inasmuch as junior applicants were distinguished from adults chiefly on the basis of age and degree of experience, orders had to be routed between junior and adult divisions on that basis. This distinction was sometimes a difficult one to make. Job openings clearly calling for beginning workers, such as orders for messengers and mothers' helpers, could of course be easily identified as suitable for junior applicants and routed to the junior division accordingly. Other orders, such as those for certain kinds of operatives in industry and for office workers, were considerably more diffi-

cult to route to the proper placement worker, inasmuch as some of them could be filled satisfactorily by applicants registered in either junior or adult division. The allocation of such calls sometimes required exceptional judgment on the part of switchboard operators and receptionists routing incoming telephone calls. Age, when it was specified, frequently covered a range served by both junior and adult divisions; experience, on the other hand, was subject to a variety of interpretations. Most public employment offices found it difficult to apply any hard and fast rules to the allocation of orders of this sort.

Insofar as possible, public employment offices attacked the problem of allocation at the point where incoming telephone calls were first received by the office. Switchboard operators and receptionists were instructed to make brief inquiries about the requirements for the opening before referring an employer to the proper placement worker. The age and experience desired were most commonly the deciding factors; frequently general inquiries were made also about the type of work involved. Only seldom did telephone operators and receptionists inquire about the wage offered, usually only when they were unable to come to a decision on the basis of other information. Most counselors felt it undesirable to route orders on the basis of wage unless absolutely necessary. Their experience had been that all too often this information tended to direct to the junior division only those openings which were substandard in this respect.

In practice, most of the orders which telephone operators and receptionists found difficult to route on the basis of brief general inquiries were referred to adult-placement workers, who used their own discretion in filling them or in relaying them to the junior counselors. Where staffs were small, worked closely together, and had a clear understanding of the function of each division of the public employment center, an informal arrangement for transferring orders in this way was entirely satisfactory to both divisions. But in some of the larger employment centers, where divisions were less closely unified, such informal arrangements tended to direct to the junior division only those orders that adult-placement workers were unable to fill from their own files.

Some placement services have attempted to meet this situation by maintaining central order files containing a copy of every order received by the employment center, so that, whenever they wished to do so, both junior- and adult-placement workers might suggest qualified applicants to the staff member in charge of filling the order. It was partly because of the difficulties encountered in working out procedures to govern the allocation of orders that some junior counselors had cross-referenced the names of their applicants in the files of adult-placement workers. The use of secondary registration cards in the adult files was an assurance that junior applicants possessing

the necessary qualifications would be considered in connection with all orders filled by adult interviewers.

Records of Employers' Orders

In most of the offices visited, information about each order received was entered by the junior counselor on an employer's order card and this card was kept on the desk of the counselor responsible for filling the order until the opening was either filled or canceled; thereafter the order card was usually filed in an inactive-order file, arranged alphabetically according to the name of the employer.¹

Counselors in most of the public employment offices visited used the standard United States Employment Service order card. (See pp. 82-83.) The public employment offices of New York State used a similar form developed for the same purpose for use throughout the State. Many of the forms used in public-school offices were considerably less detailed than the United States Employment Service card, but all of them covered essentially the same information. Two² provided space for additional data on whether the job offered full-time, part-time, or vacation work; others³ called for information on whether the employer was willing to consider handicapped applicants or applicants who were still attending continuation school.

The Detroit public-school office simplified its order-taking procedure by using lists on which employers' orders were entered chronologically as they were received by the office. Each counselor kept a separate order list and entered on it all orders calling for workers within the broad occupational fields with which he dealt.⁴ Information obtained on orders listed in this way was necessarily less detailed than that entered on separate cards and was somewhat less convenient to analyze for statistical purposes. The procedure had been adopted chiefly because it made possible a considerable saving in time that counselors would otherwise have had to spend in record keeping.

Investigation of Establishments

In filling employers' orders, the needs and the protection of the applicant who is to be placed deserve the same degree of consideration as the requirements of the employer. Insofar as the wages, hours, and duties outlined by the employer were concerned, the specifications of each order enabled the counselor to judge whether the opening itself was suitable for a young applicant. These data did not by any means give

¹ In one branch office in New York City all filled orders of a given employer were filed with the firm-information card for his establishment; in Essex County filled orders were filed occupationally.

² Essex County, Atlantic City.

³ New York State offices.

⁴ Several offices reporting by questionnaire indicated that all orders were listed according to the name of the employer placing the order and that a separate order card was used for each employer.

EMPLOYERS' ORDER CARD

[Boys—white card; girls—buff card]

[Actual size: 6 by 4 inches]

EMPLOYER OR FIRM		POSITION OPEN	
ADDRESS	TEL. NO.	NUMBER OF OPENINGS	NUMBER TO APPLY
APPLY TO	ADDRESS	INDUSTRIAL CLASSIFICATION	CODE
WHEN	HOW REACHED	SEX M W	AGE RANGE
DUTIES		WORKING UNDER WHAT CODE	DURATION
		CODE HOURS	CODE WAGES
		HOURS WKLY.	DAILY TO SAT. SUN.
		WAGES	PER
		INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE EXISTING OR THREATENED?	
EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE REQUIRED		WHITE NEGRO OTHER	NATIONALITY C. J. P.
		MARRIED	LIVE AT WORK
		SINGLE	LIVE OUT
PERSONALITY, PHYSICAL, AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS		TIME LIMIT TO FILL	
		ORDER TAKEN BY	DATE

PLACEMENT AND REFERRAL RECORD

[illegible]

Form (developed by the United States Employment Service) used in Cedar Rapids, Cincinnati, Concord, and Durham

a full picture of the conditions under which the applicant would be required to work, however. Other considerations, such as sanitation, policies in regard to overtime work, and the general character of the surroundings were equally important in protecting the applicant from unsuitable working conditions. Much of this information could be obtained by the counselor only through a personal visit to the establishment in question in order to observe working conditions and to inquire into the policies of the concern.

In the case of those establishments that had been visited previously for solicitation purposes, conditions of work had already been ascertained by the placement worker and noted on the firm-information cards on file in the placement office. It was only in connection with the comparatively small group of establishments that had never been visited that there was need to make any special investigation of working conditions.

In the smaller communities, where virtually all employers had already been visited or were known personally to staff members of the placement office, there was seldom any need to make a special investigation of the establishments in which applicants were placed. On the other hand, in some metropolitan districts, where visits by the staff of the placement office were likely to be confined to large firms, many orders were received from employers about whose establishments the placement office had little or no direct knowledge. In actual practice, counselors in large offices filled most openings of this sort without making any preliminary investigation of the establishments in question because, under most circumstances, orders would have been canceled if applicants had not been referred promptly. Special investigation was considered essential only when there was good reason to suspect, from the information supplied by the employer when he placed the order, that working conditions might be undesirable.

Considerably more investigation of working conditions was undertaken after the applicant had been placed on the job than before placement. In Atlantic City the counselor checked every placement made by calling at the employer's place of business the day after placement; and in New York City and in Essex County all placements made with employers unknown to the office were checked as soon after placement as possible by a visit to the establishment from a staff member of the placement office. In offices where sufficient time was available for checking placements in this fashion, these visits provided a fairly satisfactory although somewhat delayed method of checking on the suitability of the placement from the applicant's point of view.

Even though counselors in some of the offices visited did not investigate all establishments in which they placed junior applicants and which were unknown to them, it should be emphasized that those with whom the matter was discussed were in entire agreement with

the principle that young people should not be sent out indiscriminately to work for employers under conditions unknown to the placement office. It was clear that pressure of work, rather than lack of concern, was responsible for preventing many placement workers from putting this principle into more general practice.

Substandard Jobs

Counselors were occasionally asked to fill openings that fell below their standards of acceptability. Usually these were openings offering low wages or requiring long hours or hazardous work illegal for young persons. Some of them could be identified by unreasonable demands made by the employer when he placed the order or by the employer's record of failure to live up to his promises to workers; a few were openings about which counselors felt doubtful and which, upon investigation, they found to be unsuitable.

In justice to their applicants, some placement offices refused to accept such orders. In the interest of maintaining satisfactory relationships with employers, however, the number of orders refused outright was usually kept at a minimum. Particularly within public employment services, it was a policy for counselors to accept orders of this kind, at the same time explaining to the employer that the conditions outlined were such as to make it improbable that any qualified applicant would be interested in applying for the opening. Inasmuch as most counselors made little or no effort to locate qualified applicants for orders of this sort the treatment given them in this respect was tantamount to refusal to accept them. Some counselors stated that although they did occasionally fill orders offering substandard wages they did so only when the training the young worker would receive outweighed salary considerations or when the applicant was faced with an acute personal problem that would be relieved by his obtaining any kind of work regardless of the wage offered.

Selection of Applicants

It is a generally accepted policy of employment offices that each applicant should be assured consideration for every kind of work that he is willing and able to perform. The placement worker who is filling an employer's order must first identify the records of all registrants meeting the basic requirements outlined by the employer and then select from among this group of qualifying registrants the applicant who is best able to do the work required and who is interested in the opportunities it offers. The first process, known as initial selection, involves a brief inspection of the records of a fairly large group of registrants, and the second, or final selection, involves a careful examination of the entire registration record of each applicant thus found to be reasonably well qualified for the opening.

Initial Selection.

Initial selection was intended to single out from the entire applicant group those who might be qualified to fill the order and to eliminate from further consideration all those classified in other occupational categories and those who, although classified in the desired category, were obviously not qualified for the opening because of sex or other factors specified by the employer. Much of this first part of the selection process was routine, and in many offices it was performed by clerical workers acting under the instructions of the counselor.

Counselors in Atlantic City, Cedar Rapids, Concord, and Rockland County made their initial selections directly from their registration files. After inspecting the occupational or descriptive classifications assigned to each registrant they withdrew for closer examination the cards of those whose classifications indicated that they possessed the qualifications necessary for the order that was being filled. When no qualified applicants were listed in the proper classification, related classifications were usually consulted.

It was evident that this procedure was satisfactory chiefly because the registration files in those four offices were small; seldom did the number of cards in their active files exceed 350, and in all cases the occupational classifications were entered near the top of the record so that the brief initial inspection could be accomplished quickly. Furthermore, counselors seldom needed to inspect more than half of these registration cards in connection with any one order, for their files were already separated according to the sex of the applicant, and this was an item almost always specified on the employer's order.

In Rochester, where the placement office was somewhat larger, counselors also made their initial selections directly from the registration file. Inasmuch as scanning the entries on the rather large number of cards in this file would have been unduly time consuming, tabs were attached to each registration card, their color and position indicating to the counselor the broad occupational group or groups to which each applicant was classified for placement. Thus the counselor was provided with a quick means of identifying all registrants classified within a specific occupational field, among whom he could locate by further inspection of each record all those classified in the desired occupational category.

The active files of the other placement services visited were too large to be used for initial selection in either of the ways that have been discussed. Some of them contained the records of more than a thousand applicants, and even a brief inspection of the classifications assigned to so many applicants would have taken too much of the counselor's time to be a satisfactory procedure in filling employers' orders. Furthermore, the group of registrants thus selected on the basis of classifications would often prove to be too large for practical

purposes of final selection and would include many obviously not qualified for the order held, because employers in large communities specified much more frequently than did employers in small communities the age range, training, or nationality that they considered acceptable. Counselors in large offices found it necessary, therefore, to develop procedures that would speed up the process of initial selection and at the same time narrow down to reasonable proportions the number of applicants whose records were to be given final consideration for the opening being filled.

In one large placement office, the Long Island City branch of the New York City public employment service, selections were made directly from the registration file also, but the work was done by a machine. The office used special registration cards, each of which was notched along the edges according to the applicant's occupational classifications, age, training, and other qualifications. These cards were passed through a selecting machine, which could be so adjusted that it automatically singled out the records of all registrants meeting the basic requirements for the job order to be filled.

Counselors in other large offices⁵ made their initial selections by means of the separate classification records which have been discussed. (See pp. 51-54.) Where these records were kept as lists or in visible-index holders initial selections were usually made by scanning the occupational categories and the special qualifications noted opposite each registrant's name and by then withdrawing from the registration file the records of all those who met the employer's specifications. Where supplementary classification records were kept as occupationally arranged classification files, counselors had only to consult the names and other data entered under the proper section of the classification file in order to determine which of their applicants met the basic requirements for the job order to be filled.

Final Selection.

The final selection of the applicant best qualified to fill an employer's order was made by comparing all specifications of the order held with the full registration record of each of the applicants who had been identified by the process of initial selection. Many counselors consulted not only the order at hand but whatever information about the firm and previous orders from the employer was available in the office.

In making final selection counselors considered not only the specifications of the order but also the special interests of the applicant. Just as an applicant not fully equipped to meet the demands which the job makes upon his training and abilities will probably prove to be an unsatisfactory worker, so an applicant will be likely to prove equally unsatisfactory if his qualifications, even though they fit him for work

⁵ Detroit, Durham, Essex County, New York City (Brooklyn branch office), Philadelphia.

in the same occupational field, are definitely superior to the opportunities which the job holds for him or if his interests are such that he will not be satisfied in the job.

Under all but the most unusual circumstances junior-placement counselors followed this policy of basing their final selections on the individual's ability to do the job and the likelihood that the job would, in turn, prove to be in line with his interests. Nevertheless, there has undoubtedly entered into junior-placement work a recognition of the need to help the inexperienced applicant to see the value of a beginning job and to assist him through his work experience to develop his potentialities to the highest degree possible. Occasionally, when the most promising applicant available for an opening under consideration has failed, at the time of placement, to measure up to the employer's specifications in characteristics such as poise, or even in some phases of his preparation or previous work experience, junior counselors have sought to enlist the employer's cooperation in working out necessary adjustments. Still other young applicants come to the placement office specially trained for work in which there is very small chance of obtaining positions and counselors have found it desirable sometimes to consider such applicants for referral on beginning jobs which, although they are in the same occupational field, require a somewhat lower level of performance. Considerations such as these occasionally entered into the junior counselor's decisions in selecting the applicant to fill an employer's order.

In most large communities the counselor's selection of the applicant best qualified to fill an employer's order was usually considered final and the applicant thus selected was referred to the employer. In many small communities, however, the family connections of the applicant and the firms for which he had previously worked sometimes played an important part in determining whether he was acceptable in all respects to the employer. Accordingly, counselors serving small communities often found it desirable to check their tentative decisions with the applicant or with the employer or with both before taking any final action in regard to the referral.

Most counselors referred to the employer the same number of applicants that the order called for. This might or might not be the same as the number of positions available, for employers frequently asked to see several applicants for a single opening. Most counselors discouraged this practice whenever possible, however, feeling that the competition involved often placed young persons at an undue disadvantage and that the procedure was at best inefficient.

Occasionally the best selection a counselor was able to make from the registration records narrowed his choice down to two or more applicants who seemed equally well qualified for a single opening. Sometimes such applicants were called into the office for reinterviews

in order that the counselor might check information previously recorded and make a more careful evaluation of qualifications. Less frequently counselors left the final decision up to the employer, either by discussing the matter with him over the telephone or by referring to him all applicants who seemed equally well qualified so that he might interview them personally and state his own preference. Counselors in other offices made it a policy to select from equally well-qualified applicants those who had been in most frequent or most recent touch with the placement office; still others gave precedence to applicants whom social agencies in the community had referred to the office and for whom employment offered a solution to urgent personal problems.

Other Methods of Selection

The procedures already discussed were designed by counselors to help them to handle selections in which the most important requisite was the occupational classification assigned to the applicant. Most selections were made in this manner. Nevertheless, all counselors had occasion to use other methods from time to time. Occasionally a job order had to be filled immediately or it offered temporary employment with such limited opportunities for the applicant that it did not justify the time necessary for the usual selection procedures. Sometimes the classification into which the order fell was not so satisfactory an index for selection purposes as were personal characteristics such as height and weight or special talents and abilities; in other cases counselors were unable to find qualified applicants in the active registration file at the time the order was received.

Until a few years ago employment offices frequently made selections, not after a consideration of all qualified applicants who might be registered, but from among those who happened to be in the waiting room when the order was received. At the time of this study this practice was by no means so prevalent as it had once been. The limited number of selections made in this way were usually for those orders that came within the lowest limits of acceptability, and applicants considered for referral in connection with them were often young persons of limited ability.

At other times it was necessary for counselors to base selection on special characteristics and abilities rather than on the occupational classifications assigned to the registrant. To some extent initial selection for orders of this type could be made by consulting classifications stated in descriptive rather than in occupational terms. Often, however, the specifications of the employer's order were such that selection could be achieved only by examining all cards in the entire registration file in order to locate applicants who had the desired combination of characteristics.

Many counselors eliminated a considerable amount of this laborious work by keeping special lists and index files of the names of applicants who possessed special characteristics not related specifically to any one occupational classification but nevertheless important in filling certain types of orders for inexperienced workers. Probably the most extensive use of records of this kind was made in the District of Columbia public employment center, where junior counselors made a limited number of selections and for this purpose used a special-qualifications file, as it was called in that office. Applicants whose names were entered in this file were those who owned bicycles, who possessed special aptitudes as demonstrated by unusually high scores on psychological tests given at the employment center, who were exceptionally tall, who were proficient in one or more foreign languages, and who possessed other special qualifications. With the help of these records, selection for some kinds of openings—for example, openings for graduates of the eighth grade who possessed bicycles or for receptionists who would be required to give information to foreign-speaking clients—could be made more quickly and efficiently than would have been possible by inspecting each card in the entire registration file.

When inspection of the records of all active registrants failed to produce any applicant qualified to fill an order, other records, chiefly those of inactive registrants, were consulted. The inactive file usually contained the names of some applicants who were still available for employment but whose registrations had lapsed because they had neglected to keep the office informed of their employment status.

In a few offices preliminary registration data and school records assembled on young persons not yet interviewed for registration purposes represented another source of potential applicants which might be tapped to fill an order for which there were no qualified registrants in the active files. When these data revealed the name of a young person who had not as yet been registered but who appeared to possess the characteristics desired by the employer, the counselor got in touch with him and completed his registration without further delay; if he was found to be interested and qualified, he was then referred on the opening available.

Clearance of Orders

When counselors failed to locate qualified applicants within the confines of the junior office itself, they often turned to other junior-placement services, to adult-placement divisions with which some of their junior offices were affiliated, and to other employment agencies in their communities. It was evident that this clearance of orders occurred only rarely between schools or school placement offices on the one hand and public employment offices on the other, but within

their own organizations counselors in each type of junior-placement service reported that they frequently cleared orders and succeeded in finding qualified applicants in this manner.

Clearance with other agencies, as well as within the placement service itself, was usually undertaken informally over the telephone or by personal conference, since the size and the number of the placement organizations in most of the communities visited were relatively small. Only the offices in a few large metropolitan centers visited had adopted regular procedures for clearance. One of these, the public employment center in Rochester, circulated a daily clearance sheet among its various divisions, and in this way each division was kept informed of unfilled orders held by other divisions. In Durham staff conferences were held each morning for the same purpose. In metropolitan New York a number of public and private nonprofit-making placement services had set up a central clearance office to serve the same purpose. This central office issued and circulated daily bulletins containing job specifications for all unfilled openings referred for clearance by member agencies, together with the name of the agency holding the order. Participating placement organizations that had qualified applicants could then get in touch with the agency holding the order in which they were interested. The final decision on the applicant's acceptability rested with the office holding the order, and in most cases that agency assumed responsibility for completing the transaction with the prospective employer.

The service for the New York City area was the only district clearance system encountered in the course of the field study. State-wide and interstate clearance systems, organized by the United States Employment Service along the same lines, were quite widely used by public employment offices, however. These systems were particularly useful in clearing openings for highly skilled and specialized workers not generally handled by junior-placement offices, but counselors reported that occasionally they too cleared unfilled orders through these channels and placed their young applicants in jobs that came to their attention in this way.

Notification of the Applicant

Once the counselor had selected an applicant who met the employer's specifications the machinery for referral was put into action immediately. Counselors in metropolitan centers found it particularly important to take prompt action because business usually moved at a rapid pace and there were often competing employment agencies in the community. Delay by the placement office might mean the loss of the order under these circumstances. In the smaller communities,

where the tempo of business was somewhat slower, this pressure was less evident.

Counselors usually got in touch with the applicant selected for referral by the quickest means available. In most cases this was a telephone message either to the applicant's home or to a neighbor through whom he had previously informed the office he could be reached quickly. Occasionally telegrams were used. The expense of these was eliminated in one office by sending them only to those who had signified their willingness to pay the small charge of a collect message; another office reduced the cost by using a standard message which the telegraph company had agreed to handle at a minimum rate. Less frequently, office boys, clerical workers, and counselors themselves delivered the message in person. Finally, in some of the smaller communities, where communication facilities were least satisfactory and where it also seemed least likely that an order would be lost through a day's delay in filling it, applicants were notified through the regular mail or by special-delivery letter.

Referral

Ordinarily the notification sent to applicants requested them to report immediately to the placement office, where they were interviewed by counselors before being sent on to see the employer. Occasionally a junior applicant was referred directly to the employer without a preliminary interview with the counselor, either because the counselor already knew that applicant well enough to be sure that he could manage the interview with the employer satisfactorily or because the time that would have been spent in reporting first to the placement office would have seriously delayed the service to the employer.

It was difficult to estimate the extent to which interviews held at the time of referral were intended for purposes of final selection and the extent to which they were for the purpose of informing the applicant about the order and preparing him for referral. Inasmuch as only one applicant was usually called into the office for each position being filled it would seem that selection was not the primary purpose of interviews taking place at this time, although there was undoubtedly some element of decision about the applicant's acceptability to the employer.

Once the counselor had satisfied himself about the applicant's ability to do the work required, the preparation for the interview with the employer assumed major importance and most of the conference was given over to this subject. For many young persons an interview with a prospective employer is a momentous undertaking, and most junior counselors recognized this fact by giving the applicant a special

kind of guidance at this time. They have found that many young persons need preparation for the kinds of questions employers ask them as well as general information about the work they may be required to do and advice on dressing suitably for a business interview and on the importance of courtesy and a businesslike attitude. It is true that employers who understand young people do not expect a great deal from them in these respects, but it is also true that many employers do not have such an understanding. Counselors have found that a little coaching at the time the young applicant is referred to the employer often gives him needed encouragement and helps him over some of the difficulties connected with applying for a job.

Applicants sent to interview employers were usually given referral cards (see below); less frequently letters of introduction were mailed to applicants referred to employers without a preliminary interview at the placement office or else the office telephoned to the employer and gave him the name of the person who was being referred. These procedures served to protect the placement office against other applicants who might overhear details about orders and misrepresent themselves as having been referred by the placement office. Letters and cards of introduction also provided applicants with the feeling of assurance that credentials can afford.

REFERRAL CARD

[Self-addressed post card]

TELEPHONE	
TO:	
.....	
IN RESPONSE TO YOUR REQUEST WE ARE INTRODUCING	
AS AN APPLICANT FOR POSITION OF	
RESULT OF INTERVIEW EMPLOYED: DATE TO YES START WORK NO REASON EMPLOYER'S SIGNATURE.	WE APPRECIATE YOUR USE OF OUR SERVICE AND HOPE THAT YOU WILL CALL US AGAIN. PLEASE CHECK THE RESULT OF THIS REFERRAL. SIGN AND MAIL. NO POSTAGE IS REQUIRED. YOURS TRULY, MANAGER. APPLICANT INTRODUCED BY:

Form (developed by the United States Employment Service) used in Cedar Rapids, Cincinnati, Concord, and Durham

Verification of Placement

All counselors followed up their referrals to employers until they had ascertained whether the applicant had been found acceptable or whether the opening was still unfilled and the employer wished to interview other candidates.

Placements were verified through the employer or, when that was not feasible, through the applicant himself. Many of the introduction cards used were printed on return post cards which furnished the employer with a means of reporting to the placement office on the outcome of the referral, and applicants were usually instructed to leave these introduction cards with the employer for this purpose. Applicants themselves were also asked to inform the office whether they were engaged as a result of the referral.

Counselors stated that the great majority of placements were satisfactorily and promptly verified in either of these two ways and that it was necessary to verify only a small proportion of placements in some other manner. Occasionally, when the employer or the applicant failed to return the report requested by the placement office or when the counselor felt it desirable to verify the placement without waiting for the routine report to reach the placement office, the outcome of the referral was checked by a telephone call, usually to the employer, less frequently to the applicant. Sometimes this verification was made within an hour or two of the referral; at other times counselors allowed a week or 10 days to elapse. In all cases they tried to fit their procedure to the employer's convenience and to the circumstances under which the referral had originally been made.

Although these were the usual procedures followed in verifying placements they were by no means the only methods used. In Atlantic City and Cedar Rapids counselors verified many placements by calling personally at the employer's place of business, at the same time renewing contacts for solicitation purposes. Counselors in the Detroit office, accustomed to handling orders for many applicants from large industrial concerns, reported that they often verified placements by mailing to employers check lists of the names of all applicants who had been referred.

Much of the work connected with the routine verification through the employer or the applicant was handled by the clerical staff of the placement service. Whenever it was necessary for the placement office to take the initiative in getting in touch with the employer, however, counselors usually found it preferable to make the contact themselves. If the applicant referred had not proved satisfactory to the employer and the job was still open counselors were then in a better position to get further information on the employer's needs and to interest him in considering other registrants.

FOLLOW-UP OF PLACEMENTS

An inquiry into the work histories of any representative group of young persons produces convincing evidence that the junior applicant's employment problem is by no means completely solved once he has been placed. Many positions held by young workers require a minimum of skill and experience. They are the easiest for employers to fill and among the first to be discontinued during periods of business inactivity. Other openings, such as orders for some types of garment-factory work, are seasonal and are filled temporarily by inexperienced applicants only because more experienced workers cannot be obtained at such times.

The statistical reports of the offices visited reflected this situation. More than one-third of the placements that counselors made during 1936 were reported to be in positions which employers estimated would be terminated within a month of the time of placement. Moreover, the few records that are available on the actual duration of these jobs indicate that an even greater proportion than this did actually terminate within a month. Of 7,000 placements made during 1936 by the two branch offices visited in New York City, 52 percent lasted less than a month and only 13 percent lasted 6 months or longer. The Rockland County office, located in a rural area of the State, reported a stability of employment not much better. Of 250 openings in which this office placed its applicants during 1936, 46 percent lasted less than a month, and 22 percent lasted 6 months or longer. Although located in the same geographical area, these two communities represented the extremes in economic development within which most of the junior-placement services in the country fell.

Under these circumstances placement agencies concerned with the welfare of their young applicants have little reason to believe that their services will no longer be needed by the applicant when he has been placed in a job, even though the job shows promise of being permanent at the time the placement is made. As a result, many junior offices have developed special procedures for following up the progress of the young worker after placement.

Follow-up of placements should be distinguished from the verification of placement previously discussed. The distinction may seem obvious, but it was apparent from the questionnaire survey that preceded the field study that placement workers themselves sometimes confused these two aspects of the placement program. The follow-up

procedures discussed here entail an investigation into the youth's adjustment to the job after he has worked in it for a substantial period of time. Obviously it is not possible to make this investigation when the placement is verified, because there has not been sufficient time for the problems with which follow-up is concerned to manifest themselves.

Purpose of Follow-up

Follow-up has been for some time an activity common to employment offices serving applicants of all ages, but many agencies especially charged with the placement of junior applicants have changed the emphasis hitherto given to this phase of placement work. Adult-placement organizations that have undertaken follow-up have dealt almost exclusively with the employer and have been concerned primarily with his satisfaction in the transaction. While a few of the junior-placement offices visited did little more than this, there were among them a substantial number that considered the services rendered to the young worker through follow-up to be of quite as much importance as the services rendered to employers.

This concern with the progress of the applicant himself has come to be characteristic of the junior-placement office. Many times a job is lost to a young worker because of a situation that need not have developed. Young people new to a work situation must inevitably make certain adjustments if they are to become satisfactory employees. When counselors interviewed applicants before referral, they sought to forestall some of the difficulties that might later arise, but they could not of course anticipate all contingencies. Sometimes the youth's lack of experience as an employee gave rise to misunderstandings that needed to be clarified; sometimes his experience on the job indicated the advisability of further training in night school or continuation school in order to prepare himself better for the work he was expected to do. The young worker's chances of making the most of his opportunities could often be greatly enhanced by the well-timed advice and counsel of an experienced placement worker. Moreover, by keeping in touch with the young persons placed, counselors were in a position also to evaluate the worth of the job from the applicant's point of view. Sometimes their inquiries in this connection pointed to the wisdom of the applicant's seeking a new position which would afford him a better opportunity to develop his abilities.

While the adjustment of the individual to the job was usually the principal concern of follow-up, it was by no means the only purpose served. By continuing to keep in touch with employers and applicants after placements had been effected counselors also were able to add to their own fund of information about the policies and attitudes of individual employers and about job specifications for beginning

Date_____

Firm_____ Department_____

Address_____ Job held_____

Supervisor_____ Supervisor's title_____

Exact nature of work_____

Wages _____ Other compensation _____ Job expenses _____

Hours { Daily schedule _____ Lunch period _____

Days per week _____ Overtime _____

Vacation or time off _____

Chance to learn on the job_____

Advantages_____

Disadvantages_____

Age of applicant _____ Education _____ Height _____ Weight _____

School record_____

Testing Division report_____

Outstanding qualifications for job_____

Experience_____

Date registered _____ Date placed _____ Date left _____

Report on placement _____

Recommendation_____

Held by_____

Classification_____

Junior counselor.

Provided by the Maternal and Child Health Library, Georgetown University

workers in their communities. Sometimes information so obtained was analyzed and recorded in such a way as to constitute a valuable source of information on opportunities for junior workers in the community. In the District of Columbia, for instance, information about jobs in which junior applicants were placed was recorded in the course of follow-up on a special form (see p. 97) and filed occupationally so that it might be available to all counselors in the junior office.

Methods of Follow-up

Nine of the junior placement offices visited had developed their own special procedures for making a routine follow-up, through the applicant or the employer or both, of almost all placements made.¹ In other offices the same follow-up procedures were used in connection with placements of both adult and junior applicants or else the young persons whose progress was checked made up only a small proportion of the total number of junior applicants placed by the office. It is with the policies and methods developed by placement services with special follow-up programs for junior applicants that the present section deals, for they typify the somewhat unique emphasis that junior counselors have come to place on this phase of their work.

Methods of follow-up varied considerably in these nine offices, depending largely on the size of the group placed. In the smaller offices the volume of work was such that counselors could usually remember most of the placements they made over a brief period of time as well as any special problems of follow-up that they might present. In connection with their follow-up work, counselors in these small offices often took advantage of incidental contacts with employers and even with friends of the young persons who had been placed. In most cases they needed no carefully organized system for making these contacts. By contrast, large centers serving thousands of applicants and employers annually found it necessary to conduct their follow-up in a much more systematized fashion and gave special treatment to comparatively few cases.

Follow-up Through Employers.

In all nine offices placements were always followed up through the employer, provided the office had not been notified that the job had terminated. Some offices made it a policy to follow up all placements regardless of the expected duration of employment at the time the order was filled;² others confined their follow-up to placements with a probable duration of a month or more, sometimes including also a limited number of temporary placements that had presented good

¹ Atlantic City, Cedar Rapids, District of Columbia, Durham, Essex County, New York City, Philadelphia, Rochester, Rockland County.

² Atlantic City, Essex County, New York City, Rochester, Rockland County.

possibilities of permanency.³ Counselors who followed up temporary as well as permanent placements pointed out that the information they obtained was sometimes useful if the office later had occasion to consider the applicant for placement; moreover, temporary placements did occasionally develop into permanent jobs.

The customary procedure for handling follow-up through employers was to mail to them form letters inquiring about the progress of the person placed. (See p. 100.) Employers were asked to fill in and return to the placement office the brief questionnaires that were either appended to these letters or enclosed in them.

In Cedar Rapids and Atlantic City counselors reported that they achieved their best results by personal calls on the employer rather than by letters. In both these offices the group served was small enough to make this plan practicable and acquaintanceships existing between many employers and the junior counselors helped to make this procedure effective. Visits made in this connection were useful also in renewing contacts for solicitation purposes. Similarly, when counselors in larger offices solicited openings from employers, they occasionally availed themselves of the opportunity to follow up the progress of applicants placed with the employer. They could check on only a small proportion of their placements in this way, however, because of the time required to do so.

Much less frequently, counselors obtained follow-up information over the telephone. This was generally considered an unsatisfactory means of getting the desired information, however, and the offices visited used it only when employers happened to call the office in order to place further orders or when counselors had been unable to follow up the placement in other ways.

Special files were usually set up to serve as a guide to the office in preparing the communications necessary for follow-up. In some offices the cards used in these follow-up files were registration records that had been transferred from the registration file at the time each placement was made; other offices used special follow-up cards giving brief information about each opening filled. In all cases follow-up cards were filed chronologically by date of placement, their position in the file determining the date at which follow-up should be undertaken.

The time at which counselors in the offices visited got in touch with employers for purposes of follow-up varied from 1 week to 6 months after placement. In small offices⁴ the circumstances surrounding each placement frequently determined the exact time at which follow-up was undertaken. Larger offices, on the other hand, usually observed clearly defined follow-up procedures and much of the work was handled

³ Cedar Rapids, District of Columbia, Durham, Philadelphia.

⁴ Atlantic City, Cedar Rapids.

JUNIOR PLACEMENT

Follow-up Letter Sent to Employers

----- was placed in your employ through
this office on -----.

The junior counseling service is interested in knowing how this placement has turned out from your point of view.

We shall appreciate your filling out the brief form below and returning it to us in the enclosed franked envelope, since such cooperation will enable us to render you more satisfactory service. The information will be regarded as confidential.

Very truly yours,

Junior Counselor.

Is ----- still in your employ? Yes -----

No -----

At what job is employee working at present? -----

Present salary? ----- Has there been any advance in position or
salary? -----

Has employee's work on the whole been outstanding -----

good ----- fair ----- poor -----

Outstanding good points -----

Outstanding faults -----

Write in any recommendations you would like us to suggest for improve-
ment: night school, etc. -----

(If no longer employed, date of leaving ----- Reason -----

-----)
Additional comments: -----

Form used in District of Columbia

by clerical workers according to an established routine. In some of them follow-up letters were sent to employers approximately 1 or 2 months after placement;⁵ in others, after a 6-month interval.⁶ Many counselors were still experimenting in regard to the most effective time to check on placements in this fashion and they were in general agreement that each of these intervals had its own peculiar advantages. Since a large proportion of young workers are discharged or laid off from their jobs during or shortly after the first month of employment the end of the first month may well be considered an opportune time for the counselor to get in touch with the employer. If difficulties on the job have arisen or seem imminent, counselors can then try to forestall them by a word of advice to the applicant; even if the applicant has already been discharged because the job has terminated or because he has proved unsatisfactory, the office nevertheless has a valuable check on its own placement work and on the applicant's adaptability. On the other hand, a period of time considerably longer than a month is usually necessary for any reliable demonstration of the applicant's adjustment to a work situation, and placement offices have little measure of this unless follow-up covers a period of several months' employment.

Where relationships between the placement office and the employer were entirely impersonal, as they were in most communities, counselors generally found it desirable to get in touch with employers only once in the course of following up each placement. If follow-up was undertaken more frequently, the desired information was less likely to be forthcoming; the Detroit office, which had for a short time checked through employers at 1-month and again at 6-month intervals after placement, had discontinued the practice partly for this reason. This situation did not usually prevail in the smaller communities, however. The counselor in Atlantic City reported that he followed up each placement through the employer at least three times during the first 6 months and found this arrangement quite satisfactory to the employer.

Follow-up Through Applicants.

Counselors in all nine offices also followed up some or all of their placements through the applicant. In Atlantic City, Cedar Rapids, and Durham this aspect of the follow-up program touched only a limited number of young persons, chiefly those who returned of their own accord to the office in order to report progress on the job and those whom employers indicated to be in need of further training or practical advice on attitudes and work habits. Counselors in the other six offices⁷ either got in touch with all applicants placed, regardless

⁵ District of Columbia, Durham, Philadelphia.

⁶ Essex County, New York City, Rochester, Rockland County.

⁷ District of Columbia, Essex County, New York City, Philadelphia, Rochester, Rockland County.

of the probable duration of the job at the time of placement, or else with all those who had been placed in permanent employment. Some placement services not following up applicants placed in temporary employment, as was the case in the District of Columbia, continued to keep the registrations of such applicants in the active file; should those applicants fail to get in touch with the office after the prescribed interval for keeping their registrations active had elapsed, an inquiry about their employment status was sent them which was the equivalent of a follow-up regarding the outcome of the temporary placement.

In Philadelphia, New York City, Rochester, and the District of Columbia, follow-up through the applicant took the form of an invitation to come to the office to discuss the job during evening office hours that had been established for that purpose.⁸ In most offices it was a policy for the counselor who had originally handled the applicant's registration to see him at this time. Counselors in Rockland and Essex Counties got in touch with all applicants placed by means of a letter with a questionnaire appended. (See p. 103.) In this way each applicant placed by these two offices was asked to report on the status of his job and was invited to discuss it with the counselor if there was any further way in which the office could serve him. The counselor in Rockland County reported that she frequently had occasion to interview such persons at her home in the evening; in Essex County, staff members of the placement office remained on duty in the late afternoon whenever former applicants indicated a desire to confer with them.

Most counselors who followed up placements through the applicant stated that they felt these personal interviews were essential for effective work with at least some young persons. They had found that telephone conversations, interviews at the applicant's place of work, or information obtained from him by questionnaire often failed to clear up difficulties or even to bring them to the surface. Personal interviews were necessary if the counselor was to discover the applicant's true reaction to the job—a reaction that sometimes brought to light problems of which the employer was unaware or which he had neglected to report when the placement office communicated with him. Whenever the follow-up report from the employer was available at the time of this conference with the applicant, the counselor was in a position to know both sides of the placement situation and to discuss things from the employer's point of view as well as from that of the young worker.

⁸ The Durham office was planning at the time it was visited to institute a similar procedure.

Follow-up Letter Sent to Applicants

Several months ago we placed you with -----
as -----.

We are very much interested in learning how you are progressing in your work, and will appreciate your answering the following questions:

1. Are you still employed with the above firm? ----- If not, please answer No. 5 and No. 6, below.
2. What was your starting salary? ----- What is your present salary? -----
3. Have you been promoted or transferred? ----- If so, please explain.

4. Have you considered that further education or training might help you toward greater efficiency or advancement in your work?

5. If you are no longer employed with the above-named firm, when did you leave? ----- Why? -----
6. Are you now working elsewhere? ----- If not, I would suggest that you come in and renew your application.

If there are any problems in connection with your work, we may be able to help you with them. Through our knowledge of employment conditions and opportunities, we are in a position to offer advice or suggestions which you may find of value. Should you be interested in further education or training in preparation for advancement, we shall be glad to advise you regarding the educational and vocational courses which are available in this area.

Will you kindly use this form and the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope for your reply? You may also use the reverse side of this letter for additional remarks.

Cordially yours,

-----,
Chief of Placement.

Form used in Essex County

As in the case of follow-up through employers, counselors who followed up placements through applicants felt that there were advantages to be gained by getting in touch with them a few weeks after placement and again after a longer period had elapsed. The first few weeks after placement, they felt, was the most critical time at which to give whatever advice and encouragement might seem necessary and to establish the counseling relationship desired in this connection. On the other hand, a longer period was necessary before the counselor could be in a position to make a reliable estimate of the qualities displayed by the applicant on the job and the opportunities that the job had to offer the applicant.

The usual procedure followed was for counselors to communicate with each applicant about a month after placement, and the response that they received to their inquiries indicated that this was a welcome procedure from the applicant's point of view. Counselors in New York, Philadelphia, and the District of Columbia, all of whom maintained evening office hours, reported that at least half these young persons responded to their invitation to return to the office for conference. Where questionnaires were sent to applicants, as in Essex County, the proportion of replies received was even larger.

In many cases the interview held after the first few weeks of employment was followed by conferences at intervals that varied according to the needs of individual applicants. It has already been noted that in Philadelphia an effort was made to have subsequent follow-up interviews coincide with the registration period for night-school terms so that additional training might be considered and planned if it seemed desirable. Counselors in the offices visited in New York State made a routine follow-up of all applicants 6 months after placement, which was similar to the one made after 1 month. Applicants who failed to respond to this second invitation to return to the office during evening office hours were later sent a questionnaire on which they were asked to report briefly about their progress on their jobs. One branch office in New York City reported that 86 percent of the applicants placed in 1936 responded at the time of the 6-month follow-up either by calling at the office or by returning the questionnaire. Where the follow-up program reached such a large proportion of the young persons placed and where their experience over so long a period was reviewed, counselors were in a position to form a reliable opinion of the effectiveness of their placement work from the applicant's point of view as well as from that of the employer.

SPECIAL APPLICANT GROUPS

Most applicants served by junior-placement offices were handled according to the procedures outlined in preceding sections of this report. These usual methods of registration and placement did not suffice for taking care of all types of young persons, however. At least a few of those who registered with the junior-placement offices visited presented placement problems which counselors felt called for special handling. Included among them were applicants with serious health problems, applicants placed with the Civilian Conservation Corps or in positions as houseworkers and apprentices, and young persons whose recent or current association with the public-school system made it advantageous for the placement office to work closely with that agency. Usually some applicants made up only a small proportion of the total applicant group in any one office, but nevertheless they presented special problems that were common to all offices and that required adjustments in standard placement procedures.

Programs for special applicant groups varied considerably among the offices visited. They were influenced to a large extent by the character of the agency supervising the work in each office and by the types of service agencies available in the community. Close association with public-school systems had imposed upon some junior-placement offices special responsibilities in connection with the placement or follow-up of special groups of former school pupils; in other cities, the presence of other agencies in the community had caused counselors to adjust their procedures in such a manner as to avoid duplication of work and to utilize to the fullest extent the facilities of those other agencies; in still other cities, the very lack of these facilities had made it necessary for counselors to include in their programs special services which were only remotely connected with the placement function itself but which were indispensable if placement was to be satisfactorily achieved for the applicant group in question.

Applicants for Housework

Household service often makes unreasonable demands upon the time and energy of the worker and is for the most part poorly paid; the result is that many persons feel it gives a low social status to the worker and that placement offices often find themselves with more

orders for houseworkers than they have applicants able and willing to accept positions of this kind. Frequently these orders are substandard in regard to wages or working conditions or both, and counselors do not feel justified in recommending that applicants accept them. On the other hand, the employer who does offer satisfactory employment conditions often requires experience and personality characteristics that make it difficult for counselors to find well-qualified candidates for the opening.

Because of the scarcity of applicants who are willing to accept employment as household workers and who are qualified to do this work, some placement workers have found it desirable to centralize the registration of all applicants classified as houseworkers and the filling of all orders of this type. Such an arrangement has made it possible for one placement worker to consider all registrants classified as houseworkers for the most desirable openings received by the office, and to leave unfilled openings offering less satisfactory working conditions. It has also eliminated the possibility that some employers of houseworkers might place orders with several different staff members of one placement organization in the hope of obtaining houseworkers at a lower wage from one than from another.

In the public-school offices, where all registrants were juniors, there was no need to make special provision for centralizing the placement of houseworkers, since the division of responsibility among counselors in each of these offices was such that in practice each staff member usually handled all orders for houseworkers and registered all applicants classified in that field. Of the eight public employment offices visited, the usual procedures followed by the functional junior divisions in Cincinnati and the District of Columbia also resulted in centralizing the placement of adults and juniors registered for housework, inasmuch as in these two offices the placement of all applicants in a specified field of work was handled by one operating or placement division.

The remaining six junior divisions of public employment offices operated as complete placement units, with junior- as well as adult-placement workers registering applicants and filling employers' orders. Of these, the three offices in Cedar Rapids, Rochester, and New York City had developed special procedures for centralizing housework placements.¹ In each of these offices all placements in household service were handled by the adult-placement divisions responsible for this type of applicant, and the registrations of all juniors classified as houseworkers were, therefore, made available to those adult-placement divisions. This was done either by referring the applicant

¹ Special domestic-placement procedures, which were standardized for use throughout New York State, were not followed by the complete junior-placement unit visited in Rockland County, because at the time of this study the public adult-employment office in the county was making only a limited number of placements in private employment.

directly to the proper adult-placement division for registration or by giving him a secondary registration card, or cross-reference, in that division. Such action was in all cases preceded by an interview between the junior applicant and the junior-placement counselor and was undertaken only when it had the approval of the counselor as well as of the applicant.

Applicants referred for registration and placement in adult domestic divisions were generally those who were qualified for and interested in housework only. After their referral, junior counselors ceased to have responsibility for the registration or placement of such applicants, which was handled according to the usual adult procedures followed in these offices.

Young persons who were classified for housework as well as for work regularly handled by the junior division were provided with registrations in the junior- as well as in the proper adult-placement division and both divisions shared responsibility for their placement. Usually the primary registration card was held by the junior division and the duplicate card, or cross-reference, was filed with the adult-placement worker for consideration in connection with orders for houseworkers. The records of applicants in whom both junior- and adult-placement workers had this joint interest were signaled or coded in such a way that any further transactions that either division might have with these applicants would be cleared with the other.

In many of the other offices visited where junior counselors themselves registered and placed junior applicants in housework, orders of this type were handled somewhat differently from orders for other types of workers. Counselors obtained considerably more information about the job at the time the order was placed with the office than they did for other types of jobs, and they entered this information on special order forms. These forms provided for the usual data identifying the employer and giving information about hours and wages, and in addition included a somewhat detailed description of the duties of the worker, living accommodations, and the size of the employer's family (see p. 108).

Because of the considerable number of young girls who are placeable in household service, many junior counselors have been especially concerned with the need to raise standards in this type of employment. Whenever a prospective employer offered wages such as "\$2 a week and a good home," as they sometimes did, or made other unreasonable demands, counselors often handled the request as a substandard order and made little or no effort to interest qualified applicants in the opening.

Domestic Order Card

[Actual size: 6 by 4 inches]

Name	Date
Address	Transportation
Husband's business	Home telephone
Adults	Age of children
Single residence	Flat
Apartment	No. of rooms
Condition of home: Excellent	Comfortable
Poor	
Religion: C	J
P	Girls attend church: Yes
No	
Separate room	Shares
Class: A	P
F	Nights: Yes
No	Hours
Time off	
Wages	
Duties: General cleaning	Child care
Ironing	Cooking
Washing	Machine
Impression	

(Reverse side)

Type of girl	Nationality	Negro: Yes	No	Age
Experience	Personal qualities			
Referred	Date	By	Result	
.....	
.....	
.....	
.....	
.....	
.....	
.....	
.....	
.....	
.....	

Form used in Detroit

The counselor in Atlantic City, in his capacity as a school official, had made a beginning in regulating working conditions for young persons still attending school and taking part-time jobs as houseworkers. Before any such part-time placements were made, employers in Atlantic City were asked to subscribe to standards for house-

hold service which were set forth by the placement office in a schedule of wages, hours, and duties.² Counselors in other offices visited usually confined their efforts to attempts to interest individual employers in offering better conditions at the time they requested assistance in obtaining domestic workers.

Most junior counselors, even though they themselves made no placements in openings of this kind, did include in their follow-up activities all young applicants placed as houseworkers. Accordingly, staff members in adult-placement divisions who placed junior applicants as houseworkers reported those placements to the junior counselors who had originally referred the applicants to them.

Because counselors were doing follow-up through housewives rather than through businessmen, many found it necessary to modify their usual follow-up procedures. Counselors with whom the matter was discussed reported that letters addressed to employers of domestic workers often were unanswered. Some had achieved more satisfactory results by following up housework placements through telephone calls to the employer or by getting in touch with the applicant himself. And since the turn-over in this type of work is relatively high, follow-up of domestic placements was sometimes made after a briefer interval of employment than was the case with other types of placement.

Handicapped Applicants

Handicapped applicants made up another group that was often given special handling by the placement office. In determining suitable occupational classifications for such young persons, it was necessary for the counselor to have a thorough understanding of the limitations that their handicaps imposed on their sphere of activity. Before making a placement, it was often necessary also to enlist the employer's cooperation in accepting a handicapped applicant and in safeguarding his health on the job. Applicants whose disabilities counselors felt were severe enough to warrant such consideration included those with visible handicaps, such as facial disfigurements, amputations, or deformities, as well as those with nonvisible handicaps, such as epilepsy, heart disease, or serious eye defects.

Inasmuch as handicapped persons make up only a small proportion of all young persons, only in the largest offices was the number of handicapped applicants great enough to warrant the introduction of special placement procedures for them. The junior offices in Cincinnati, the District of Columbia, New York City, Philadelphia, and

² A similar attempt to encourage better working conditions was reported by the junior-employment department of the Milwaukee Vocational School, one of the offices that returned the questionnaire. This office furnished prospective employers and employees with a summary of the Wisconsin minimum-wage law as it affected domestic workers, together with suggestions of points to be considered in connection with providing reasonable standards of work.

Rochester found themselves in this position and each maintained specialists on their staffs who were responsible for at least part of the work with handicapped applicants. Many counselors elsewhere frankly admitted that their organizations were not equipped to deal with the special placement problems of handicapped applicants and that they were able to do little more than refer severely handicapped persons to other agencies, such as State rehabilitation agencies, for prosthetic appliances or for retraining and placement.

The relationship between the specialists responsible for handicapped applicants and the junior counselor in the five offices maintaining this special service varied somewhat. Four were public employment services in which these specialists served adult as well as junior applicants. In one of these, the District of Columbia office, the specialist served in an advisory capacity to the junior-counseling service and to the operating divisions responsible for placement; in the other three public employment offices—Cincinnati, New York City, and Rochester—the placement as well as the registration of handicapped persons was handled by a special division of the employment service to which handicapped registrants of all ages were referred. In the fifth office—Philadelphia—the junior-placement service, operated by the public-school system and affiliated with the United States Employment Service, had on its staff one specialist who divided her time among the four branch offices in the city and handled the registration and placement of all handicapped juniors referred to her for service.

Because of the exceptionally large number of handicapped registrants that it handled, the public employment service in New York City had set up well-defined policies and procedures for their registration and placement. Other offices with special programs for handicapped applicants were considerably smaller and had less need to adhere to formal procedures. Nevertheless, in most respects all five offices observed the same general principles in their work with handicapped applicants, and the program of the New York City service illustrates these basic policies.

Junior counselors in New York City were responsible for singling out all handicapped applicants, including those whose disabilities appeared to be slight, and for referring them to the specialists who were better able than junior counselors to determine the manner in which each applicant's disability might limit his employability. For much the same reason that applicants in need of special counseling were referred to consultants only after they had been to the office several times, most handicapped applicants also were referred to the division for the handicapped only after they had returned to the office for reinterview and were somewhat accustomed to its procedures.

The specialist for the handicapped, after conferring with the applicant and investigating any medical records which might be available through doctors and clinics, was responsible for deciding which applicants so referred had health problems serious enough to warrant special consideration in connection with placement. All those registrants whose handicaps were found not sufficiently grave to interfere with placement—for example, those with slight heart murmurs and those with defects in vision that had been properly corrected—were referred back to the junior division. A second large group with somewhat more serious disabilities, such as some types of orthopedic handicaps and heart disease, was also referred back for placement through the regular channels; in the case of each of these applicants, however, the specialists made the assignment of occupational classifications in which they felt placement could be made without injury to health, and they kept in touch with the applicant's progress by holding in their own files a secondary registration or cross-reference for him. The registrations of a third group of handicapped applicants, whose placement was likely to require a great deal of care and judgment, were retained by specialists for intensive work. This group included deaf mutes and those who used crutches, suffered from progressive myopia, or had other serious disabilities. Staff members working with handicapped applicants made every effort to keep this last group at a minimum, feeling that it was undesirable to emphasize the handicap in the applicant's mind by singling him out for special treatment.

The registration of an applicant with a serious handicap frequently necessitated a careful study of his physical condition and special abilities and the development of plans for retraining him in suitable work before he could be considered ready for placement. Interviewing records of and supplementary data assembled on most handicapped applicants in New York City were therefore more detailed than in the case of other registrants, and special registration forms providing additional space for this information were used.

Unlike most of the solicitation done by junior counselors, solicitation of openings for handicapped applicants was usually done with the individual applicant in mind. Specialists for the handicapped spent considerably more of their time in solicitation than did other placement workers and, since their placements were made with a relatively small group of cooperating employers, they also made greater use of the telephone in soliciting openings from employers who had accepted handicapped applicants in the past.

Placements were never made until exact conditions of work had been ascertained, usually by visit to the establishment. Thereafter, particular emphasis was placed on follow-up, because of the possibility that the job might prove eventually to include duties that were not stipulated by the employer at the time he placed the order and that

it might be unwise for the employee to undertake. Consequently, specialists working with handicapped applicants did much of their follow-up by means of personal visit to the employer's place of business and by conference with the applicant.

Applicants Associated With the Schools

Most junior counselors have regarded the services of the junior-placement office as a sequel to the training and guidance given to young people in the academic and vocational schools. As such, one of its greatest fields of usefulness is in assisting young persons to make the transition from school to employment. The common interest of school systems and employment services in the progress of this particular applicant group has led many counselors to cooperate with the schools by instituting special procedures for handling the registrations of young persons at the time they leave school for work.

High-School Graduates.

Graduates of academic high schools and of vocational schools were accorded special treatment by the offices visited more frequently than any other group of young persons associated with the schools. As has been noted, most of the applicant recruiting being done by counselors at the time of this study aimed to encourage this group of young persons to use the services of the placement office.

High-school graduates presented something of a registration problem to almost all placement offices because they generally became available for employment in large numbers at those times of the year when the schools were graduating their senior classes. Thus some placement offices had found themselves overwhelmed periodically with high-school graduates seeking to register for placement, and in order to cope with this situation they had found it necessary to make certain adjustments in their registration procedures.

Almost all the offices visited readjusted interviewing schedules in order to allow counselors a greater amount of time for the registration of prospective graduates before the end of the school term. In Rochester, for instance, the junior counselors went to the public and parochial high schools to explain the services of the placement office to school officials and senior classes a month or two before the close of the school year. Through the cooperation of teachers and vocational advisers in these schools, appointments for registration interviews at the placement office were arranged for boys and girls who were planning to register for employment after graduation, and counselors readjusted their interviewing hours at the placement office so that these young persons could be interviewed on Saturday mornings and on weekday afternoons before the end of the school year.

Counselors in Atlantic City, in Essex and Rockland Counties, and in Durham handled the registration of many prospective graduates in a similar manner, but instead of interviewing registrants at the placement office they registered applicants at the school during the school day. In Philadelphia some of the branch placement offices handled this heavy applicant load by furnishing supplies of their registration forms to teachers and advisers in the high schools, who assisted in the registration of prospective graduates by conducting preliminary interviews with pupils who were planning to go to work; applicants registered at the schools in this way were later reinterviewed at the placement office. Counselors in other offices prepared the way for a quick registration of high-school graduates by obtaining, before graduation, the results of psychological tests given to members of senior classes and by assembling teachers' estimates of the abilities and qualifications of young persons about to be graduated.

Aside from using these special procedures, most offices handled the registrations of high-school graduates in the same way that they handled those of other types of applicants. Only a few offices continued to treat graduates as a special applicant group once the initial registration had been completed. Counselors in these few offices undertook special follow-up for this group of applicants after placement, and in order to facilitate this follow-up some of them distinguished the registration records of high-school graduates from those of other applicants by means of separate classification lists or differently colored registration cards. Where this was done, special reports based on this follow-up were usually submitted at regular intervals to the schools concerned. In Rochester, for instance, placements effected for each graduate were reported at monthly intervals to the director of guidance and, through his office, to the school from which each applicant had graduated. And in Philadelphia, Atlantic City, and Essex County counselors followed up not only graduates placed by the employment office but all other graduates of prescribed courses, regardless of the channels through which they had obtained their jobs, sometimes continuing the follow-up until the applicant reached 21 years of age. Placement offices in these cities were thus able to furnish the schools with information about opportunities for young workers in their communities and the progress of their former pupils, and with a means of evaluating the training they were offering young people.

Pupils Enrolled in the Schools.

School authorities and junior-placement workers in a few of the communities visited, notably in Detroit and Rockland County, undertook some special placement programs for pupils who were still attending school. For the most part these were high-school seniors who

were offered an opportunity to gain practical experience for brief periods at Christmas and during spring vacation periods. Placement-office counselors and advisers in the public schools worked together in selecting qualified pupils and in conducting brief training classes for those interested in obtaining temporary jobs of this sort. These jobs were looked upon as a part of the training given to these boys and girls during their senior year in high school, and a careful report on the performance of each employee was in most cases returned to the school by the employer.

Aside from applicants placed through these special programs, young persons registering for part-time or temporary work were usually handled according to the regular procedures of the junior-placement office. In most offices such applicants made up only a very small proportion of the total number of registrants. Employers looking for young persons to work outside of school hours were in the habit of telephoning their requests directly to the schools, where teachers and principals who were in daily contact with young people looking for openings of this kind selected candidates to fill them. Some of the placement workers interviewed felt that this was undoubtedly the best way to handle orders of this kind, provided, of course, that school officials based their selections on ability to do the work required rather than on other considerations such as the need for a job. Placement workers pointed out that school officials possess a more extensive knowledge than the placement office of the school pupils available for part-time work and that they also know which pupils will be able to fill such jobs without jeopardizing their school work.

Applicants Placed as Apprentices

The school office in Detroit made a considerable number of apprenticeship placements and accorded this applicant group special handling. Apprenticeship training in that city was sponsored by industrialists who, through their manufacturers' association, employed a representative giving full-time to the selection of suitable candidates. The counselors in the placement office worked closely with this agent, making preliminary selections from among their registrants for his consideration. Their selections were in all cases based upon a consideration of the individual's interests and home background, his school achievement, ratings on tests of general intelligence and mechanical ability, and teachers' recommendations in regard to his suitability for apprenticeship training. This information was included on the school-information blanks submitted to the employment office for all graduates of the Detroit public schools. For all candidates recommended for apprenticeship by the placement office a summary of this information was forwarded by the placement office to the selection agent

of the manufacturers' association, who interviewed and made final decisions in connection with those to be accepted for apprenticeship.

In addition to the apprenticeship placement program in Detroit similar but less extensive programs were carried on in Essex County and Philadelphia, where counselors also cooperated with local manufacturers or union officials in selecting applicants for apprenticeship. Counselors elsewhere reported that they had no occasion to make placements of this type or else that they did so very rarely. Although preliminary selection of apprentices is obviously a service that placement offices are in an excellent position to give, many employers who might have been in a position to use the facilities of their local placement offices for this purpose showed little disposition to do so, preferring to obtain their apprentices through other channels.

Applicants Placed in the Civilian Conservation Corps

Many young persons registering in junior-placement offices were encouraged to enter the Civilian Conservation Corps until such time as their prospects for obtaining employment should improve. This was particularly true in public employment offices, many of which were in rather close touch with the program of the C. C. C. because of their national affiliation.

In Cincinnati the public employment office had developed a special program for handling this type of applicant. All young men in Cincinnati seeking to enroll in the C. C. C. were first instructed by enrollment officers to report at the public employment office. There, if they had not already done so, they registered for employment with a junior counselor in the placement office, who then sent them to apply for enlistment at the local office of the C. C. C. Shortly before each group of enrollees was scheduled to leave for camp, C. C. C. officials sent to the placement office a list of the names of those who had been accepted. Junior counselors checked the registrations of these young men and returned to the enrollment officer a report containing information about their special aptitudes and interests, together with information about the type of work for which each enrollee seemed best fitted. The Cincinnati office, which maintained an extensive program of psychological testing, was in an especially good position to supply this kind of information. It was made available in order that each enrollee might be assigned, insofar as possible, to the camp where he would have an opportunity best to develop his abilities.

At the close of each enrollee's enlistment period, the camp adviser forwarded to the placement office a form on which he reported the date of discharge, information about work experience and training acquired at camp, and recommendations regarding the enrollee's future plans. Counselors in the Cincinnati placement office, in re-

newing their contacts with these young men, often found this information valuable in reclassifying them for employment.

Other Types of Applicants

Applicant groups other than those already discussed were occasionally given special handling, although for the most part no extensive programs had been developed for them. Such groups included applicants registering as laborers in Cedar Rapids and as farm laborers in Rochester. These applicants were first interviewed by junior counselors and then referred for registration in adult-placement divisions. This arrangement had been adopted because there were usually more openings than applicants for these types of work and a centralization of placement made the best openings available to all registrants interested in obtaining them. Moreover, selection of a worker to fill job orders of this kind depended more on the applicant's physical ability to do the work involved than it did upon his temperament or intelligence, and it was not so essential for the junior counselor to give the special care in selection that was necessary for other types of job orders.

Applicants referred to the placement office by social agencies also were handled somewhat differently from other registrants in a few of the offices visited. Social agencies made such referrals to junior counselors informally over the telephone or, in a few cases, communicated by letter or on prescribed forms, giving the reason for the referral and furnishing supplementary information about the applicant referred. In the placement office the registration cards of these applicants were often coded or tabbed for identification, and some offices, including those in the District of Columbia, Cincinnati, and Essex County, regularly reported back to interested agencies on any action taken or suggestions they had to make for the applicant so referred.

SERVICES OTHER THAN PLACEMENT

The procedures that have been discussed had been developed primarily because they increased the efficiency of the placement service that counselors offered to applicants and to employers. All these procedures were more or less closely related to placement and occupied a major part of the time of junior counselors.

While placement activities are the main concern of all placement workers, most counselors interpreted the program of the junior-placement office in a considerably broader sense. The problems of most young persons cannot be catalogued arbitrarily as problems of placement, or training, or recreation and handled separately; a co-operative relationship between youth agencies of all kinds is essential if the program of any one agency is to be fully effective. Just as the placement office has been able to do a better job when it has had access to the records and the special services of other agencies in the community, so junior counselors, in their turn, have been of material assistance to those same agencies by sharing with them the experience of the placement office. It has already been noted that some activities directly connected with placement, such as follow-up, were so conducted as to furnish data useful to other agencies as well as to the placement office. Other services, often further removed from the placement function of the junior office, also were extended to agencies working with young persons in some of the communities visited.

Services in Regard to Curriculum Changes

Most school systems include in their curricula vocational courses that are directed toward preparing their pupils to earn a living. If this vocational education is to be effective, it is important that the school should know in what ways its program may be serving or falling short of serving this purpose. A junior-placement office is in an excellent position to furnish the public schools with this kind of information. From its contacts with employers it knows the particular fields of work in the community in which opportunities for young workers exist; from its examination of the abilities and aptitudes of registrants and from its follow-up of placements it is able to judge how well the schools are preparing their pupils for the kinds of positions open to young workers and to point out the shortcomings they may reveal when placed on jobs for which they have been trained by the schools.

Almost every office visited reported cases in which junior counselors had been at least partly responsible for changes in school curricula. Where placement offices were a part of their local school systems, schools undoubtedly made greater use of the experience of counselors than did schools in communities where junior-placement offices operated as separate divisions of public employment systems; nevertheless the same cooperative relationship between school administrators and counselors in public employment offices was found to exist.

In some cases lack of employment opportunities for certain groups of applicants as reported by the junior-placement office led to the elimination of vocational-training programs, as in Atlantic City, where a commercial course offered by a vocational school for Negro girls was discontinued; in other cases the facilities of the public schools were extended to pupils previously excluded from them, as in Cedar Rapids, where arrangements were made at the suggestion of the junior counselor for a selected group of parochial-school pupils to make use of the industrial-arts equipment in the public schools and thus acquire needed training. Again, in Atlantic City and in Rockland County the progress of young persons placed in office positions as reported by the junior-placement office led the schools to devote more time to instructing commercial pupils in spelling and in developing speed in shorthand and typewriting.

Similarly, the opinions of junior counselors were sometimes sought by school authorities who were considering the addition to the school curricula of new training units. Thus, before deciding to initiate a course in ornamental horticulture in one of the Rockland County high schools, school authorities consulted the counselor in the local public employment office about the demand for trained workers in this field; and in Philadelphia a large part of the summer-school program was built up each year on the basis of suggestions made by the placement office from its knowledge of the kinds of work in which there was a current demand for trained young workers.

The Essex County Board of Vocational Education, which supervised the work of the county junior-placement service as well as that of the vocational schools, probably made greater use of information obtained from the placement office in developing training programs than did the school authorities in any other community visited. At the request of the county board, counselors of the Essex County placement service spent an estimated 15 percent of their time during 1937 in research and investigation into industrial conditions that might have a bearing on vocational-training programs. Some of these investigations were conducted independently by counselors of the placement office, others were undertaken in cooperation with teachers from the county vocational schools; findings were usually submitted as formal reports with recommendations to the County Board of Vocational Education.

Many of these investigations were made for the purpose of determining whether changes were desirable in the subject matter covered or in the equipment used in connection with courses being given in the vocational schools; others were preliminary to the establishment of new courses of study. Especially when investigations were made for the latter purpose, trends in selected industries throughout the country were studied, and employers were visited in order to obtain information about the need for specific types of workers, the types of young persons who should be accepted for such training and the level of ability required, and the units of instruction and kind of equipment necessary for the projected course.

Special Guidance Services

Guidance was another field in which placement offices supplemented the work carried on by other agencies. Indeed, some of the placement offices visited gave the only kind of guidance service available in their communities, and the experience of the junior counselor in placing young applicants gave him a knowledge of current employment trends and practices which was often of practical value to school advisers and other youth workers as well as to young persons themselves. As a result, counselors in a number of offices were called upon to give group and individual guidance to young persons who in many cases were still attending full-time school, and they also served as a source of guidance information to school advisers whose opportunity for obtaining first-hand information about local business and industrial conditions was often limited.

Many counselors, when addressing school groups on the subject of their placement services, also discussed the importance of vocational planning and the relationship of aptitudes to occupational success. For the most part these talks were addressed to members of high-school graduating classes who would soon be going to work; less frequently, as in Cedar Rapids, counselors also discussed occupational opportunities and vocational and educational planning with those eighth- and ninth-grade pupils who expected to leave school for work or who were planning their high-school courses of study. In Atlantic City and in Rockland County this employment counseling was offered regularly to graduating classes in a series of class discussions held in the schools by the counselors themselves. At these class meetings the services of the junior-placement office were explained to prospective graduates, and ways and means of job hunting were discussed.

To a lesser extent guidance information was given through mimeographed bulletins addressed to school authorities and through articles for the general public appearing in local papers. In Essex County, for instance, the school placement office was occasionally called upon to answer questions received by the editor of a query column in one of the

local papers; it made available to school advisers the resources of its library of occupational information, kept them in touch with current articles and publications in the field of guidance, and furnished them with information about occupational opportunities in the community which came to the knowledge of its counselors through their solicitation of openings from employers. And in Cincinnati a publicity worker on the staff of the public employment center prepared for the school page of one of the evening papers a series of articles on the facilities of the employment office and on the vocational courses available in public and private schools of that city.

Assistance to Law-Enforcing Agencies

The employment of many of the applicants served by junior-placement offices was subject to regulation by State child-labor and school-attendance laws. Counselors who placed these young persons in employment and kept in touch with their progress thereafter were in a position to aid materially in promoting the observance of these laws. Thus the counselors in Rochester had prepared for the use of other agencies in the community mimeographed summaries covering work-permit laws and hours of labor permitted for minors.¹ It has already been noted that in many other offices proof of age was required from all registrants, who were thus protected from illegal employment.

Counselors in Philadelphia and in Rockland County were directly responsible for issuing the employment certificates required by their State child-labor laws. Even though many of the young persons applying at these offices for certificates already had promises of employment and so had no need to register for placement, counselors considered it advantageous to have the issuance of certificates handled by the placement office since it afforded them an opportunity to counsel young persons leaving school for their first jobs and to know which employers in the community were using young workers in their establishments.

Other offices, although not directly responsible for any part of the administration of State laws and regulations, made it a policy to report to the proper authorities any violations coming to their attention and to ascertain whether applications for work certificates had been made by all registrants who were required to have them. In Essex County and in Cincinnati the names of registrants of certification age were reported regularly to the authorities in charge of issuing certificates. Counselors in several other offices stated that they had had occasion to report to the enforcing authorities serious violations of State labor laws, particularly when these violations involved excessive hours of work.

¹ The school placement offices in Los Angeles and Milwaukee reported by questionnaire that they had issued similar material.

THE COUNSELING STAFF

A junior-placement program demands exceptional judgment and a background of information on the part of the counselor. The counselor in charge of the program must be a person with insight into the problems of young persons and ability to win their confidence and evaluate their abilities. He must be able to work harmoniously with school authorities and with representatives of other agencies. He must know where job opportunities for young workers exist in his community and be able to present the services of the placement office convincingly to employers. He must also be capable of so organizing the junior-placement program that it forms an integral part of the broader program of the agency sponsoring it.

Because the capacities and the personality of the counselor play such an important part in the program of the placement office, the caliber of the counseling staff is in many respects even more important than the merit of the basic procedures followed. A knowledge of the background and training of the counselors in the offices visited is therefore essential to a full understanding of the programs of those offices.

In order to obtain this information about the staff members of the offices visited, standards governing the selection of counselors were discussed with managers and supervisors in each office, and information about training and experience was obtained from a total of 60 counselors on their staffs.¹ Twenty-five were counselors in the 4 public-school offices and 35 worked with junior applicants registering in the 8 public employment centers. With a few exceptions their appointments were governed by the merit systems of the State employment services and public-school systems in which they worked. In some of the largest placement organizations,² the competitive examinations on which they qualified had been set up specifically for the position of junior counselor; counselors in a few public employment offices were appointed from among candidates qualified as employment-office interviewers or, in the case of counselors in school offices, as teachers.

¹ This total represents all members on the counseling staff in each of the offices and branch offices at the time they were visited. The number of counselors for whom information was obtained was as follows: Public-school offices—Atlantic City, 1; Detroit (1 branch office), 5; Essex County, 4; Philadelphia (4 branch offices), 15. Public employment offices—Cedar Rapids, 1; Cincinnati, 3; Concord, 1; District of Columbia, 3; Durham (2 branch offices), 3; New York City (2 branch offices), 18; Rochester, 5; Rockland County, 1.

² New York State Employment Service, North Carolina State Employment Service, Philadelphia Junior Employment Service.

Personnel

Most appointing authorities were of the opinion that junior counselors should be college graduates, preferably with some undergraduate or graduate courses in vocational guidance. In this respect, counselors in public employment offices and counselors in public-school offices reported similar backgrounds of training. Forty-nine of the sixty counselors for whom information was obtained were college graduates and approximately half of this number qualified also in respect to training in guidance. Many other counselors reported college and university training in related fields, such as personnel administration and social work. Of the 11 counselors who were without college degrees—9 in public employment offices and 2 in public-school offices—all had completed at least some course on a college level.

The background of previous work experience acquired by counseling staff members before their appointment also was considered important in qualifying them for work with junior applicants. Counselors in both types of placement services reported such experience in a wide variety of professional and business fields. Counselors in public employment offices were a comparatively young group of workers, however; three-fifths of them were under 35 years of age, while all but 1 of the 25 public-school counselors were 35 years or over. The previous work experience of counselors in public employment offices, although equally varied, had therefore covered a considerably shorter period of time than had the experience of school placement workers.

Supervisors placed particular emphasis on professional experience in placement work or in related fields like personnel management and vocational guidance as a valuable background for positions on their counseling staffs. In some public employment offices this type of professional experience was considered an acceptable substitute for college training. More than half of the 60 counselors in the offices visited had had such experience, having held positions as placement workers with other employment agencies, as training supervisors and personnel workers in department stores and industrial establishments, and as vocational counselors in public-school systems. Some appointing authorities also considered teaching experience a desirable prerequisite to counseling in the placement office; approximately one-half of the counselors in public-school offices and a somewhat smaller proportion of those in public employment offices reported this type of experience.

In addition to this professional experience almost all of the 60 counselors had acquired practical knowledge of occupations and industrial processes based on actual experience in work not directly related to counseling and placement. They had held positions in the fields of

business management, engineering, and labor-law administration, and had done various kinds of sales, clerical, and factory work.

Most appointing authorities considered the personality of the counselor to be fully as important to his success as his training and experience. Even where merit systems governed the appointment of new staff members almost all supervisors were permitted some degree of choice in selecting from among candidates whose training and experience met prescribed standards, those whose personalities and interests served best to qualify them for work with junior applicants.

Salaries

In view of the fact that the backgrounds of the counselors in the offices visited were similar in many respects, the difference in the salary scales maintained by the two types of offices visited was striking. School salaries were, on the whole, much higher than salaries in public employment offices. Of the 35 counselors in the 8 public employment offices visited, only 4, all of whom were in supervisory positions, reported salaries of \$2,500 or more a year, whereas salaries on this level were reported by 18 of the 25 counselors in the 4 school offices. Of the 7 school counselors who received less than \$2,500 a year, 5 were paid from funds allocated to school offices by Federal agencies, but all received \$1,500 or more a year. By contrast, 3 counselors in public employment offices were paid less than \$1,500 a year.³

This difference in salary scales may be due in part to the fact that most of the school offices visited were operating in large urban centers where salary levels tend to be higher than in small communities such as were served by several of the public employment offices visited. This fact by no means accounts for the entire discrepancy in salary scales, however. Even in cities of comparable size, salaries in the school offices visited outranked those in public employment services. The

³ Annual salaries reported by questionnaire for counselors in public-school and public employment offices throughout the country showed the same contrast as did salaries in the 12 offices visited. They were reported for a total of 226 counselors as follows:

Annual salary	Counselors in public employment offices	Counselors in public- school offices
Total	164	58
Less than \$1,500	76	5
\$1,500 and less than \$2,000	62	11
\$2,000 and less than \$2,500	16	13
\$2,500 and less than \$3,000	4	2
\$3,000 and less than \$3,500	6	13
\$3,500 or more		14

difference in salary scales may be at least partly explained by the fact that a large proportion of counselors in public employment offices had come to their jobs during the depression years when there was little difficulty in obtaining well-qualified workers at comparatively low salaries. Five-sixths of them had been appointed within 5 years of the time their offices were visited in 1937 and early 1938, while only one-half of the public-school counselors had served for so brief a period.

In-Service Training

Whatever the experience and training of counselors when they are appointed to the staff of the placement service, some plan of training for their new work is necessary. Newly appointed counselors need information not only about their duties as placement workers and about the procedures and policies of the office with which they have become associated but about the schools and other agencies in the community as well. Particularly in public employment offices it is necessary for counselors to have an understanding also of the functions and interrelationships of the various divisions of the office serving other types of applicants.

Only in New York City, the largest placement service visited, did newly appointed counselors participate in an organized in-service training program. Elsewhere there was comparatively little need for formal training procedures since counseling staffs were considerably smaller and new appointments were made at infrequent intervals. In most offices visited, therefore, the program of the placement office was explained informally to new staff members, and the instruction which each received was adapted to his background of training and experience, to his particular responsibilities as a member of the staff of the placement service, and, at least to some extent, to the amount of time that his supervisor and his coworkers found available for this instruction.

Irrespective of the manner in which training programs were conducted, there was similarity in their content and in the practice work they provided. The usual procedure was to have trainees observe other staff members at work and gradually, under supervision, to have them take over the same duties. In many of the smaller offices this constituted the backbone of the instruction given to counselors after their appointment. Often it included not only the registration of applicants and the filling of employers' orders but the solicitation of job openings. In some public employment offices it included observation of the work done in divisions placing other types of applicants as well.

The amount of time devoted to this process varied from a very few days in some services to at least a month in New York City, where trainees spent time in each of several branch offices of the city place-

ment service, working under the direction of junior- and adult-placement workers who served as training supervisors.

Observation and practice work were supplemented by frequent conferences with supervisors to afford the new staff members an opportunity to discuss the general policies and procedures followed, the development and the function of the placement service as a whole, and the school-attendance and child-labor regulations affecting the work of the office. In New York City, where there were usually several trainees receiving instruction at one time, many of these discussions took the form of group meetings.

Supervisors in several of the offices visited also made an effort to provide time for new staff members to make contacts with employers and with other agencies in their communities. In the District of Columbia particular emphasis was placed on visits to employers in order that new counselors might obtain occupational information and thus acquire familiarity with business and industrial conditions in the city. Newly appointed counselors in this and in other offices also visited and observed the work of schools and other agencies with which their work brought them in contact. Thus some of the counselors in New York City spent a part of their in-service training period working in the offices of the Junior Consultation Service, to which many junior applicants were referred by the public employment service for special counseling.

While most of these training and informational programs were designed expressly for new employees they were not always confined entirely to this group. In the District of Columbia all counselors and adult interviewers on the staff of the employment center were participating in an in-service training program at the time that office was visited. Begun during 1936, the course of training was intended for new employees only, but in its initial presentation it was extended to all staff members. In a series of group discussions held once a week, division supervisors reviewed the functions of the various divisions of the employment center, problems related to the coordination of the work of those divisions, and the development and philosophy of the public employment service in the District of Columbia and in the country at large. As the course progressed, a summary of each topic presented was prepared in mimeographed form as an aid to class discussion. In this way each staff member assembled a body of material that served as a manual of office procedure and policy. In addition to these discussions, guest speakers, many of whom were personnel workers, addressed selected groups of staff members on economic and industrial problems relating to employment.

This was the only organized training program in which all placement staff members were participating at the time the 12 offices were visited. In almost all the other offices, however, staff conferences were held at regular intervals, counselors were encouraged to take time to attend occasional conventions and training institutes, and they were kept informed of new publications and university extension courses related to their work. Most supervisors with whom the matter was discussed considered it essential that there be continued training of staff members after their appointment and exchange of information among all staff members in order to keep the program of the entire placement organization coordinated and operating in the most effective manner possible.

THE PUBLIC-SCHOOL SYSTEM AND THE PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT OFFICE IN A PROGRAM OF JUNIOR PLACEMENT

As it has become more and more difficult during the past few years for young persons to find suitable employment, attention has become focused on the need for a program of guidance that will help the young worker find his proper place in occupational life, and there has been a great increase in the number of offices providing specialized placement services for junior applicants. Chief among the agencies responsible for the development of this work have been public-school systems, public employment services, and the National Youth Administration. The two former types of agencies hitherto have been concerned primarily with somewhat different phases of the occupational adjustment of youth—the schools with the education and the vocational preparation of young persons, the public employment office with the placement of workers in business and industry. Particularly during recent years the pressing need of young persons for assistance in finding suitable employment has been bringing together more and more closely the functions of these two agencies. A placement service for young job seekers operated by either one of them finds that, by making use of the resources of the other, it can greatly improve the quality of its service.

The account which this report gives of the junior-placement programs of public-school systems and public employment services offers abundant evidence of the interdependence of these two agencies. Experience in junior-placement work suggests that the development of a cooperative relationship between public-school systems and public employment services may well be of far more significance in a successful placement program than can any answer to the much-discussed question whether one agency may be in a more advantageous position than the other to undertake junior-placement work. Given the same high quality of personnel—and this presupposes the financial resources necessary to maintain adequate salary standards and a staff large enough to meet the needs of all young persons who may require assistance in finding work through the placement office—a junior-placement program sponsored either by the public-school system or by the public employment service has the basic equipment for effective work. But such a program fails to reach its full effectiveness if undertaken

by either one of them without the cooperation and assistance of the other.

The school placement office has much to gain from the knowledge of employment opportunities and trends that is acquired by a Nation-wide public employment system, from the pooled experience in junior-placement procedures as developed by public employment offices throughout the country, and from the standardization in reporting methods that a national organization makes possible.

In communities in which junior placement is done not by the schools but by the public employment service, the schools can be of assistance to the public employment office by explaining to pupils withdrawing and graduating from the schools the facilities available through the public employment center. The junior division of the public employment center can greatly improve the quality of its service by making use of the records of achievement and ability that the schools may have assembled on applicants and by obtaining the recommendations of teachers, principals, and vocational counselors.

Thus the public-school system and the public employment office are in a position to make a valuable contribution to a program of junior placement. The interchange of services and information between these two agencies makes possible a junior-placement program that is based on the guidance program of the schools and that, by making use of the knowledge and experience of the adult-placement agency, helps the young applicant to become oriented in the working world that he is entering.

SUMMARY

The function of a specialized junior-placement service is to counsel inexperienced young persons in search of employment and to help them find jobs suited to their interests and abilities. The nature of the placement problem for such junior applicants differs from the placement problem of adults chiefly because young applicants have little if any occupational experience that can serve as a guide to types of work they are fitted for and interested in and are therefore under a serious handicap in getting a job.

This study deals with junior-placement services conducted under the auspices of public employment services and of public-school systems in which the program was sufficiently specialized to require the full-time services of at least one junior-placement worker. It touches upon the extent of such programs in operation in the United States during all or part of the year 1936 and studies more closely the work done by a selected number of junior-placement offices in 1937. Junior-placement programs of the type with which this study is concerned were reported to the Children's Bureau to have been operating in only 66 cities in 1936, notwithstanding the expansion in this field of service in recent years.¹ Two-thirds of these cities had a population of 100,000 or over; even so, young job seekers were offered such specialized assistance in placement in less than half the cities of this size in the country. Much more rarely did employment offices and school systems in cities smaller than this offer the same kind of assistance to junior applicants.

The major part of this report is concerned with the problems met by counselors in junior-placement work and the ways in which counselors have dealt with them in the 12 offices visited during the course of the study. The following summary reviews briefly the methods and procedures found effective in serving the young applicant group in the offices visited.

The most characteristic feature of junior-placement procedure is the interview between applicant and counselor in which the applicant's job interests and qualifications are discussed and evaluated. This interview initiates the process of registration with the placement office and in it the counselor seeks information about the applicant which is needed later in order to make a good selection for an opening from among all applicants registered. The interview, which is conducted with as much privacy as possible, includes a discussion of the appli-

¹ The results of a later survey of the extent to which junior counseling and placement services had been developed within public employment offices are given in appendix A, p. 133.

cant's school experience, previous jobs, and interests, the kinds of work available in the community for which the applicant may be qualified, and perhaps also his health and his hobbies.

This interview and subsequent ones, in addition to serving the needs of registering and maintaining the registration of an applicant, are the means of counseling the young person who needs help in understanding his own interests and abilities, who needs information on occupations and work likely to be available in the community, and who needs assistance in making vocational plans for himself that are in line with his abilities and with employment opportunities.

In serving as guidance as well as placement workers, junior counselors do not always have the time and resources necessary to render the intensive guidance assistance that is needed by some applicants. A few large junior offices found it possible to give specialized consultation services to a limited number of applicants who presented difficult problems in vocational planning or who seemed especially difficult to place. In some offices such services operated as part of the placement organization, and in others the services of outside agencies were available to the placement office.

It is often desirable for both registration and counseling purposes to supplement the information obtained through the interviews by using records on the applicant's abilities and background and by consulting other agencies that have worked with him. Counselors frequently consulted scores of psychological and other tests. Several of the junior offices visited in the course of this study had available testing services under the supervision of a trained psychologist and were, therefore, able to use tests to measure aptitudes and abilities. Other junior offices confined their testing programs to tests for proficiency in typing and stenography. Many counselors found the school records of applicants useful in helping them understand the abilities, interests, and personalities of young applicants. Other records used by some offices were proof of age, employer references when certain types of jobs were under consideration, and health records if available.

In addition to obtaining as much information as possible regarding an applicant's qualifications for placement, it is essential that a record-keeping system be maintained that makes such information on an applicant available in the office in written form and that also makes it possible to locate quickly the record of any applicant both according to his name and according to his qualifications.

In most of the junior-placement offices visited, junior-placement counselors not only handled the registration and counseling of young applicants but also referred applicants to employers requesting the services of the placement office. This arrangement of work was found in all public-school offices visited and in most of those operating

within public employment centers. A few of the junior services operating as units in public employment centers, however, specialized in the registration and counseling of junior applicants only, placement being made by units handling placement of adult applicants also.

In order to find job opportunities for its young registrants, junior offices find it necessary to determine which employers in the community have employment opportunities for relatively inexperienced young persons and to interest them in utilizing young applicants. Most junior counselors therefore spend a certain amount of time at regular intervals visiting employers' places of business. Through these visits counselors learn the kinds of jobs that are available in an establishment and the types of applicants preferred by the employer. This background, in addition to facilitating placement, helps counselors give young applicants counseling assistance that is geared to actual job opportunities in the community.

The selection of a worker for referral to an employer in response to an order calls for careful judgment by the counselor of the kind of worker that will be satisfactory to the employer and also of the qualifications of the applicant and of his probable interest in the job. At the time of referring an applicant to a job junior-placement counselors do more than is usually done by placement offices for adult applicants in preparing the selected applicant for his interview with the employer. The junior counselor discusses with the candidate the kind of work the employer offers and the type of questions the employer is likely to ask him, gives advice on how to dress for and how to conduct himself in a business interview, and generally encourages him for the momentous undertaking of applying for what may be his first job.

The assistance of a well-functioning junior office to a young applicant does not cease with placement. Many junior offices arrange their office hours to allow a period outside of usual working hours when young workers who have been placed on jobs can conveniently call for follow-up consultation. Junior counselors have found that after the applicant has been on a job for several weeks it is advantageous to discuss his problems of adjustment to the job, his interest and satisfaction in the job, and the possible need for further training or a shift in jobs. Consultation with the employer as to his satisfaction with the placement is also part of the follow-up procedure, but it is secondary in importance to follow-up through the applicant.

Throughout junior-placement work emphasis is placed on the individual and his needs and interests. This stress on service to the individual entails constant revision and refinement in junior-placement office procedures, modification in ways of dealing with special groups of applicants, and a branching out of activities in a variety of ways.

Many junior-placement offices also give certain services that are of benefit to youth by rendering assistance to other youth-serving

agencies. In some offices considerable work is done in helping vocational schools to set up vocational-training programs adapted to industrial needs and employment opportunities in the community. Services relating to vocational guidance also are extended to schools and other agencies. In addition, many junior-placement offices keep in close touch with the work of agencies enforcing child-labor and other labor laws and with officials issuing employment certificates. Most of the offices visited made it a policy to refrain from placing young applicants on jobs offering conditions and wages below an established level of acceptability, and some reported to the proper authorities conditions in violation of legal labor standards that came to their attention.

Throughout the field of junior-placement activities the ability of the junior-placement counselor himself is the key to the effectiveness of the service that the office renders to junior applicants. It is therefore of vital importance in the development and expansion of junior-placement services to develop and maintain personnel standards at a professional level both as to qualifications and as to salary levels. In the offices included in this survey the position of junior counselor was generally recognized as calling for special qualifications in personality, training, and experience, and the counselors, in the offices visited, both those in school systems and those in public employment centers, were generally well prepared for the work; but salaries, especially in the public employment offices, were often at such low levels as to endanger seriously the future development of junior-placement service at a desired high level of performance. Furthermore, the full realization of the possibilities in junior-placement service calls for provision of a staff large enough to handle the volume of work pressing to be done. Quality of service is seriously sacrificed when efforts to give some service to all comers result in insufficient time for counseling and for contact with employers and community agencies.

Special junior-placement services in this country have developed in response to a special need. Good social planning demands that community resources for the immature and inexperienced applicant for work be different from those for the adult out of a job. The junior-placement office is dealing with immature youths and with their developing individual abilities and personality characteristics. The junior-placement counselor, through the vocational counseling and placement assistance he gives the young applicant, can make a vital contribution to the solution of the problems the young job seeker encounters and can help him find a field of work that will be satisfying. By increasing that chance of finding satisfaction in work, the junior-employment office has an unequalled opportunity to contribute to the social usefulness of the individual and to the social progress of the community and of the State.

APPENDIX A

Junior-Placement and Counseling Services Within Public Employment Offices, 1937-39

At the close of 1936, when this survey was undertaken, public employment offices throughout the country with the assistance of the National Youth Administration were in a period of expansion in their special programs for junior applicants. A questionnaire survey made in the fall of 1939 by the Employment Service Division of the Bureau of Employment Security (formerly the United States Employment Service) shows that during the 3 years after 1936 the number of special programs for junior applicants in public employment offices, similar to those discussed in the present study, had more than tripled. On October 1, 1939, there were 177 cities in which public employment services had on their staffs counselors giving full time to work with junior applicants. Of this number, 166 were cities of the size covered by the Children's Bureau study; that is, cities with a population of 10,000 and over; 11 were cities with a population of less than 10,000.

During the past 3 years many public employment offices have been developing a somewhat different type of special service for junior applicants in addition to these full-time junior-counseling and placement services. Particularly in small communities, where the number of junior registrants does not justify the appointment of special staff members to give their entire time to that group, public employment managers have been assigning one of their regular interviewers to give a part of his time to work with juniors and to handle the registration of all applicants in this age group. Eighty-seven of these part-time programs were in cities of the size discussed in the present survey; 23 were in cities with a population of less than 10,000.

The following table gives detailed information about the distribution of these full- and part-time junior-counseling and placement services as of October 1, 1939.

Junior-counseling and placement services established by public employment offices, by size of city, Oct. 1, 1939¹

Size of city	Cities with counseling and placement services					
	Total		Having full-time counselors		Having part-time counselors	
	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution
Total.....	287	100.0	177	100.0	110	100.0
100,000 or more population.....	76	26.5	74	41.8	2	1.8
25,000 to 100,000 population.....	119	41.5	76	43.0	43	39.1
10,000 to 25,000 population.....	58	20.2	16	9.0	42	38.2
Less than 10,000 population.....	34	11.8	11	6.2	23	20.9

¹ Exclusive of junior-placement offices in Los Angeles, Philadelphia, and Providence, where public-school appropriations for junior-placement work were supplemented by State and Federal funds.

APPENDIX B

List of Selected Readings on Junior Placement

- ATKINSON, RAYMOND C., ODENCRANTZ, LOUISE C., and DEMING, BEN: Public Employment Service in the United States. Public Administration Service. Chicago, 1938.
- BENTLEY, JEROME H.: The Adjustment Service; a report of an experiment in adult guidance. American Association for Adult Education. New York, 1935.
- CULBERT, JANE F. and SMITH, HELEN R.: Counseling Young Workers. Vocational Service for Juniors. New York, 1939.
- FITCH, JOHN A.: Vocational Guidance in Action. Columbia University Press, New York, 1935.
- INTERNATIONAL LABOR OFFICE: Problems of Vocational Guidance. Geneva, 1935.
- OCCUPATIONS—the Vocational Guidance Magazine. Published monthly from October to June by the National Occupational Conference, New York.
- UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE: A Counseling Program for Public Employment Offices. St. Louis, 1939.
- WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILD HEALTH AND PROTECTION, 1930. Subcommittee on Vocational Guidance: Vocational Guidance. Century Co. (now D. A. Appleton-Century Co.), New York, 1932.