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ABSTRACT

This study examined some of the social and spatial factors that influence access to services for displaced workers in Windsor and Essex County. Published literature points out that decision rule factors; the client's knowledge about services; and spatial, personal and demographic characteristics all influence accessibility of social services. The study is based on a combined social geographic conceptual framework, and a recursive model of access and explanatory geographic, individual and organizational factors.

The procedure used to evaluate the above issues has two dimensions. The first dimension used descriptive analysis and cross tabulation to present the relationship between general access to Canada Employment Centre services (including Unemployment Insurance) and personal, organizational and spatial variables. The second dimension used logistic regression analysis to identify the most significant determinants of access to optional employment and labour adjustment services. The study was based on a sample of 118 respondents.

Most of the laid off workers in Windsor and Essex county are blue collar workers employed in capital intensive industrial plants. However, the study was primarily concerned with organizational, individual and spatial factors associated with accessibility of existing federal funded social services. The study found that earned services, specifically Unemployment Insurance benefits, are accessed by twice as many displaced workers as optional employment and adjustment services such as job training, job creation and others.

Results from the logistic regression model indicated that education, client knowledge of CEC services interacting with age, encounter with bureaucracy and area of residence produced significant outcomes in explaining access of employment and adjustment services. This study recommends improved outreach to inform displaced workers of services available and also the use of a supportive and participatory approach to help workers cope with displacement. Because the study used a non-random sample of informants, the results should be treated as issues for further research.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Research Problem

Manufacturing is the quintessential economic and employment sector of Windsor and Essex county. When factories are forced to lay off large numbers, within a short span of time, this causes immense strain on newly displaced individuals and existing social services. According to the Canada Employment Centre in Windsor, more than 16,000 people made claims for unemployment insurance benefits by September 1990, which was an increase of 60 percent from 10,000 claimants by the same month in 1989 (Brennan R. 1990, p.1). This created an added need for social services in order to deal with the various problems resulting from plant layoffs. The added need for social services means increased demand for: social workers, financial services, psychological services, children services and others.

The recent decline in Windsor/Essex County's manufacturing sector has prompted various trends of investigation by academics, the media, and certain public institutions, who contend that a solution to this dilemma is of primary importance. One trend focuses on the primary effects caused by the decline of Windsor's manufacturing sector and the long term implications for the area's economy. Another trend, which is also the focus of this study, examines the implications of unemployment on the provision of social services for these displaced individuals.

According to Saunders (1984) the government should be required to help workers that have been laid off as a result of an industry in decline. In a study
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entitled, "Aid to workers in declining industries", Saunders pointed out that the government's adjustment assistance for laid off workers serves two purposes:

...compensation of workers who unexpectedly experience hardship as a result of the economy's adaptation to changes in technology and/or the international economic environment. To direct displaced workers into growth areas or occupations so as to alleviate bottlenecks thus simultaneously reducing structural unemployment and inflation (Saunders, 1984, p.1).

The study by Saunders was limited to a review and evaluation of state programs for helping workers adjust to displacement. Among the recommendations made by Saunders are:

- improve information between the labour market, counselling agents and laid off workers;
- more research to aid the design of compensation programs.

An important insight that eventually arose from the recommendations made by Saunders was the need to probe and discover the factors that affect a displaced individual's access to existing assistance programmes and the implementation of appropriate compensation. The reason this surfaced as an issue of tremendous importance, is that during a recent "pilot study on the socio-economic impact of plant closures and lay offs in Windsor/Essex County", by Chacko et al. (1991), it was observed that some displaced workers preferred to utilize self-supported means of coping with lay off. The study also found that other laid-off workers were either embarrassed to seek help, or felt that the bureaucratic process was an impediment to accessing designated social services.
1.2 Background

The impetus for this study arose from a concern for the individuals who had to cope with the consequences of plant closures, and the government's inability in alleviating the problems faced by the displaced. Marshall, described social welfare as part of "...the right to an acceptable level of economic welfare and security and to live the life of a civilized being according to prevailing social standards" (Marshall, 1964, p.78).

The link between the provision of social services and industrial decline was clearly recognized as far back as the 1930's, during the great depression. This period marked the initiation of the Canadian government into a welfare state. The decision to assist the laid-off workers was based on a recognition that unemployment due to plant closures was not a temporary but a chronic problem. In the words of Leonard Marsh:

...the provision of unemployment benefits both economically and socially is the first and the greatest need in terms of security programmes designed for the modern industrial economy. (Marsh, 1943, p.7)

To Marsh, the provision of social welfare was part and parcel of a long-term strategy to avert political dissent and instability. Henceforth, the provision of social service benefits has been recognized as part and parcel of society's obligation to both individual and more long-term political and economic needs.

Social services may be defined as the structural arrangements through which the policies and legislation of social welfare are implemented. Most services for displaced workers are funded by the Federal Government. This is done through the
auspices of Employment and Immigration Canada (EIC) which provides placement, counselling, and information services to displaced workers. These services are accessed from Canada Employment Centres (CEC) located at various centres throughout the country.

To be eligible for federal funded services (including unemployment insurance), displaced workers are required to register with the CEC. Services provided by the CEC include: job referrals to alternative sources of employment, information services on the labour market, compensation payments, mobility assistance as part of moving expenses faced by workers who must relocate to obtain jobs, and retraining as part of adjustment to new forms of labour market demands.

The services provided by the CEC are governed by a variety of objectives and regulations. Rules and regulations have been laid down in order to ration the services provided by the CEC. The eligibility requirements for CEC services are:

- to collect Unemployment Insurance Benefits workers must have made contributions for at least 21 weeks. To prove that contributions have been made a client must produce an employment record indicating the period of employment and amount of contributions to the Unemployment fund. In addition a social insurance number is required plus one other authentic form of identification
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- to obtain retraining and labour adjustment services a client must be registered with a CEC counsellor. Based on a client's circumstances and availability of funding the counsellor will determine if one can access Government sponsored retraining and adjustment services. Since the CEC does not have its own training facilities the counsellors check to see if clients meet entry requirements for institutions contracted to provide training.

Apart from the official limitations that determine who gets assistance, there are also other social and individual factors that influence displaced worker's attitudes and relations with CEC services. Consequently, we expect differential access by those who seek compensation services offered by the CEC.

Over the last decade, the government has put forth a number of proposals with the claimed intent of minimizing waste and misuse of service implementation and delivery without reducing access for those in real need. Contrary to these proposals, indications from other sources clearly show that a number of these services do not reach the intended client. Studies on similar subjects by Lipsky (1976) and Prottas (1979), indicated that due to certain structural constraints, existing service agents were incapable of responding favourably to contemporary needs. As a result Prottas and Lipsky recommended that more studies on services provision were needed.
1.3 Scope and Purpose

As an important aspect of their discipline, geographers have taken a keen interest in topics that address the distribution of social services. Geographers recognize that, 'all do not share equally in the bounties of public policy' (Gillespie and Marten, 1978, p.183). This has prompted greater inquest into accessibility as a function of policy, location and administrative discretion. Lineberry and Welch (1974) called for social geographers to redirect their attention to government agencies and the effect of their decisions on the distribution of social services. Emphasizing the need for more scholarly attention to the issue of accessibility, Gillespie and Marten (1978), pointed out that many applicants are turned away from government services. Among those who proceed to see service agents, only a few actually receive services. Gillespie and Marten, recognizing the multifaceted nature of accessibility, recommended studies that incorporate social and geographical considerations, along with client assessment of service provision. This type of research carried out by social geographers may be distinguished by the following theme groups:

- descriptions of geographical distribution of services and the socio-economic correlates;
- studies in the utilization and accessibility of social service systems;
- follow up or longitudinal studies of service recipients, especially in issues of health;
- analyses of implications of location for certain services in particular neighbourhoods. (Dear, 1977, p.223)
Based on the issues raised by the first two themes, and a combination of personal, organizational, spatial and geographical factors; the aims of this study are:

- to study the association between demographic factors, other client characteristics, and their effects on worker displacement and accessibility of social services;
- to see how personal characteristics impact on a client’s knowledge of CEC services;
- to examine the association between geographical factors and the accessibility of social services;
- to investigate the relationship between a client’s profile and the interaction with service agents regarding social service accessibility.

1.3.1 Study Area

The city of Windsor and the surrounding Essex county have been selected as the study area for this research. The Windsor/Essex area is strategically located at the southern most tip of Canada and adjacent to the Detroit metropolitan area of the United States. By 1970, this important industrial area had earned the reputation of being Canada’s third largest manufacturing area, after Toronto and Montreal. Many of the automobile and non-automobile plants established during the last two decades have taken advantage of Windsor/Essex’s strategic location; at the tip of the peninsula formed by Lake St. Clair, the Detroit river and Lake Erie, situated in south western Ontario (see Figure 1).

Recent lay offs and plant closures have affected Windsor in a much more negative way than past recessions. Explanations for recent plant closures in Windsor...
and Essex County range from global to national to localized causes. Changing industrial technology has been cited by some scholars as the reason why many of the plants operating in Windsor and Essex county, like many other plants in North America, have become obsolete. Massey and Meegan (1982) pointed out that such technical changes produce three distinct processes associated with the 'geographical' decline of industry:

1) the location of new industries;
2) closure of some works to compensate for new investment elsewhere;
3) job cut backs in other works as a cost cutting measure.
Notes
30 Respondents stay in Windsor
31 Respondents stay in Amherstburg
30 Respondents scattered in rest of County
28 Did not indicate area of residence

C.E.C. : Canada Employment Centres
Massey and Meegan further stated that non-geographical characteristics of production combine with specific geographical factors to determine the spatial pattern of employment changes (ibid., p.170). More specific reasons why Windsor and Essex counties have been so seriously hit by industrial decline point to the effects of the free trade agreement between Canada and the United States. One such effect, it is argued, is that the agreement has transformed the geographical advantage of Windsor and Essex county into a liability. This is because US companies no longer gain tariff benefits from the Canadian government for locating in Windsor.

In brief, the economic, financial and social implications of industrial decline in Windsor and Essex will continue to receive a lot of attention by researchers, Federal agencies and Industrial institutions. Increased numbers of displaced people have prompted calls for changes in the social services network that caters to various needs of displaced workers. This paper considers the study of accessibility to be a necessary prerequisite for improving existing social services.

Of the 118 respondents selected for the study, 87.5 percent were laid off by four companies making automobile parts. Among the four companies, 48 percent were laid off by SKD Technology located in Amherstburg, 17.5 percent by Wickes, 14.2 percent by Brant Castings and 7.5 percent by Kadem Technology all located in Windsor. The remaining 15 (12.5 percent) of the respondents were laid off by Fabricated Steel, Camtech Technology, Grahams Electric, I.T.L and Sandvik all in Windsor. Most of these companies produced parts for automobile manufacturing plants.
The largest cluster of respondents for the study lived in Windsor (25 percent) and Amherstburg (26 percent). Another 11 (9.2 percent) lived in the Kingsville and Lasalle areas, 8 (6.7 percent) resided in McGregor, Tecumseh and Harrow areas, and 8 (6.7 percent) lived in various parts of Essex county. The remaining 27 percent did not indicate the location of their residence. The data were recoded to distinguish urban and rural residents. Those not responding to this question were classified as 'non-spatial' respondents.

There are three Canada Employment Centres that provide services to the displaced workers in Windsor/Essex County, located in East Windsor, West Windsor and Kingsville, shown as C.E.C. 1 to 3 in Figure 1. In summary, recent displacements resulting from plant closures; and the implications for the provision of social services, make Windsor/Essex a suitable area for this study.

1.3.2 Significance of Study

This study has both theoretical and practical significance. The issues raised by this research provide insight into the social services provided in the Windsor/Essex county and the problems that plague the displaced workers when forced to deal with the system.

This study provides a systematic analysis of the social service accessibility and the displaced worker, and an understanding as to how personal, organizational and geographical factors influence the process of social service provision. The survey data used in this study include non-prejudicial subjective assessments from displaced workers. In keeping with effectiveness and style, this study is descriptive in nature.
Descriptive studies are useful in outlining relationships or differences within them. The study is undertaken in a positivist mode, which allows explanation as a means for social management. A logistic regression model was operationalized in order to isolate elements relevant to the research question of access to social services.

The remainder of this thesis will review the relevant literature, discuss the conceptual framework, and the methodology for the study, present the results and findings, and then draw conclusions.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Literature on the provision of social services suggests that the need and access functions of social services are influenced by a combination of social and geographic factors. Some of the key elements that lead to differential access to social services are summarized as:

1) modern bureaucratic complexity
2) variation in the knowledge and understanding of rights and appreciation of the values of certain resources, benefits and entitlements
3) discrimination; and
4) geographic distance between people and services (Kahn, 1979, p.29)

In addition to the issues raised above by Kahn, literature on accessibility of social services points to the importance of personal or demographic factors in influencing the outcome of a client's request for services. The literature also suggests that the issue of geographic distance extends beyond the physical dimension. For instance, in a developed context such as Windsor and Essex county, the significance of physical distance may be undermined by the high ratio of cars owned by the displaced respondents.

Prottas (1979) conducted a two and a half year case study of Massachusetts Department of Public Welfare. He observed and interviewed sixty case workers, and
found that central to gaining access to social services is the decision arrived at by the intake worker. According to Prottas social service systems exercise direct and indirect influences on the service applicant's decision to access or seek assistance. Such decisions culminate from the interaction process with the street-level bureaucrats who then decide to provide or deny assistance. Indirectly, such decisions are related to how much information the clientele has as well as the reputation of the welfare department. In addition, this study will also consider both spatial and individual or personal effects of such access decisions.

2.1 Direct Effects

Potential social welfare clients may be granted or denied service because of the influence of discretionary judgement and other extra legal mediative influences that regularly crop up in the course of interaction between the client and service official. Social planners as well as geographers, interested in matters of equity in the distribution of social services, are paying more attention to the implications of administrative discretion. Summing up the tension between two contending views on service bureaucracies, Lineberry states that:

The bureaucracy is portrayed as rigid, highly structural by its decision-rules, rather closed to external forces, and relatively predictable. In the other, bureaucracy is soft, enjoys considerable discretion, is idiosyncratic and individual bureaucratic decisions are unpredictable. (Lineberry, 1977, p.65)

According to Michael Lipsky, the interaction between clients and street bureaucracies is premised upon rationing as a key factor in service allocation and distribution.
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Faced with high demand and charged with the responsibility of serving people with alternative resources, public agencies, confronting limited resources themselves, typically develop mechanisms to limit service to eligible citizens while ignoring the costs to clients of the administrative arrangement. (Lipsky, 1984, p.8)

Expressing a similar viewpoint, Prottas stated that:

Because all rules are equal (except for the de facto inequality of core rules) and because they impose more demands on the street-level bureaucrat than can be met, some demands must be evaded. As the organization cannot formally distinguish among its rules, it necessarily falls to the street-level bureaucrats to make the choice. (Prottas, 1979, p.94)

Because of organizational pressure and ambiguous structural mechanisms of processing clients, street bureaucrats utilize their position to influence the nature and outcome of the interaction with service seekers. Access may be denied directly based on definite eligibility rules or indirectly through a variety of costs that are passed on to the client. Prottas defined the role of a street bureaucrat as one of transforming citizens into clients. This is done via the decision to categorize a client in one way or another (Prottas, 1979, p.4).

In providing services to displaced workers bureaucrats make decisions on:

- which date the client can see the CEC counsellor
- whether to interact formally or informally with the client in the interview process
- what kind of information to provide about optional training and employment
services
- what kind of assistance program a client is eligible for
- if direct financial assistance should be given to the client or not

Lipsky points out that clients undergo certain costs in seeking services. The cost of these services includes time extracted from clients while waiting for a service to be administered. This resulting dependency and relative powerlessness puts the client in a weak bargaining position. Michael Lipsky’s theme on service agent/client power relations has been pursued by several social planners, who argue that service delivery strategies can be conceptualized as a scale that measures the varying degrees of control exerted by either the service consumer or the service professional (Hardina, 1988, p. 58).

Prottas (1979), in a discussion of the 'price of free goods', also points to the 'interaction costs' to the clients caused by indifferent or condescending treatment by service agents. Consequently, applicants for welfare either give up and don’t come back after the first encounter, or minimize contact with the agency. Interaction costs to clients may also translate into a bad reputation for service agencies, further dissuading other potential clients from ever making contact.

Hence, the interaction between the client and service bureaucrat more often than not culminates into a power relationship that favours the service official. In the final analysis, power over any individual’s time is a powerful tool. Bureaucracies have ultimate control by rewarding clients by expediting services, or punishing them.
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by delaying services. This increases the time between intake interviews and placement on the welfare rolls, thus discouraging further pursuit of assistance (Lipsky, 1980, p.90).

The issue of service delay is also compounded by the requirement, in many instances, to queue. Essentially, clients are encouraged to believe that the time they spend in line is necessary "...because the resources of the agency are fixed and this system...also benefits the average client to the disadvantage of people with extraordinary needs, since initially it has no mechanism for differentiating among clients." (Lipsky, 1980 p.95).

In addition, Lipsky found that "...rationing effectively reduced citizen access to Boston social welfare programs by imposing costs and inconvenience on clients, and by changing the operating ideology of the system toward one in which workers were less helpful and recipients were more apprehensive...generated fear, and uncertainty among welfare recipients"(Lipsky, 1984, p.8).

Apart from queuing and time costs, Lipsky also talks about the psychological dynamics of clients seeking social services from bureaucrats. Interviews conducted in an overly legalistic way are often devoid of sympathy for the position of the applicant. Consequently, many potential clients do not complete the application process because they prefer not to suffer anticipated pressures and indignities. The extent to which potential clients, such as displaced workers, approve of service is also a manifestation of the psychological interaction with the service provider.

Alternatively, clients may be put on a waiting list that has no specified waiting
period. Lipsky found that the waiting list tends to increase the discretion of street level bureaucrats by providing opportunities to call clients from the waiting list out of turn, or to provide special information that will permit them to take advantage of ways to be treated with higher priority (Lipsky, 1984, p.97). Lipsky also states that the interaction process is also characterized by 'creaming', in which street level bureaucrats often choose (or skim off the top) those who seem most likely to succeed in terms of bureaucratic success criteria. Employment counsellors, for example, may send to jobs people who have the greatest chance to gain employment anyway, to the neglect of people who are more difficult to place (ibid., p.107).

In summary, the Lipsky and Prottas studies concluded that the discretionary powers of street-level bureaucrats result in inequality, favouritism, and alienation in the provision of services. The total costs associated with seeking help such as long waits, waiting lists, queuing and condescending treatment all nurture perceptions that the whole process of administering services is bureaucratic and insensitive to displaced workers needs.

The variables used in the study consist of objective measures such as: access, area, age, income, education and information about CEC services. Subjective measures used in the study include: location as a problem, encounter with bureaucracy and transportation as a problem of access.

Additional factors that affect the interaction process include the posture of the client. The interaction process is riddled by numerous variations that cannot be
anticipated. For instance, applicants may be compliant and cooperative or aggressive and demanding. Focusing on factors that mediate individual awareness and response to the process of seeking services, Gordon proposed that the bureaucratic competence of clients does influence the outcome of the service request process. Bureaucratic competence is defined as all those abilities peculiarly related to bureaucratic interactions. Included are such factors as vocabulary, familiarity with forms and documents, knowledge of the possibility of expediting procedures, etc. (Gordon, 1975, p.198).

According to Kroeger, however, some service agents do not conform to the bureaucratic stereotype. One does find "client oriented workers" who do not "... feel so constrained by universalistic rules, but makes his or her determinations on the basis of what he or she thinks is in the best interests of the client" (Kroeger, 1975, p.182). Hasenfeld (1985) criticized the Lipsky and Prottas studies as being "anti-bureaucratic", in claiming that officials use their own discretion to deprive citizens of their social rights. Hasenfeld asserts that, "...one cannot deduce...with any degree of confidence, the extent to which these incidents are representative of all bureaucratic encounters or how frequently they occur. It is quite possible that these negative encounters are the exception rather than the rule" (Hasenfeld, 1985, p.623). Hasenfeld presents an alternative approach which views bureaucracies as rational systems in which the discretion of officials is curbed and controlled by universal norms.

Katz, et al., in a study using a survey methodology of sampling and
interviewing recipients of services, found that clients are generally satisfied with welfare state officials. In the words of Katz, "... our data...also contradict certain stereotypes about service bureaucracies. One of these commonly held beliefs is that bureaucratic encounters tend to be unpleasant and that clients are typically dissatisfied. Our results pointed in a more positive direction, with three-fourths of the respondents expressing satisfaction with their most important encounter" (Katz et al., 1975, p.624).

Barbara Nelson (1981) disputed the findings of Katz et al., challenging the lack of a theoretical framework in explaining determinants of client dissatisfaction or satisfaction. Nelson contended that subjective factors and acquiescent response biases can also affect survey based assessments of service agencies. It seems preferable to rely on a methodology that provides a representative sample of bureaucratic encounters across diverse welfare bureaucracies, if some of the methodological pitfalls of client survey can be avoided (Hasenfeld, 1985, p.624).

Geographers have also paid attention to the role of administrative discretion in the distribution of services. According to Lineberry:

Decision rules result from some rough admixture of professional norms, rules and regulations of superordinate bodies, loose perceptions of both needs and demands and a search for economizing devices when perceived demands exceed perceived capacity. (Lineberry, 1977, p.153)

The role of administrative discretion in service distribution has been studied by social geographers on the premise that:
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The quantity and/or quality of urban services are primarily functions of bureaucratic decision-makers made to simplify complex allocations of administrative time and resources (the decision-rule hypothesis). (Ibid, p.67)

Lineberry and Welsh (1974, p.707) identified factors such as behaviour of street-level personnel, conduct with clients and demeanor of service employees as important indices for measuring access of public services. Based on an example of how police departments allocate their scarce resources, Lineberry and Welsh noted two issues about the bureaucratic allocation of public services. The first, is how low in the bureaucratic hierarchy decision rules are formulated and implemented. The second, is how insulated the rule-makers are from external constraints, an insulation fortified by the relative invisibility of both the rules and rule-makers. The capacity to define the situation gives a street-level bureaucrat power to invoke a decision of his or her own choice.

2.2 Indirect Effects

The indirect effects of social service systems can influence access by displaced workers. One of the most influential indirect means of regulating access is by providing or withholding information. According to Lipsky (1976), clients may know about services but still not access them. This is because of countervailing disinformation which stigmatizes access to certain social services, such as job loss related services.

Clients may be given or denied information that may have an effect on the outcome of seeking social assistance. Lipsky characterizes this phenomenon as the favouritism of the street-level bureaucrat that provides some clients with privileged
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information, permitting them to manipulate the system better than others. They experience it as confusing jargon; elaborate procedures and assumed practices that act as barriers to understanding how to operate effectively within the system (ibid., p.190). A key element in enhancing the autonomy of service officials is through the control of the flow of information into the client environment. Service agencies are the primary source of information about the nature of services provided, and about the rules and the regulations governing access and eligibility of service.

In a discussion entitled: 'Information and Felt Costs', Prottas talks about the psychological costs of obtaining service due to incomplete or confusing information about the process of how to get assistance. In many cases this can result in a client feeling helpless and anxious. Street-level bureaucrats may use informal and unconventional techniques which let a client believe that obtaining a service will be a long, arduous or humiliating ordeal, so that the client is quite naturally less anxious to pursue the matter (Prottas, 1979, p.130). Because such informal aspects of the interaction are not recorded or witnessed by anyone, consequently they are out of the control of superiors and the regulation of the service institution.

Prottas points out that a common pattern among welfare offices is the suppression of information about certain services and categories of assistance. In these circumstances, if the client is ignorant he or she is unlikely to request or demonstrate eligibility for the service. Alternatively, information may be poorly advertised or may be provided in a way that makes it difficult to understand exactly what, where and how to get particular services. The decision to provide either no
information or inadequate information is also determined by particular circumstances and the client's behaviour. In essence, when the difficulty in obtaining a service rises to a certain level, in practice that service may be considered denied.

Prottas also discusses information as a 'real' cost to clients. Clients are often asked to support their requests with application forms and documents from other sources, such as a former employer, which add to the cost of accessing services. The balance of knowledge is heavily tilted in favour of street bureaucracies because they are familiar with the rules, formal categories and procedures governing distribution of service. On the other hand, most clients have access only to information about themselves and their demand, consequently:

Because the street-level bureaucrat controls the information pertaining to those interactions, he can contemplate both the interaction and information generated in it with a view toward their effects on the internal alternatives. This critical and unavoidable dependency is the primary resource of the street-level bureaucrat. (Prottas, 1979, p.87)

It is important to clarify that clients are not always passive to the street-level bureaucrat's power advantage. Clients who are more knowledgable about the system are capable of insisting on correct treatment and proper application of the rules governing service eligibility. To that extent, individual attributes play an important role as empowering assets to the clients.
2.3 Individual Effects

In a discussion of response to job loss, Leana and Feldman suggested that individual characteristics, particularly age, gender and education play an important role in how people react to and cope with job loss. Leana and Feldman postulated that older employees, females, non-Caucasians and those without college education will: a) have the most negative reactions to losing their jobs, and b) have the most difficulty in getting re-employed and reestablishing a satisfactory quality of life after job loss (Leana and Feldman, 1990, p.1163). Hence, personal characteristics not only affect a worker’s vulnerability to lay off but also influence eligibility to certain social and/or coping services.

Looking at access to social services from a power-dependence perspective, Hasenfeld states that clients who have more power resources at their disposal are in a better negotiating position to obtain favourable results from service officials. Hasenfeld identified income and education as important sources of client power, because:

Income, provides clients with a greater selection of service bureaucracies, particularly those that are less stigmatizing...income will also affect the client’s expectations regarding the outcome of the encounter because it serves as a yardstick to one’s ability to obtain desired resources. Hence, the greater ones income, the higher is the expectation of obtaining favourable results (Hasenfeld, 1985, p.625).

Hasenfeld elaborated on the importance of education when he stated that:

Education as a source of power gives clients competence and knowledge of bureaucratic policies and procedures that enable them to exercise greater influence over officials...better-educated clients are more informed about the potential services available
to them, are more likely to contact such services, and use their knowledge and bureaucratic competence to influence officials. (ibid, p.625)

Lipsky (1976) also conceded that services may be limited due to the client's personal characteristics such as income and age. Goodsell found that the client's characteristics, especially age, did appear to play an important part in influencing client perceptions. Older clients were evaluated more favourably. In fact, when one compares appropriate correlation between the co-efficients for program and age, the latter are generally higher (Goodsell, 1980, p.134).

The results of Hasenfeld's study supported Katz et al. findings that government programs utilization rates are generally low. It also found that the key variable that distinguishes the users from the non-users is income, in that those with lower incomes were most likely to contact government agencies. Education and knowledge did not seem to affect the encounter and its outcome. Results from his study led Hasenfeld to conclude that:

The findings give some support to Lipsky's contention that means-related programs are 'street-level bureaucracies'...the poorer the people are, the greater the influence street-level bureaucrats tend to have on them...clearly in such bureaucracies, citizens come to expect less, believe they have no influence over officials, and face greater risk of having their requests denied. (Hasenfeld, 1985, p.632)

Marc Bendick (1979), carried out an investigation of the rate of participation in public assistance programs. The study commenced from the premise that many
eligible persons, especially those with the lowest income and hence the greatest need for assistance, are precluded from receiving benefits because of program inaccessibility. According to Bendick, before making the decision on whether or not to seek social services, clients weigh the benefits and costs of access, that include: travel, time and psychological costs. Psychological costs include the stigma of being a welfare recipient and the hostility or indignities that might be encountered during the application process or while receiving program benefits (Bendick, 1979, p.269). Benefits vary, across programs in monetary terms. Benefits also vary widely among households eligible for the same program, usually in relation to income and family size (ibid., p.270).

Bendick posited that many public assistance programs extend eligibility to persons of relatively high incomes. In addition, there are some people who may be eligible for a program according to the letter of law but do not fall within the target group intended by the spirit of the service.

Bendick's study found that access is limited by some personal attributes that exert an influence on the enrolment process. Among these factors are education and income. The study found that "... voluntary non-participation seems to be associated most commonly with incomes that fall in the upper ranges of program eligibility" (ibid, p.271). Referring to education, "... a gap often exists between the reading and literacy skills of potential applicants to programs and the skills demanded for completion of agencies' application forms and procedures" (ibid., p.272). The lower the educational levels of clients, the lower the index of accessibility, especially among
those who are also in the lowest income group. It is important to note that individual effects are often moderated by the very nature of social service provided.

For example, Hasenfeld distinguished between non-means-tested programs that are less stigmatized than means-tested programs, since the very nature of the former confers greater power to clients by virtue of their 'earned' entitlement to service (Hasenfeld, 1985, p.625).

Goodsell's (1980) study compared three welfare programs: public welfare, which he considered to have a subjective service climate; social security (retirement and other benefits) and unemployment compensation, which are provided to clients as a right rather than a privilege. In the words of Goodsell:

Public welfare has yet a different climate, one of patronizing help to down-and-outer...The climate is hence not without ambivalence, for along with humanitarian 'giving' values goes the understanding that the staff is superior in status to clients. The gulf between the two is readily apparent in both demeanour and dress...The climate of unemployment compensation, by contrast, is legalistic. Concern is overwhelming not for making payments justly due but for catching cheaters who have no right to assistance (Goodsell, 1980, p.126)

Goodsell's analysis of the climate in which public welfare is provided is comparable to the atmosphere in which optional employment and adjustment services are provided by the CEC. In order to gain access to optional employment and adjustment services, displaced workers are required to make an appointment with a CEC Counsellor. Assistance by counsellors, "... is mostly confessional,...in which...the client is not so much served as protected from adversity" (Goodsell, 1980, p.126).
Consequently, access is generally easier for direct entitlements like social security and unemployment compensation than other optional programs (job training, job search, etc.), for which the client has to go through an additional eligibility process before gaining access.

2.4 Spatial Effects

In addition to individual dimensions of service provision, socio-geographers are also concerned with the spatial implications of administrative decisions about social services. Thus, the standing decisions of public authorities about how scarce resources will be allocated "...need not contain any spatial component whatsoever, but they will have unintended spatial implications. The outcomes of decision rules are the resultant allocations of particular services" (Lineberry, 1977, p.153). Thus, social geographers have extended the issue of access to social services to include the areal differences. Lipsky agreed with this when he stated that:

Street-level bureaucracies may reduce services geographically. They may formally narrow the catchment area from which clients are drawn or reduce the number of neighbourhoods served by a program. Alternatively, because reductions in service are unpopular, street-level bureaucracies may prefer to reduce the number of centres, effectively cutting services to some areas, without formally changing anyone's eligibility. (Lipsky, 1980, p.102)

Harter echoed this sentiment when she wrote that: "... facilitating access to a program begins with establishing the location at which to apply for and receive assistance. There should be sufficient sites located at geographically convenient places" (Harter, 1977, p.119).

McLafferty examined, among other issues, differential access to public services
among various income groups. She found that distance had a significant effect on utilization of public services, especially among low income groups (McLafferty, 1982, p.348).

Bendick found that rates of participation in food stamp programs differed significantly between rural and urban dwellers, for instance the participation rate for Washington, D.C. was 78 percent, compared to 12 percent in rural parts of North Dakota. The fact that urban areas offer better information channels, than do rural areas, was cited by the study as a possible explanation for this rural/urban gap (Bendick, 1979, p.272).

Bendick also pointed out that because applications for public assistance programs have to be filed at specific offices, many eligible persons may be discouraged or be afraid to go to rough neighbourhoods, where many welfare offices are located. In some parts of the rural areas, the welfare offices may be over twenty miles away from potential clients with limited access to transportation. Even within the urban area, where distance is less inhibiting, the required regularity of visits and time spent during the application process may discourage enrolment. Hence, in addition to physical distance, it is important to consider the travel time and transportation costs incurred during the 'access' process.

Kirby criticized McLafferty’s use of physical distance as a measure of accessibility. Kirby noted that although physical accessibility should not be underplayed, of greater importance are the time-space constraints (Kirby, 1983, p.290). Dear also noted that relying only on physical distance as a measure of access
was simplistic. In a study on the demand for mental health care, Dear assessed the effect of:

* physical distance
* location as catchment, in which rules governing the administrative area where clients live may force the clients to ignore more closely located service centers
* social distance, the distance placed between client and service by referral patterns
* relative distance, the set of intervening service opportunities and why services may be ignored or accepted.

Dear’s approach to the question of access, permits the integration of the decision-making process and its consequences of creating social distances and other forms of distance that determine who gets relief, and of what sort. This integrated approach provides an appropriate socio-geographic theoretical framework necessary for this study. In the words of Dear:

... a public facility location theory must also be a theory of society...which can only be understood as a manifestation of a given social order. (Dear, 1978, p.97)

In addition to decision-making and spatial factors, access to social services is also affected by issues of discrimination and inequality. Instances of suspected or demonstrated discrimination in the distribution of urban services on racial grounds were investigated by Lineberry, in a study of social services in San Antonio (Lineberry, 1977). Issues of discrimination considered in social geography include race, class and the power elite hypothesis. According to Lineberry, the intercorrelations among race, class and power are sufficiently powerful to complicate any
effort to measure their independent effects. Thus, the combined effects of race, class and power are often studied in an all inclusive 'underclass hypothesis'. The data proposed for use by this particular study are not expected to yield sufficient numbers of minorities for testing the underclass hypothesis.

In summary, decision rule factors, the amount of information available, personal or demographic characteristics, spatial and other access determinants combine to produce differential access to social services provided by the Canada Employment Centres. This study attempts to model those relationships.
CHAPTER 3

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Theory

As suggested by the literature review, access to social services is a topic that concerns and therefore links both social planners and geographers. For geographers this link has been incorporated into a specific niche of social geography. One of the focus areas of the discipline of social geography is the explanation of the distribution of human services based on a combination of socio-geographic factors. According to Pacione:

Contemporary social geography is a pluralist subject in which traditional and ecological-based investigations...have been complemented by new research foci related to questions of social justice, resource allocation, the formulation and appraisal of social policy, the social geography of specific groups...and analysis of institutions and the role of the state in the distribution and exercise of power. (Pacione, 1987, p.ix)

Gillespie and Marten criticized studies that approached issues of access to social services as independent problems of physical distance. They proposed an interdisciplinary approach that incorporates the physical distance covered, the amount of time used, and the cost incurred by clients in accessing social services (Gillespie and Marten, 1978, p.184).

The need for a social and geographical approach is summed up as follows:

There is a lack of clarity and agreement about the exact meaning of accessibility and its parameters. The concept of accessibility includes a wide range of dimensions that affect the relationship between service users and agencies or providers. Investigators, however, have looked at accessibility through single
perspectives...discipline-bound theoretical frameworks...that do not present a composite view of this problem (Shannon & Devers, 1974, p.155).

Hence, this study will attempt to combine sociological and geographical views into a theoretical framework for understanding the accessibility of social services by displaced workers. The advantages of this approach are:

- it incorporates client characteristics into an integral view of accessibility;
- it facilitates a unified view of accessibility which is an important building stone for coherence and unity in constructing theories (Anderson and Aday, 1974; Gillespie and Marten, 1978)

An integrated socio-geographic theory represents a paradigmatic shift away from the mechanistic approaches, towards more involvement in contemporary social issues based on a revamped interest in applied geography and public policy. The methodological and social validity of this approach will be tested in this study's analysis of accessibility of social services to displaced workers.

Social planners have relied on various theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of access to social services from state bureaucracies. The first approach is that articulated by Michael Lipsky, who views social services bureaucracies as being caught between ever increasing service demands and chronically inadequate resources (Lipsky, 1980). Consequently, social service officials wield a lot of power in deciding who gets a share of rationed welfare resources. Prottas (1979) study on social welfare programs in Boston was also based on this
power-dependency theory. The methodology used to test the theory is participant observation in selected case studies of client-official interactions. Hasenfeld criticized the case study/participant observation method for magnifying incidences in which officials seem to deprive applicants of their rightful amount of social services. The reliability of such a method is therefore put in question.

An alternative approach used by social planners, views bureaucracies as rational systems in which official discretion is controlled by set rules and regulations. Based on the above premises, Katz et al. (1975) found service bureaucrats to be pleasant and positive towards client needs.

Utilizing a survey approach, Goodsell, in a client evaluation of three welfare programs, also found a very positive assessment of service agents by clients. He found that:

A majority of clients of all three programs reported that they had achieved what they sought in the encounter, had not engaged in arguments with office personnel and felt the worker really listened and tried to help, and had judged the office personnel to be very courteous. (Goodsell, 1980, p.133).

Hasenfeld (1985), preferred to borrow from both case study and survey approaches by incorporating the power-relations theory and survey based methodology to study citizen encounters with welfare state bureaucracies. According to the power-dependency theory, service provision is characterized by control and power relations between clients and service officials. Hasenfeld defines the client's dependency on the service official as directly proportional to the client's need for services controlled by the official, and as inversely proportional to the availability of
the services elsewhere (Hasenfeld, 1985). Consequently, the ability to obtain desired services from the service organization is a function of the client’s power resources.

Based on client power resources Hasenfeld formulated a hypothesis to explain the client’s ability to obtain positive outcomes from service agents. He identified two crucial sources of client power: education and income. Hasenfeld also posited that the power of service bureaucracies over clients is influenced by the nature of the service at offer, whether it is a means-tested program or non-means tested program. Based on these and several other propositions, Hasenfeld proposed a causal model for analyzing a data set of welfare recipients from Detroit. In the full model, a client’s evaluation of the service provided and its outcome are posited to be a function of education, personal knowledge of services, eligibility rules income, expectations and influence of the client. In brief, Hasenfeld’s model brings out some of the non-spatial factors necessary in a study of access of social services by service agencies.

Hasenfeld’s distinction between means-tested programs or non-means-tested programs is not directly applicable to the services provided for displaced workers by the CEC. CEC services are either earned benefits such as Unemployment Insurance or optional employment and adjustment services, such as: job search, job training and other labour adjustment services. For the CEC services listed above, eligibility is not based on ‘income testing’ as a direct criterion of service. According to the literature, other factors may be significant in explaining the differences in access between earned benefits and optional employment and adjustment services. Apart from various social and spatial factors discussed in the literature, access to optional
and unearned services may also be influenced by psychological costs that are difficult to measure. These may include stigma about receiving free services and perceived hostilities about the counselling process.

Figure 2: Welfare Data Matrix
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(Source: Smith D. 1977, p.7)

The social planners perspective is linked into a more integrated socio-geographic theory by Smith, (1974). Smith's model of 'who gets what, where and how' helps to synthesize social and geographical factors at play in the distribution of social services. Smith's welfare data matrix above (Figure 2) is an adaptation of Berry's three dimensional geographical data matrix. Smith's cubic illustration is designed to provide a simple description of welfare variations.

It can be interpreted vertically as a social indicator, relating to different area units, or horizontally (in which case a profile of an area is given). The cube can also be used to differentiate provision relating to different social and ethnic groups. The fact Xij can be one of the many variables, relating to
housing...social services provision (Smith, 1977, p.18).

Smith's model, "... provides a frame of reference for the restructuring of the field in a manner which facilitates the analysis of all human geographical patterns in terms relevant to...an interdisciplinary approach" (Smith, 1977, p.7) (emphasis added).

Each of the questions raised by Smith, 'who', 'what', 'where' and 'how,' is linked to different research questions. The question 'who', prompts an investigation of which class or group of people benefit. In the case of South Africa, Smith used the racial subgroups of Africans, Coloureds, Indians and Whites. The question of 'what', raises the issue of success associated with accessing the kinds of services or goods to be provided. The 'where' question deals with the basic spatial or area dimensions of service distribution. Finally, the 'how' questions deals with the allocation process, focusing on understanding the structures that are designated to distribute social services.

Based on the conceptual building blocks provided by Smith's social/spatial model, this study of access to social services is concerned with how different individuals and/or groups are able to influence decision-making arrangements in order to exercise differential claims with respect to availing themselves of the benefits of life and avoiding the penalties (Smith, 1974, p.294). The study is also concerned with how displaced workers in different areas (urban and rural) establish differential claims on social service resources. An important contribution in elaborating the link between social and geographic factors is that made by Dear in a study on "locational..."
factors in the demand for mental health care", in Lancaster County. Dear writes about "... six dimensions of the 'accessibility' variable: physical accessibility; visibility, to ensure public awareness, administrative accessibility to avoid procedural barriers to service; economic accessibility, psychological accessibility, to ensure that comfort, convenience etc., encourage utilization; and cultural accessibility, implying programs that are out to reflect the heterogeneity of the population being served" (Dear, 1977, p.25). The basic theme in Dear's work is that accessibility should be studied as part of social order based on a prior theory of society.

Dear's research tested four dimensions of accessibility to mental health. The first hypothesis, tested traditional wisdom that utilization rates at a mental health facility will decline as distance from the facility increases (Dear, 1977, p.230). No clear pattern in the influence of access by physical distance was found. This means that having a service nearby does not guarantee effective service delivery.

The second hypothesis tested in Dear's study was the administrative catchment area hypothesis. Set administrative areas of accessing services are associated with a higher volume of care and a greater accessibility of services. In Dear's study, this was not found to be the case, instead, the catchment rule produced distortions in the spatial patterns of attendance by increasing the aggregate distance travelled to access the service. The third hypothesis tested by Dear is location as a social distance, a complex notion that extends location analysis even further from the simple notion of physical distance or travel time. The social distance hypothesis refers to 'distance' created by decisions of service agents vis-a-vis a client's needs. The impact of social
distance factors is closely interrelated to the concept of relative location in which clients are said to make choices on the basis of a trade-off amongst a set of possible service opportunities. The effect of intervening factors may increase the attractiveness of one location as opposed to others, thus upsetting the normal distance-decay relationship (Dear, 1977, p.235).

Dear points out that many of the intervening factors are usually non-geographical. One set of intervening variables includes service intake policies such as: extensive form filling, utilization characteristics, facility opening times, lengthy processing and waiting lists used to 'weed out' unwanted clients and stabilize the flow of clients into the system. Dear also found that a wide range of client characteristics act to influence the demand for social services. Among the important 'non-illness' related factors, is a range of demographic characteristics. "The tendency for more women than men to use...facilities...the lack of black adult males in many services...a preference of certain service types by different racial groups...the importance of income and education in demand for mental health care." (Dear, 1977, p.237).

Although this particular study is not concerned with issues of location and the demand for mental health care, Dear's work is an appropriate example of how social and geographic factors combine to explain the access to social services, based on spatial and non-spatial factors. Dear's writing on the subject matter emphasizes the ambiguity of distance and shows how accessibility cannot be conceptualized simply as physical distance but also in terms of social distance. The end result is an a priori theory of social geographic analysis of accessibility.
To sum up, an a priori socio-geographic theory presents several advantages. Firstly, it combines the sociological theory of power relations in service distribution with geographic theories to form an integrated perspective on accessibility. Secondly, the concepts of non-spatial factors and spatial factors are used in order to provide a more elaborate meaning of accessibility. Finally, a socio-geographical theory based on sociological cause-effect models allows for client assessment of accessibility of social services. Essentially, the social and geographic approach selected for this study seeks to combine the "... technical strength of the quantitative and model building era with a passionate concern for the condition of mankind;...for...the world requires feeling human beings as much as skilled scientists, technicians, managers and teachers, and geography should do more to meet this need" (Smith, 1974, p.297).

3.2 A Priori Model

Elaborating a model of accessibility of social services requires one to formulate the various relationships between social and geographical factors and access outcome. The causal model (Figure 3) shows social and geographical characteristics and their relationship to access outcome. The model is derived from examples of several existing models formulated by social planners and geographers in other studies of accessibility (Knoke and Burke, 1980; Hasenfeld, 1985; Schervish, 1983).

According to Knoke and Burke, "... the causal analogy is sufficiently appealing to allow a tempered use of the method whenever a well-reasoned hypothesis can take advantage of unidirectional causal sequences among the variables" (Knoke and Burke, 1980, p.42). The illustrated a priori model, developed from the literature review and
theory, draws the variables that are incorporated into a causal model of access to social services. As suggested by the theory, the dependent variable is access status, a two category nominal variable (yes or no) measuring the outcome of clients seeking a range of social services offered by the Canada Employment Centre.
FIGURE 3: Relationships Among Access Status and Independent Variables
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The model suggests that access status is a function of organizational, personal or demographic and geographic determinants. An improved knowledge of organizational, personal and geographic determinants would permit greater precision in understanding accessibility of social services to displaced workers, and also enhance an understanding of the causal process linking displacement and access to social services. If a particular client has a favourable combination of personal, organizational and geographic factors, then he or she is most likely to obtain assistance. If an unfavourable combination of personal, organizational and geographic factors predominate then the most likely outcome is no social service assistance.

In Figure 3, the single-headed arrows 1 to 3 signify that geographic factors exert a direct effect on access status as a result of the spatial constraints implied. Dear (1977) suggested that spatial factors of location are often ambiguous and compounded by effects of other variables. In a study of mental health demand, Dear found no clear pattern in the influence of physical distance upon utilization rates. Bendick (1979), found the cost or unavailability of transportation to be an important barrier to access. In addition, he also found that access to certain services was associated with locational characteristics rather than their physical distance. For instance, an access point may be physically close but invokes fear because it is located in a rough neighbourhood. Bendick's study also found higher access rates in urban areas than in rural areas due to the distance created by lack of information in the latter areas. Hence, this current study is more concerned about spatial or geographic
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factors, as they are perceived by clients, rather than in objective measurement terms.

Thus, the hypothesis:

**H1:** A client's positive perception of the location of a service is associated with a positive outcome of access status. Clients who are in possession of transportation means or who do not perceive location as a problem are more likely to access social services. Because of various constraints, rural clients are less likely to access employment and adjustment services than urban clients.

In Figure 3, the single headed arrows 4 to 6 signify that personal or individual determinants empower clients with the ability to influence or negotiate a positive access status outcome. Several studies have confirmed the importance of client characteristics in the access to social services. Goodsell pointed out that age did appear to play an important part in influencing client perceptions and that older workers were evaluated more favourably (Goodsell, 1980, p.123). However, it is important to note that based on her study's findings, Kroeger (1975) disputed the importance of age, race and education of the client vis-a-vis welfare assistance received. According to Kroeger, caseworkers' sentiments are guided by universalistic guidelines rather than demographic characteristics of clients.

Hasenfeld (1985) considered personal characteristics such as income and education as sources of client power. Education and income are posited to give clients competence and knowledge of bureaucratic policies and procedures that enable them to exert greater influence on the access process and eventual outcome. Because of better reception and experience accumulated in dealing with social service agents, older workers are more likely to gain a positive result in accessing services.
Better educated clients are informed about potential services and so are more likely to contact such services and use their knowledge and bureaucratic competence to influence a positive outcome. Also, we expect significant differences between lower and higher income groups in accessing social services and gaining positive outcome.

The personal factors considered above lead to the following hypothesis:

\[ H2: \text{There will be a positive relationship between the education, age and income of the displaced workers and access to CEC's employment and adjustment services.} \]

In Figure 3, the single-headed arrows, 7 and 8, suggests that two key organizational factors, information and the encounter with the service bureaucrat, have a direct influence on access status. Prottas, (1979) suggests a tendency by social service agents to suppress the 'downward flow information', thus, denying the client information about a service through deliberate and non-deliberate means, such as poor advertising. Bendick, (1979) points out that ineffective outreach campaigns and motivation of eligible people is an important factor in service accessibility. Consequently, the amount of information at the disposal of the laid-off worker, about social services, is an important variable. Hence the hypothesis:

\[ H3: \text{Successful access to social services is positively influenced by the amount of information clients possess about C.E.C.'s optional employment and adjustment programs.} \]

Linebery (1977), Hasenfeld (1985) and Dear (1977), have all discussed the importance of service characteristics in respect to intake policies and the 'terra incognita' of street bureaucrats in dispensing social services. Contrary to any
Weberian thesis of a rigid and highly structured bureaucracy, service agents possess and exercise power over administrative service provision. The existence of gaps between reading literacy skills of potential applicants to programs and the literacy level required to apply successfully; between formal powers of service agents and client; and between client needs and eligibility, all influence client perceptions about accessing services. This results in the decision-rule hypothesis:

H4: Successful access to social services is positively influenced by a client’s positive perception of the encounter with the street bureaucrat.

Arrows 9 and 10 will test interactions suggested by the literature review between age and information, education and information. Dear (1977) and other writers on the subject of access have also posited the importance of additional personal characteristics such as race and gender that are not considered by this study. As previously stated, it is regretted that the survey utilized by this study did not yield an adequate sample of visible minorities and women to warrant inclusion of these factors in the study.

In conclusion, using this causal model (Figure 3) to discuss accessibility of social services presented certain advantages. It allowed an integration of existing empirical findings by social planners and geographers about accessibility. In addition, it facilitated an analysis of client perceptions on the impact of socio-geographic factors on accessibility. Hopefully, the model used in this study may also open up the horizon of research related to the process through which personal, organizational and geographic factors impact on accessibility of social services.
3.3 Methodology

The previously outlined socio-geographic model has been used to analyze the outcome of personal, organizational and geographic factors in the process of determining which of the displaced workers get 'service assistance'. For this purpose, the dependant variable (access status) is hypothesized to be the culmination of individual, organizational and geographical independent variables. The variables used and their categories are shown below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable Access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Service as a Problem</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Problems</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Urban (Windsor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural (Essex County)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55 &amp; Over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Under $10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$11,000 to $20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$21,000 to $30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$31,000 to $40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$41,000 to $50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$51,000 and over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apprenticeship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about CEC Services</td>
<td>Job Placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minority Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encounter with Bureaucracy</td>
<td>Did Wait Long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counsellor Understood Needs and Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comfortable with Counsellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talk about all Employment Concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understood Everything Discussed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variables used in the study consist of objective measures such as: access, area, age, income, education and information about CEC services. Subjective measures based on client perceptions used in the study include: location as a problem, encounter with bureaucracy and transportation as a problem of access.
3.3.1 Access Status

The variable (access status) has two dimensions each composed of two categories, Yes (coded 1) or No (coded 0). Dimension 1: yes, the client has registered with the employment center or no, the client has not registered with the employment center. This dimension is necessary because in order to receive any form of assistance from federal funded services, a displaced claimant must register with the employment centre. This precondition has certainly helped to boost the overall number of reported contacts with the CEC's. Dimension 2: Yes, the client has applied for an interview with the CEC counsellor, in order to gain access to optional employment and adjustment programs, or no, the client has not applied.

3.3.2 Transportation

In line with this study's theory, the clientele's perception of service delivery is an important consideration. Respondents were again asked to indicate between Yes and No: Yes (coded 1) if transportation was a problem and no (coded 0) if transportation was not a problem.

3.3.3 Location

Respondents were asked if they considered the location of the CEC offices to be a problem: Yes (coded 1) and No (coded 0). Just as in the case of the transportation variable, a client's subjective choice of yes or no, rather than a physical distance measure, allows the study to conceptualize location in broader and much more personal terms. For example, Bendick (1979), suggested that clients will consider issues like the nature of the neighbourhood in which the welfare offices are
located before making the decision to access service.

3.3.4 Area

Three categories were needed to illustrate this variable. These categories were based on the respondent's residential telephone number; urban was coded 1, rural -1 and 0 for non-respondent. This method of coding is known as the 'indicator variable coding scheme'. The co-efficient from an indicator variable coding scheme represents the effect of each category compared to a reference category (SPSS Guide Manual, 1990, p. 128). Hosmer and Lemeshow recommended the use of indicator coding methods for categorical scaled covariates measured at two levels. (Hosmer and Lemeshow, 1990, p.147)

3.3.5 Age

In this study, age is used as a categorial variable coded as follows:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18 - 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25 - 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>41 - 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>55 &amp; Over</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.6 Education

According to the literature, education is a significant client characteristic. Education gives clients the knowledge and capability to access services. Education is operationalized as a categorized variable coded as follows:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Apprentice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Apprentice/College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These measures are taken from the study on plant lay offs in Windsor by Chacko et al (1991).

3.3.7 Income

Like education, income can enhance the power of the client. It is suggested that the greater the income, the higher is the client's competence, ability and confidence to access services. Income is coded in the following manner.
These measures are also taken from the pilot study on the socio-economic impact of plant closures in Windsor/Essex by Chacko et al. (1991).

3.3.8 Information

The information variable was computed from a series of questions indicating a client's knowledge about several CEC services. These included information related to job placement, training, mobility, job creation, testing, creative job search, Canadian Job strategy and minority assistance. These parameters were then computed into a continuous variable, scaled into 1, in order to fit into the 0-1 range. The variable was then recoded so that responses ranging from 0-0.4 = 0 and 0.41 - 1.00 = 1.0, where 0 represents no knowledge of services and 1, full knowledge of CEC services.
3.3.9 Encounter with Bureaucracy

Clientele assessment of the bureaucracy is an important measure of the psychological costs incurred while seeking social services assistance. Thus, clients were asked if they felt that they got an understanding reception, felt comfortable talking with the counsellor, thought the process took too long and if they understood what the counsellor was telling them. The responses yes or no were computed into an average and representative variable; scaled to 1, the responses were coded 1 if > 0.5 and 0 if < or = to 0.49.

3.4 Participants

This study utilized respondents from a population of workers laid off due to plant closure in the Windsor/Essex area. The sample used in the study consisted of 118 respondents of all ages. Most of the respondents (94.8 percent) have lived in the Windsor/Essex area for more than 10 years. Only 25 percent were not born in the area. However, the sample yielded a number of imbalances that curtailed the potentially wider scope of the study. Specifically, the overwhelming majority, at 93.2 percent, were male. The main reason why the sample yielded so few women is because, traditionally, women have been a very small component of the manufacturing sectors labour force. Similarly the study yielded very few members of visible minorities, 8.4 percent of the total sample analyzed. Unfortunately, this means that this study could not pursue race and 'underclass' dimensions of service provision.

Over 70 percent indicated they were of English origin, which does not conform
to the actual proportions of people using other European languages in the Windsor/Essex area, as indicated by Statistics Canada. This may suggest that since the questionnaires were in English, people who did not feel confident enough to respond were excluded.

3.5 Research Design

The research design used to measure the impact of plant closures and access to social services was non-experimental. The data used were of a secondary nature obtained from the Social Science Research Unit, University of Windsor. The data were collected and used for a pilot study of the socio-economic impact of plant closures and lay offs in Windsor/Essex country region, by Chacko et al. (1991). The study was launched by the mayor's committee on services to the unemployed, in the wake of a sudden increase in the numbers of people laid off due to plant closures, and it identified a number of issues that required more in-depth research, such as the area of social services accessibility. The use of this secondary source of data presented this study with a number of advantages, especially in terms of time and money saved.

3.6 Sampling Procedure

Data used in the study were collected by means of a questionnaire survey. A specimen of the questionnaire is attached as Appendix 1. Copies of the survey instrument were initially sent out to a list of displaced workers provided by the employer and Canadian Auto Workers Union (CAW). Of the 390 questionnaires mailed to the workers, 103 were completed and returned. The questionnaires were
mailed on October 11, 1990, and returns accepted until November 1, 1990. A second batch of questionnaires was distributed at the CAW, Local 195 union hall on Ottawa street. The respondents at the union hall had been employed at a manufacturing firm. Through this method 21 questionnaires were completed, for a total sample of 124 (21 + 103) questionnaires. The majority of respondents had been employed at four (4) manufacturing firms (Chacko et al., 1991, p.10). The sample used in this study is a convenience sample made up of available and interested respondents of displaced workers from Windsor and Essex country.

Due to the incidence of missing data, the study sample was reduced to 118 respondents. Since this study uses client perceptions and subjective assessments of social services provision, the survey method used is an appropriate approach.

3.7 Data Analysis

Inferential analysis of optional employment and adjustment programs has been applied using a logit regression model run using the S.P.S.S. statistical package. The goal of the analysis using this method is to find the best fitting and most parsimonious, yet conceptually reasonable, model to describe the relationship between a response variable and a set of predictor variables. Logistic regression is distinguished from other models because the dependent variable is binary or dichotomous. In circumstances where the dependent variable is discrete or dichotomous, the ordinary least square procedure cannot be used without violating some of the classical assumptions of the method.
One of the requirements of logistic regression is that the conditional mean must be greater than or equal to zero and less than or equal to 1 (i.e. $0 \leq E(Y/X) \leq 1$). Because the conditional mean approaches 0 and 1 gradually, the change $E(Y/X)$ per unit change in $X$ becomes progressively smaller as the conditional mean gets closer to zero or 1. Consequently, the distribution curve is S-shaped, resembling a plot of a cumulative distribution of a random variable as shown below (Figure 4).

![Figure 4: Classical Logit Distribution for E(Y/x)](image)

Since the values of the dependent variable are between 0 and 1, the error term, $e$, also has two values. The error term, $e$, is not normally distributed, it has a discrete distribution, which violates the ordinary least square assumption that $e$ is normally distributed.

The use of a logistic regression model was preferred because it enabled the study to deal with the requirements of a binary condition of mean distribution, with values between 0 and 1. Secondly from a mathematical point of view, it is an extremely
flexible and easily used function. (Hosmer and Lemeshow, 1979, p.6). Finally, as long as the dependent variable is dichotomous, the model can be used to analyze the relationship with either dichotomous or continuous independent variables.

The logistic regression model selected for this study takes the form.

\[
\text{Prob(event)} = \frac{1}{(1+e^z)}
\]

Where: \( e \) is the base of the natural logarithms, approx. 2.718. and \( z \) is linear combination of the independent variables:

\[
z = B_0 + B_1X_1 + B_2X_2 + \ldots + B_pX_p
\]

access = age + income + education + information + encounter with bureaucracy + transportation + location + area

In logistic regression, we have to think of probability in terms of the odds in favour of the outcome, in this case, access status Yes or No. Thus, the coefficient of the model measures the change of odds, \( P/(1-P) \), of accessing status Yes or No as the probability of an explanatory variable changes from 0-1.

For selecting variables to be included in the model this study used forward stepwise logistic regression because the procedure provides a fast and effective means to screen a large number of variables and to simultaneously fit a number of logistic regression equations (Hosmer and Lemeshow, 1990, p.106). Forward stepwise regression starts out with a model that contains only the constant and then feeds in all the independent variables in order of importance. Selection stops when there are no more variables with a significance level that is less than the specified alpha cut off value for the model. The forward stepwise procedure is particularly useful when
one has many dependent variables and needs to screen out less important variables.

Stepwise logistic regression requires two alpha level specifications to judge what variables to include in the model. The first is the alpha level (PE) which denotes the alpha entry level of variables to the model. The second is the alpha level specification (PR) that indicates the point at which a variable is removed once entered into the equation. Essentially, "... whatever value we choose for PR, must exceed the value of PE to guard against the possibility of having the program enter and remove the same variable at successive steps" (Hosmer and Lemeshow, 1990, p.109). PE and PR specifications are very crucial elements because they give the model the kind of flexibility necessary for social analysis.

Bendel and Afifi (1977), in a study of comparison of stopping rules in forward stepwise regression, found the choice of alpha 0.05 to be too stringent and opted for an alpha entry level of (PE) 0.15 to 0.20, because this will ensure that the model yields variables whose co-efficient are significantly different from zero.

Knoke and Burke pointed out that the choice of an alpha level is a difficult one. Setting the alpha level anywhere between .05 and .01 means that to prove the existence of a relationship evidence has to be strongly in favour of a void null hypothesis. However, "... the strategy of finding the best 'best' fitting model impels greater interest in type II error (beta), over which less control is possible... if type II error has a high probability we are likely to omit effects from the model which exist in the population.... the most frequent solution to this problem is the decision to accept a model as fitting the data if the probability of a Type I error lies between
about 0.10 and 0.35. At higher probability levels the model may involve too good a fit; that is it may include unnecessary parameters". (Knoke and Burke, 1980 p.31).

Thus for the purpose of this study, the alpha PE=0.20 and PR = 0.25 which takes into account the need to balance between a statistically significant 'best fit model,' with the need to include as many conceptually significant variables as possible. A matrix of correlations between the independent variables was used in order to check that the independent variables are uncorrelated, or not closely related. In addition, partial correlation statistics R (between -1 and 1) were used to test for the contribution of each variable in the model. According to Johnston, "...partial correlation analysis handles the data in such a way that we can identify the effect of one variable as if the others were not there.... known as holding the latter variable constant" (Johnston, 1989, p.62). A positive value indicates that as the variable increases in value, so does the likelihood of an event occurring. If R is negative, the opposite is true. Small values of R indicate that the variable has a small partial contribution to the model (SPSS Guide Manual, 1990 p.122).

In a logistic regression model the significance of the independent variables is tested by the Wald statistic and the Likelihood ratio, which play the same role as the F test in ordinary least square regression. The Wald statistic has a chi-square distribution and tests the null hypothesis that the co-efficient is zero at a specified alpha level. But according to Hauck and Donner (1977), the Wald statistic behaves in an aberrant manner, often failing to reject when the coefficient is significant. Thus, the use of the likelihood ratio (LR) is recommended, as a back up test to the Wald
The guiding principle of determining the goodness of fit is based on a comparison of observed values of the response variables to predicted values of the response variable to predicted values obtained from models with and without the variable in question. In logistic regression comparison of observable to predicted values has a specific log-likelihood function based on the following expression:

\[ LR = -2 \ln \frac{L_0}{L_1} \]

where \( L_1 \) is always 1, since the likelihood of the correct prediction in a perfect model is 1, and \( L_0 \) is the predicted probability of membership in the correct group.

The quantity inside the bracket is called the likelihood ratio (LR) or the deviance. "...The reason for using minus twice its log is mathematical and is necessary to obtain a quantity whose distribution is known and thus can be used for hypothesis testing purposes." (Hosmer and Lemeshow, 1990, p14)

The likelihood ratio tests the null hypothesis that the coefficient is zero at a specified alpha level. Also, the larger the likelihood ratio relative to the df, the more the expected frequencies depart from the actual cell entries. Hence, we conclude for large LR that the hypothesized model does not fit the data well and should be rejected as an inadequate representation of the relationships among the variables. (Knoke and Burke, 1980, p.30). The above method is opposite of the usual Chi-square test of independence, where we seek to find a large \( X^2 \) value relative to df.
likelihood method we want to find a low LR value relative to df.

Another method used by this study is to assess model fit by means of a classification table comparing model prediction to the observed outcomes. Ideally, we would like the two groups to have different estimated probabilities. (SPSS Guide Manual, 1990, p.125). The classification table is the result of cross-classifying the outcome variable y with a dicotomous variable whose values are derived from the estimated logistic probabilities. Each estimated probability is compared to a cutoff point c. "...If the estimated probability exceeds c then we let the derived variable be equal to 1; otherwise it is equal to 0. The most commonly used value for c is 0.5." (Hosmer and Lemeshow, 1991, p146). If the model predicts group membership accurately according to the set c criterion, then this is taken to provide evidence that the model fits.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND FINDINGS

In this chapter, the study will provide an analysis of the survey data followed by a discussion. The following research questions will be addressed:

- the general demographic characteristics related with displacement and access to CEC services
- personal characteristics associated with client's knowledge of CEC services
- the influence of geographical factors on access to CEC services

The analysis will proceed in two sections. Firstly, we undertake a descriptive analysis of open-ended responses to questionnaire items on variables that help to clarify the various dimensions of social services provision. Secondly, the study will operationalize a logistic regression model to help explain access status to optional employment and adjustment services.

4.1 Access Status and Profile of Displaced Workers¹

It has already been noted that in this study access status is considered in relation to services provided by the Canada Employment Centre (C.E.C). The outcome in terms of how many displaced workers sought help from the C.E.C. is given in

¹ Please note that for each type of analysis (descriptive, cross tabulation and logistic regression), the selected number of respondents will differ from the maximum N=118. This variation is due to rejected cases where missing data occurs.
Table 1 below:

Table 1: Access Rate of Canada Employment Centre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Status</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non Response</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following job loss, displaced workers are required to sign in with the C.E.C.. Based on the above responses, 74.4 percent of displaced workers reported to the C.E.C. seeking to register for some kind of assistance. This initial strong indication that displaced workers do come forward to seek assistance is corroborated by the equally high percentage that apply for unemployment insurance as indicated below:

Table 2: Numbers Seeking Unemployment Insurance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applied for Unemployment Compensation</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non Response</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To receive unemployment benefits, displaced workers are required to register
with the C.E.C. From Table 12 we see that the number of displaced workers who registered for assistance was fairly high at approximately 83.2 percent of the study sample. Failure to collect unemployment benefits by some entitled clients may be attributed to a misplaced stigma about receiving government benefits. Alternatively, non-access by eligible clients may be a "... rational action by persons eligible only for small benefits or eligible only for a short period of time" (Bendick, 1979, p.273).

**Age**

Table 3 presents the age composition of the survey population:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - 24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a study by the U.S. Department of Labour Bureau, it was found that over half of the displaced workers were 25 to 54 years of age (Monthly labour Review, 1985, p.6). In this study, 87 percent of displaced workers fall within the 25 to 55 age bracket. Hence, the sample used here reflects a higher representation for the most
likely age groups to be displaced.

**Education**

Table 4 shows the education levels of the study sample of displaced workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Group</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non Response</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeship</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/Apprentice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4, we see that 63.8 percent of displaced workers have only attained a high school education, and only 15.5 percent indicated having an apprenticeship. The distribution of the study's sample depicts a typical demographic make up of the most vulnerable sections of displaced workers. Essentially, most of today's displaced workers constitute the less educated and less technically endowed sections of the workforce. (Success in the Works, 1989, p.10)
Income

Table 5: Income Levels of the Survey Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Group</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non Response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $10,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$11,000 - $20,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$21,000 - $30,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$31,000 - $40,000</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$41,000 - $50,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$51,000 and Over</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost 50 percent of the survey's respondents earned between $31,000 and $40,000 annually prior to displacement. An additional 26.1 percent earned between $21,000 and $30,000 annually. It is evident from the above table that most of the displaced workers belonged to Windsor's middle income group.
Sex and Marital Status

Tables 6 and 7 show the sex composition and marital status of the respondents.

Table 6: Sex Composition of Survey Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex Composition</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non Response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>116</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Marital Status of Survey Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common-law</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>116</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the tables above, it is evident that the overwhelming majority of displaced workers are men, which is a reflection of the historical imbalance of sexes employed in the manufacturing sector. 70.7 percent of the displaced are married,
most (80 percent) having one or two dependents.

Although recent studies by Schwartz (1990) found that displacement has spread to the managerial and white collar job categories, this survey suggests that displaced workers in Windsor are predominantly from the blue collar category, working in capital intensive industrial plants. Consequently, in the case of Windsor, we seem to be dealing with the more traditional forms of displacement that are associated with the 'second labour shift' inspired by changing production technologies. According to Martin (1983), the 'second labour shift' which is well underway in the United States, means that "...only 20 million workers remain in goods-producing industries, while 60 million now provide a variety of services. These major employment changes have occurred over relatively long periods." (ibid., p.2)

In these circumstances the challenges of providing services have to take account of the fact that many of the jobs lost in plants that close will not be replaced. In effect, the services provided to workers displaced by this reindustrialization process have to be geared not just at providing short-term financial relief, such as unemployment insurance, but services geared to long term readjustment for those laid off to participate in the labour market in a new form.
AREA

The following table represents the respondents' areas of residence based on the survey data:

Table 8: Area of Residence of Survey Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Residence</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non Response</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 8, 39.0 percent of the survey's respondents displaced by recent industrial decline stay in the rural areas, and 34.7 percent within the official boundaries of the City of Windsor. The majority of respondents do not have to commute long distances to work because most of the firms from which most workers were displaced are located either in Windsor or Amherstberg. Consequently, travel time is not viewed as a major issue in the discussion.

4.2 Utilization of Services

An important aspect of this study is to examine the kinds of people who utilize services provided by the C.E.C. Hence, the survey population was analyzed using cross-tabulations in order to identify some characteristics of displaced people who made contact with the C.E.C.'s.

Table 9 shows the outcome of a cross-tabulation between the people who sought
help from the C.E.C. and their ages.

**Table 9: Relation of Age (within group %) to Access Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age &amp; Access</th>
<th>Yes in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 - 24</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 30</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 55</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 &gt;</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age is expected to play an important role in the realization of the need for help and where to get it. According to Table 9, all the respondents in age groups 18 to 24 and all the respondents from the age group over 55 had sought help from the C.E.C.. The lowest rate of utilization is 75.0 percent for age group 25 to 40, followed 86.3 percent for age group 41 to 55. In all, we see that over four fifths of persons from all age groups sought help, although there are slightly more young to middle-aged people (25 to 40) not seeking help than in the other categories. Utilization of general C.E.C. services seem to be relatively even between the various age groups.

Table 10 presents a breakdown of the relationship between education and access to C.E.C. services.
Table 10: Relation of Education (within group %) to Access Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education &amp; Access</th>
<th>Yes in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprentice</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appren./College</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As stated in the previous demographic profile, the majority of displaced workers are high school and elementary school graduates. As evident, 90.9 percent of the elementary grade school graduates seek assistance from the C.E.C., and 71.0 percent of high school graduates sought assistance, indicating a drop in access between elementary and high school level. This is followed by an increase in access by displaced peoples with an apprenticeship at 82.3 percent; and 80 percent for those who have a college education. In brief, it is not surprising that the less educated access C.E.C. services more than the higher educated. Contradicting the findings of Katz et al (1975), high school graduates seem less likely to seek assistance than apprenticeship or college graduates.
Table 11 is a cross tabulation of access and income.

Table 11: Relation of Income (within group %) to Access to C.E.C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income &amp; Access</th>
<th>Yes in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under - $10,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$11,000 - 20,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$21,000 - 30,000</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$31,000 - 40,000</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$41,000 - 50,000</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$51,000 &gt;</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated by the data above, 67-75 percent of those earning over $31,000 sought C.E.C.'s assistance. From the data we note that this is a decrease in the proportion of those seeking assistance from the 90 - 100 percent of the respondents earning under 30,000, who seek assistance. Hence, the data does show a decrease in access with increasing income. According to Bendick, "...voluntary non-participation seems to be associated most commonly with incomes that fall in the upper ranges of program eligibility". (Bendick, 1979, p.270)

The study, considered three spatial factors of area of residence, indication of transportation and location as a problem in relation to seeking assistance (see Tables 12 & 13).
Table 12: Relation of Area (within group %) of Residence to Access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area &amp; Access</th>
<th>Yes in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the Table we see that 87.5 percent of those living in the urban environment of Windsor sought assistance from the C.E.C. and a slightly lesser proportion of rural residents (73.9 percent) made contact with the C.E.C.. The rest, 20.7 percent, did not indicate area of residence.

Table 13: Relation of Location (within group %) of C.E.C. as Access Problem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location and Access</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Response</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 13, 68.5 percent of the respondents who sought C.E.C. services indicated that location of the service was not a problem. The same proportion of survey respondents indicated that transportation was not an inhibiting factor in the decision to seek assistance from the C.E.C.. Although the survey did reveal some area differences between the people that seek help, there was a strong indication that transportation and the location of C.E.C. services did not present major problems to access.
In summary, the survey sample is made up of displaced workers associated with current reindustrialization processes that are replacing old technology, so that many of the workers are relatively uneducated and technologically unskilled. Almost three-quarters of the displaced workers surveyed indicated that they had sought help from the C.E.C.. Unemployment Insurance showed a utilization rate of over 80 percent. The data indicates some variation in the utilization rates of C.E.C. services for certain income groups, education levels and between urban and rural areas. The data shows that lower income groups and less educated categories of displaced workers seek help in proportionately larger numbers than the respective higher categories. However, no major variation in utilization was found for different age categories and spatial factors were not generally perceived to affect utilization.

4.3 Knowledge of Services

This study is also concerned with the clientele's knowledge about different kinds of services provided by the C.E.C.. As suggested in the literature review, part of the failure to utilize government services is due to ignorance concerning their existence. It has been noted previously that over three-quarters of displaced workers in the survey sought unemployment insurance from the C.E.C.. The other services examined in this study include: job placement, training, search, creation and testing and mobility assistance.

Table 14 shows the percentages of those respondents who indicated having knowledge of the existence of the different services.
From Table 14, we see that more than half of the displaced workers seem to have some knowledge of job placement and job training services but relatively far fewer of them know about the existence of job creation, testing and creative job search programs. The latter three are important programs for assisting displaced workers prepare for new and more contemporary forms of employment. It seems that the client's knowledge of C.E.C. is mainly focussed on the traditional services of unemployment insurance, and to a lesser extent, job placement and job training.  

From Table 14, it is also evident that very few respondents know about mobility assistance, which is given in order to facilitate job changes between regions or towns. This contrasts with 41 percent of displaced workers who expressed a willingness to move if the company they worked for relocated. This implies that clients' knowledge about mobility assistance lags behind the willingness of displaced workers to relocate.  

In an attempt to understand what sorts of people are knowledgeable about C.E.C.'s optional employment and adjustment services, some of the responses
obtained in Table 14 were merged with various characteristics.

Table 15: Relation of Age (Within Group %) to Knowledge of Existence of Selected C.E.C. Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>18 - 24</th>
<th>25 - 30</th>
<th>31 - 40</th>
<th>41 - 55</th>
<th>55+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Placement</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Training</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Creation</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Testing</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Search</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Assistance</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For job placement there is generally a high level of knowledge about the existence of the service with the age group over 55 having the least knowledge of job placement. For job training the age groups 18 to 24 and 25 to 30 are most knowledgable at 60 percent and 63 percent respectively, after which there is a steady decline down to 20 percent for those over 55 years old. Less than 20 percent of all ages indicated knowledge of job testing and mobility assistance. Except for the 18 to 24 year age group (at 40 percent) all other age groups had less than 22 percent indicate a knowledge of job search services. Looking at job creation we see that the age groups 18 to 24 and over 41 show no knowledge of this particular service. The age groups 25 to 30 has relatively more awareness of job creation at 25.9 percent. It seems therefore, that the very young and old know little about job creation. Job training is associated mostly with the young, and younger age groups have more
knowledge about retraining and labour adjustment services than older displaced workers.

Table 16 outlines the relation between education and knowledge of C.E.C. services.

Table 16: Relation of Education (Within Group %) to Knowledge of Selected C.E.C. Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Elem.</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Apprentice</th>
<th>college</th>
<th>App./coll.</th>
<th>Univ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Placement</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Training</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Creation</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Testing</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Search</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Assistance</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a noticeable difference in knowledge between those respondents with elementary and those with a college education especially in services of job placement and job training. However, few respondents with college and apprenticeship qualifications seem to know about job placement although at 66 percent many more know about job training. This is consistent with the college-trained and apprentices' less vulnerable position vis-a-vis unemployment. Job creation and Job search is most
known by university graduates, implying that the more educated are more likely to know about job creation and job search. The data on education generally supports other findings that the most in need tend to have the least knowledge of what kinds of help exist.

Table 17: Relation of Income (Within Group %) to Knowledge of Selected C.E.C. Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Under 10,000</th>
<th>11,000 - 20,000</th>
<th>21,000 - 30,000</th>
<th>31,000 - 40,000</th>
<th>41,000 - 50,000</th>
<th>Over 50,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Placement</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Training</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Creation</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Testing</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Search</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Assistance</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Service knowledge was differentiated by income categories as shown in Table 17. Relatively higher proportions of respondents in the over $21,000 categories of income indicated having a knowledge of job placement services. This suggests that those who would appear to need this service most, knew less than respondents with higher incomes and thus less of a need.

Job creation services are apparently unknown to the income categories earning below $20,000. Only the category over $51,000, at 33.3 percent, seems to know about job creation services. Job testing, job search and mobility assistance services, seem
to be known mostly by respondents with the lowest incomes (under $10,000) and the highest income group (over $51,000). Essentially people in the middle income groups indicated very little knowledge of these three services.

Table 18 outlines the differences between knowledge of services and area of residence (rural and urban).

Table 18: Relation of Area (Within Group %) to Knowledge of Selected C.E.C. Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Placement</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Training</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Creation</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Testing</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Search</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Assistance</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, both urban and rural respondents show a higher degree of knowledge in job placement and job training services, than other services. However, it appears that for each particular service there is no substantial difference between urban and rural respondents.

To summarize this section, the data indicate that displaced workers knowledge of C.E.C. services varies with type of services. Whilst most of the displaced know about Unemployment Insurance, comparatively fewer (51 - 57 percent) of the surveyed displaced workers know about job placement and job training. Even fewer (less than 20 percent) of the displaced respondents know about job creation, job
testing, creative job search and mobility assistance. In terms of demographic characteristics associated with knowledge of services, the study found that services that require more retraining and adjustment are more known to the younger people than older people, especially over 40 years of age. Again, more educated laid off workers (college level) know about training and adaptation services than the less educated (high school and elementary). The less educated tend to have more knowledge of traditional reference services like job placement. The most needy, that is, those with lowest incomes, know less about the services available than higher income groups. No substantial differences were observed between urban and rural respondents in respect to knowledge of services.

4.4 Encounter with Bureaucracy

This study was also designed to identify some of the basic characteristics of displaced workers who made an appointment with the CEC to gain access to optional employment and adjustment services. In order to receive unemployment insurance, displaced workers apply for assistance using a standardized application form. In order to receive the other forms of assistance (job training, job placement, job creation, job testing, job search and mobility assistance) offered by the C.E.C., displaced workers have to make an appointment and met with a counsellor. Based on the circumstances of individual clients, counsellors determine eligibility to services requested. Table 19 presents the number of respondents who made an appointment to see a C.E.C. counsellor.
Table 19: Number of Respondents who made Appointments with C.E.C. Counsellors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>App. with C.E.C.</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non Response</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table, 38.5 percent of the surveyed workers made an appointment to see a C.E.C. counsellor for further inquiry and consideration related to employment services other than unemployment insurance.

An important consideration in this study is to examine some of the respondents' demographic characteristics associated with a positive assessment of the interaction process with C.E.C. counsellor.

Table 20 shows the relation between education and those respondents who made an appointment to see the C.E.C. counsellor.
Table 20: Relation of Education (within group %) to Making an Appointment with C.E.C. Counsellor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>% YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeship</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/Apprenticeship</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 20 we see that only 44 percent of elementary level respondents applied to see a counsellor. The proportion increased gradually up to respondents with college and apprenticeship level and then dropped to 50 percent for university level.

Table 21 outlines the relation between income and respondents who made an appointment to see the C.E.C. counsellor.

Table 21: Relation of Income (within group %) to Making an Appointment with a C.E.C. Counsellor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>% YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $10,000</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$11,000 - $20,000</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$21,000 - $30,000</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$31,000 - $40,000</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$41,000 - $50,000</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$51,000 and over</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less than half of the respondents in the categories $21,000 - $30,000 and
$31,000 to $40,000 made an appointment to seek counselling for C.E.C.'s optional employment and adjustment services. Below and above these two categories of income there is a gradual increase in the proportion of respondents from each income group, who sought help from the C.E.C. agents.

Table 22 presents the relation of age and the respondents who made an appointment to see a C.E.C. counsellor.

Table 22: Relation of Age (within group %) to Making an Appointment with a C.E.C. Counsellor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>% YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 - 24</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 30</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 55</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 55</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sixty percent of the respondents from 18 to 24 and ages over 41 sought counselling in order to gain access to C.E.C.'s optional employment and adjustment programs. Only half or less than half of the respondents between the ages 25 and 40 sought an appointment with C.E.C. agents to get further help, other than unemployment benefits. These two age groups also cover the bulk of our respondents displaced by recent industrial decline.
Table 23 shows the proportion of respondents who made an appointment to see a C.E.C. counsellor by area of residence.

**Table 23: Relation of Appointment with Counsellor to Area of Residence (within group)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>% YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown above, more people living in the rural areas, that is outside Windsor, made an appointment to see a C.E.C. counsellor than respondents living in the urban areas. The researcher expected more urban dwellers to seek appointment with the C.E.C. than rural dwellers.

In brief, this study found that only half or less than half of the respondents with elementary education, aged between 25 and 40 and earning between $21,000 to $40,000 made an appointment to see a counsellor for optional employment and adjustment services. This is an indication that less than half of the core education and income groups of displaced workers seek additional help from the CEC other than Unemployment Insurance claims.

**4.5 Model Estimation**

The logistic regression model outlined in the previous chapter was applied to 118 cases from the study's survey. 5 cases were rejected because of missing data leaving N to equal 113 for the model estimation. As in the ordinary least square regression models, it is important to ascertain the nature of each variable's
contribution to the model, since the contribution of each variable often depends on the other variables in the model. This involves a process of checking for high correlation or multicollinearity among the independent variables.

As indicated in the previous chapter, this study will rely on a correlation matrix and the R statistic as a measure for partial correlation between the independent variable and the dependent variable.

The results of the correlation matrix of the final parameter estimates is given below.

Table 24: Correlation Matrix of Main Parameter Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>Bur.Enc</th>
<th>Info by Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.1453</td>
<td>0.0642</td>
<td>0.5241</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>0.1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bur.Enc</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.1070</td>
<td>0.3012</td>
<td>0.0187</td>
<td>0.1493</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info by Age</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.1178</td>
<td>0.4707</td>
<td>0.3505</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.0320</td>
<td>0.0384</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.5575</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Large correlations between the variables in the model means that the parameter estimates have a weak independent contribution in the model. Scholars have suggested the use of a threshold value of 0.70 for the identification of 'high' correlations (Hanushek and Jackson, 1977). The results of the correlation matrix presented in Table 24 above, indicate that none of the parameters selected in the model exceed the chosen threshold of 0.70. Table 25 presents an alternative method for counter checking the results of the correlation matrix. The method is based on
the R statistic generated by the regression model discussed in chapter 3.

### Table 25: Partial Correlation Co-efficients Based on R Statistic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bur.Enc.</td>
<td>0.3609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info by Age</td>
<td>0.1604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.1122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>0.1379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The value of R ranges from -1 to +1. Small values of R indicate that the variable has a small partial correlation to the other variables in the model. The values of R for all our main parameters are less than 0.5 and so we conclude that the contributions of selected variables to the model are independent.

Some of the hypothesized variables were excluded from the final model because they did not meet the specified alpha entry and exit levels of 0.15 and 0.20 respectively. These include: distance, transportation and income.

In the final analysis, the model estimates co-efficients and related statistics from the logistic regression model, predicting access to optional employment and adjustment programs, from a constant and the variables: Bureaucratic Encounter, Information about C.E.C. by Age, Education, Urban and Non Urban areas. The results from the model are presented in Table 26.
The co-efficients obtained in the model, shown in Table 26, represent the change in the log odds associated with a unit change in the independent variables. The odds of access, the dependent variable, based on each independent variable are given as Exp. B in Table 26. From the results, we see that the interaction variable of age and the knowledge of clients about services, increases the odds of access by about 1.54 times. The education level of the displaced workers increases the odds in favour of access by a factor of 1.73 times. For respondents living in the rural areas, the odds for access are 0.4, or less than half compared to the average probability of accessing existing optional employment and adjustment services.

The odds for urban residents accessing existing employment and adjustment
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---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>WALD</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SIG.</th>
<th>EXP. (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bur.Enc</td>
<td>-5.427</td>
<td>1.1469</td>
<td>22.392</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info by Age</td>
<td>0.4363</td>
<td>0.1777</td>
<td>6.0290</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0141</td>
<td>1.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.5495</td>
<td>0.2757</td>
<td>3.9727</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0462</td>
<td>1.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1080</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0778</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>0.4584</td>
<td>0.4848</td>
<td>0.8941</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3444</td>
<td>1.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td>0.4096</td>
<td>4.9787</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0257</td>
<td>0.401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
services are 1.5 times more than the rural residents. However, with a significance level of 0.3444, the log odds for urban residents must be looked at with serious doubts. The study found that even a positive perception about an encounter with bureaucracy does not increase the odds for a positive outcome of access to optional services.

4.5.1 Hypothesis Testing

The Wald statistic is used to test the null hypothesis that a co-efficient is zero, and therefore not significant. The significance levels for the Wald statistic are given in the column labelled "sig." in Table 26. As stated in the previous chapter, when the absolute regression co-efficients are large, the estimated errors may be too large producing small values of the Wald statistics and a failure to reject the null hypothesis that the co-efficient is zero, or not significant. An alternative method for hypothesis testing used to counter-check Wald statistics results is the likelihood ratio for the independent variables presented in Table 27 below.
Table 27: Likelihood - Ratio Statistics for Model Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-Efficient</th>
<th>-2 log LR</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig. Log LR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bur. Enc</td>
<td>67.032</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info by Age</td>
<td>6.938</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4.375</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Residence</td>
<td>5.456</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0654</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the observed significance level is greater than the cut off value of alpha, then the influence of the co-efficient in the model is deemed to be insignificant. Except for a slight increase in area of residence co-efficient, the outcome of the log likelihood method basically concurs with the outcomes of the Wald statistics displayed in Table 26.

The first hypothesis in this study dealt with the influence of spatial or geographic factors vis-a-vis access to existing services. The first hypothesis is:

H1: A client's positive perception of the location of a service is associated with a positive outcome of access status. Clients who are in possession of transportation means or who do not perceive location as a problem are more likely to access social services. Because of various constraints, rural clients are less likely to access employment and adjustment services than urban clients.

Based on the model’s stepwise regression alpha entry levels of 0.20 to 0.25, this study did not yield significant results to support the hypothesis that client's
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perceptions of location and transportation have an influence on the access to existing program tested services. Hence, we reject the null hypothesis that transportation and location parameters significantly influence access of services. However, the results from Table 26 and 27 confirm that there are differences between urban and rural areas respecting access to existing social services. The significance level for the rural area's Wald statistic, at 0.0257, is significantly greater than zero and less than 0.05 alpha level, meaning that access by displaced rural residents is a significant factor. As noted earlier, the odds of access by rural residents are less than the odds of access by urban dwellers and others that did not indicate their place of residence.

The study was also concerned with the role of personal demographic factors in respect to access of social services. Personal factors were considered as part of:

H2: There will be a positive relationship between the education, age and income of the displaced workers and access to CEC's employment and adjustment services.

Both age and income did not yield significant results to qualify for consideration as part of the final parameters selected on the alpha entry and exit levels of 0.20 and 0.25 respectively. Hence, we reject the null hypothesis that age and income as independent parameters positively influence access. However, age did prove to be significant when considered as an interaction factor with client knowledge of existing services, as elaborated later. This study did find that a displaced person's education level significantly increases the probability of access by a factor 1.7. The significance of the Wald statistic is 0.0462 which is less than alpha 0.05 level of
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significance. Consequently, we conclude that education has a positive influence on access.

The next hypothesis tested related to the influence of client’s knowledge about the existence of various C.E.C. social services. Hence, the hypothesis:

H3: Successful access to social services is positively influenced by the amount of information clients possess about C.E.C.’s optional employment and adjustment programs.

Indeed, the findings confirm the null hypothesis that interaction of a displaced worker’s age and knowledge of C.E.C.’s services has a positive influence on access. The odds of accessing services based on the interaction of age and client’s knowledge (Wald statistic), is greater than zero and less than 0.05 level of significance. The log odds for the interaction factor, age and information are 1.7 times in favour of access.

Finally, this study examined the decision-rule hypothesis:

H4: Successful access to social services is positively influenced by a client’s positive perception of the encounter with the street bureaucrat.

The results from the model show that a client’s positive perception about the encounter with a street bureaucrat is not associated with a positive outcome of access to C.E.C’s employment and adjustment services. Hence, having a positive perception of the encounter with the bureaucracy does not increase odds of a positive outcome of access.
4.5.2 Goodness of Fit of the Estimated Model

Testing the 'goodness of fit' of the 'estimated model' entails the need to assess how well the logistic model fits the observed data. In logistic regression we may examine the likelihood ratio test to see how well the model classifies the observed data. The likelihood method "... tests the null hypothesis that the observed does not differ from 1 (the value of the likelihood for a model that fits perfectly)". (SPSS Guide Manual, 1990, p126)

The results of goodness of fit statistics for the model are shown in Table 28.

Table 28: Goodness of Fit Statistics (-2 Log Likelihood)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2 Log likelihood</td>
<td>80.158</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0.9755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness of Fit</td>
<td>95.208</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0.7857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a rule of thumb, if "...the observed significance level is large, you do not reject the hypothesis that the model fits". (SPSS Guide Manual, 1990, p126) In the first row of the table, the chi-square value is 80.158, the value of -2 log likelihood for the current model. The large significance level of 0.9755 indicates that the model does not differ significantly from the 'perfect' model. The goodness of fit statistic in the last row has a significance level of 0.7857, which also confirms that this model is not significantly different from the 'perfect fit' model.

Another measure that may be used to assess the goodness of fit of the logistic model is by means of a classification table showing the predicted versus the actual
values of the dichotomous dependent variable, access status, and determining the proportion of cases which were predicted correctly by the model. Ideally, one expects that all the respondents that did access services are correctly classified at the intersection of two positive outcomes. Similarly, one would expect that those who did not access services are correctly classified at the intersection of two negatives. The results are presented in Table 29.

Table 29: Classification Table of Predicted Versus Observed Values of Access Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREDICTED</th>
<th>OBSERVED</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>% CORRECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>78.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td>89.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OVERALL: 84.07

From Table 29, it appears that the model was quite successful in correctly predicting both those who accessed services and those that did not access services. Of the displaced workers that did not access optional employment and adjustment services 78.18 percent were correctly classified. Of the displaced workers that did access these services, 89.66 percent were correctly classified. Overall, the model predicts correctly 84.07 percent of the observed cases that accessed services and those that did not access services. Consequently, the classification table confirms that the
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CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

This chapter will briefly outline the nature of displaced workers in Windsor/Essex county, the study will then examine the first dimension of access based on those displaced workers who registered for assistance with the CEC. Particular attention will be paid to utilization and knowledge of CEC services. The characteristics associated with access of employment and labour adjustment services will then be examined. Finally, the results of the logistic model applied to test for likelihood of access to optional employment and labour services will be discussed.

Recent trends in North American industrial decline have effectively displaced workers from all positions. In Windsor and Essex County displacement has predominantly fallen on the blue collar worker. The reason for this is that a large proportion of the workers in Windsor and Essex County are blue collar, employed in capital intensive industrial plants.

This study suggests that variables such as age, income and education of displaced workers may be important considerations. The study results indicate that the majority of laid off workers are between the ages of 25 - 40, married with small families, possess only high school or elementary education and earn between $21,000 and $40,000 per year. These variables have direct impact on the nature of the social and labour adjustment services needed by the displaced. Authorities should be keenly aware of these facts so that they are able to effectively pinpoint the particular
disadvantages that afflict displaced workers in Windsor. In the final analysis this would make labour adjustment and job creation programs easier to formulate by providing Windsor's social services sector with the knowledge necessary to combat the recent decline in the industrial sector.

This study was primarily concerned with the secondary effects of displacement, especially the factors that influence accessibility of existing federally funded social services. First, this study looked at the type of people who utilize CEC services. In doing this, the study found large disparities in the utilization rates of the different programs offered. Unemployment Insurance has a utilization rate of 80 percent, while employment and adjustment programs (like retraining, job search, mobility assistance and job creation) have a utilization rate of 38.5 percent.

This disparity in access may be linked to suggestions in the literature review. One suggestion cited people as being more comfortable accessing Unemployment Insurance because it is perceived as an earned benefit as opposed to services that are regarded as federal 'hand-outs'. Prottas (1979) highlighted this point when he spoke of the stigma attached to seeking unpaid-for services from the government. Also in the literature, Goodsell attributed such disparities in access to differences in the delivery climate of the two kinds of services. While Unemployment Insurance benefits have a legalistic climate, unpaid-for employment and adjustment services are ambivalent, "... for along with humanitarian giving values goes the understanding that the staff is superior in status to clients" (Goodsell, 1980, p.126).

Another explanation for the disparity between employment and adjustment
services from 'earned unemployment benefits', may relate to the relative ease of accessing Unemployment Insurance which only requires filling out an application form. Employment and adjustment services, on the other hand, require going through a process of 'personal interview' or assessment to determine if a displaced person qualifies. Such an interview process may invoke some apprehension, on the part of the displaced worker, in accessing an existing service. This apprehension is, without a doubt, compounded when factors such as insufficient education and lack of language proficiency exist. In addition, the older worker may feel too old to undergo what he/she may perceive as rigorous retraining and adjustment programs.

This study found some variation in the utilization of existing services for certain income groups and education levels. In brief, access was not predominantly associated with the least educated or lowest income group. Evidence from this study corroborates results by other scholars that employment and adjustment such as "... job training and employment services, are the least utilized in relation to need" (Katz et al., 1975, p.60).

The study utilized a number of variables (age, education and income) for determining how knowledge of CEC services or the lack thereof affects access. Knowledge of CEC services varies depending on the type of service being offered. For instance, the displaced worker knows of unemployment insurance benefits, but knowledge of employment and adjustment services, like job placement and job training, is limited. Even less well known are job creation, job testing and mobility assistance services. As pointed out in the literature review, this lack of knowledge
about existing services is the most important single reason for non-access (Katz et al, 1975, p.60). The first variable affecting the amount of knowledge one might have of services was age. The interaction between age and knowledge revealed that the younger the displaced worker the greater the knowledge of CEC services. A displaced worker’s education is another variable that has a direct impact on the amount of knowledge that one has about CEC services. It also seems that the higher the level of education the more the level of knowledge about services. Taking income into consideration it was determined that more of the lower income groups indicated having no knowledge of existing CEC services.

The study then ran a logistic regression model to examine the likelihood of access to employment and adjustment services. The study hypothesised relationships between the dependent variable 'access' status and determinant contributors to the likelihood of access. The demographic factor most significant in predicting the likelihood of access of services was education. Essentially, the more educated displaced workers are the more likely they are to access an employment and adjustment program. The results support Hasenfeld’s (1985) findings that education is an important source of client power, because it gives more competence and knowledge of the services system.

This study also looked at the decision rule hypothesis to determine the influence of a displaced worker’s feelings about the service agent s/he is interacting with, and how these feelings can affect the utilization of the services offered. In the literature review it was stated that intake policies and the discretionary powers of
street bureaucrats play an important role in influencing access to services. This study's results do not support the proposition that likelihood of access increases with a client's perception of the encounter with the service agents. The high frequency of negative responses vis-a-vis encounter with bureaucracy may explain this study's support of Katz et al. (1975) that service agents make rational decisions free from clients perceptions and controlled by universal norms.

Among the spatial factors examined, only the 'area of residence' yielded significant results. Results indicate that rural residents are less likely to access employment and adjustment services than urban residents and those who did not indicate their place of residence. No significant results were obtained for the spatial variables 'transportation' as a problem of access and 'location of CEC services as an inhibiting factor.

One reason why transportation and distance do not seem to be important influences on access of employment and adjustment services. This is probably due to the fact most displaced workers own cars (83.5 percent) and live within reasonable travel time to CEC's downtown Windsor offices.

This study suggests that location should be looked at in relation to whether the service being sought is 'earned' or 'unearned'. If the service is an earned one, such as unemployment insurance (UI), then location is not very important because most displaced workers needing financial benefits will look for the location of CEC offices. If, on the other hand, the service is 'unearned' and does not offer immediate relief,
such as retraining, then the issue of location of CEC offices is precluded by issues relating to a displaced worker's knowledge about optional employment and adjustment services. In essence, before a displaced worker considers spatial limitations to access he or she must confront level I questions on information that include:

* knowledge about the existence of the service
* taking a decision whether or not to seek service based on individual assessment of need

After confronting level I questions a displaced worker is then ready to face up to level II or spatial questions that include:

* does s/he know where to get service (location) ?
* is it affordable to get to the service centre or is it too far that it would take too much time to get to the service ?
* is transportation to the service centre available ?

Once a displaced worker overcomes the questions at level I and II and decides to go to seek help at CEC offices then s/he has to grapple with level III or bureaucratic encounter questions that include:

* does s/he know what kind of employment and adjustment service to seek ?
* is s/he comfortable with the CEC's modus operandi in terms of general reception, language, cultural sensitivity etc.?
* is s/he satisfied with the outcome of the interview ?

In brief, the three levels summarize some of the components of a displaced worker's
decision making process vis-a-vis access of CEC services.

The study also examined some of the characteristics of non-users of CEC services. As noted earlier, non-use of services is more predominant among the more needy lower income and less educated categories of displaced workers. Results from other scholars point out that reasons for non-use "... were pragmatic and did not indicate negativism toward public bureaucracies. The dominant responses were that the problem was somehow taken care of; or the problem solved by the respondent's own efforts or another individual, such as spouse, child, neighbour or boss" (Katz et al., 1975, p.48). Chacko et al. (1991), using the same data set as this study found that many of the displaced also rely on friends, relatives and the labour unions for assistance.

An explanation that may shed light on non-use is linked to the dynamics of the social system, in particular, political sceptism. This may affect peoples' attitudes to the kinds of services offered by government as solutions to displacements (Katz et al., 1975). Such a climate of sceptism may also manifest itself in poor returns or non-responses to survey evaluation exercises like this study. In future, it may be important to include indicators of the political attitudes of the displaced workers in order to see how the political climate influences accessibility; by implication, also the methods and timing of research can effect responses.

Like most research, the validity of this study is compromised by a number of limitations, some methodological in form. One of the main limitations is the small sample size used as a basis for analysis and generalization. In addition, as a non-
random sample of displaced workers the data had shortcomings of skewing some demographic categories and minority people; consequently introducing some bias in the results.

It has already been noted that, by overlooking factors related to the political climate, this study may have overlooked a factor that inhibit the willingness to access social services. Although surveys of client views are an important source of data about the problem and the effectiveness of services, this method seems to be plagued by inconsistencies in the assessment of services delivery. Consequently, other scholars like Prottas (1979) and Lipsky (1984) advocated the use of case study methods, that are said to offer a more objective assessment of organizational effectiveness in service delivery. However, according to Gutek (1978), although survey type measures of client satisfaction may be problematic and subjective, their value in evaluating services cannot be surpassed by so called objective indicators. The resulting 'methodological dilemma' has prompted scholars to propose the use of a combination of methods including in-depth interviews with subjects, community groups and service providers (Gutek, 1978, p.54).

Lebow (1983) pointed out that reliability is especially likely to be a problem where scales are short. Specifically, the binary scale (yes or no) used in this study does not give sufficient options or leeway for clients to express their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with service delivery. It is proposed that use of a continuous rather than a dichotomous scale may be a better measure of client assessment of services provision. Alternatively if a researcher prefers to use a binary scale for modelling,
it may be better to ask continuously scaled attitudinal questions and then transform the responses into a binary scale for regression analysis. Such a transformation should be supported by theory (Hosmer and Lemeshow, 1990).

The study also noted that the SPSS statistical package used in this study seem limited in terms of graphical diagnostic capabilities. For instance, the partial residual plots produced by SPSS do not include a curve necessary for clarifying the nature of linearity or non-linearity of response and explanatory variables. In all, it is hoped that rather than being seen as conclusive generalizations, this study has raised some issues and hypotheses that will form a basis for further exploration.
CHAPTER 6
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In conclusion, this study examined some of the social and spatial factors that influence access to services for displaced workers in Windsor/Essex county. In the process, the study also touched on the nature of displaced workers, their knowledge and non-use of existing services.

In summary, it seems that most of the displaced workers are middle aged and mostly of high school or lower education, working in the manufacturing sector. Such peculiar factors should be considered in planning social services for the displaced in Windsor and Essex county. Many more displaced workers access unemployment benefits as compared to employment and labour adjustment services. The study concludes that personal and demographic factors, especially a client’s education attainment, increases the likelihood of accessing social services. Also, age interacting with a client’s knowledge of employment and adjustment programs increases the likelihood of access. Although younger workers know more than older workers (over 40 years of age) it is apparent that in general, many do not know about Labour Adjustment, Mobility Assistance, Job Search and Job Creation services. The study also found that displaced workers from the rural areas access CEC employment and adjustment services less than the urban based displaced workers. Other spatial factors such as location of the service center and transportation did not seem to affect access to social services.
The impact of this study was compromised by the small data set available for analysis and generalization. In addition, the survey instrument used to collect data for this study was too long and sought too much information from the respondents. The length of the survey instrument may partly explain the low response rate by displaced workers included in the survey. Other limitations include methodological shortcomings associated with the use of a survey method of service assessment and the use of dichotomous questions to measure client perceptions. Considering income and education levels, prior to lay off, it seems that it is not always the most needy that access social services most often. Since this study involved relatively very few cases, the results of this study should be looked at as issues and hypotheses for further research and clarification. A major factor that undermines the reliability of the study's outcomes, is that the sample used in the study was not based on random selection.

The study's results lead to the following recommendations:

- In order for future research to obtain more reliable results, it is important to use a randomly selected and a large enough data set. This helps to optimize both reliability and representativeness in descriptive and inferential analysis. Katz et al (1975), for instance, completed a survey of 1431 respondents in a study on social services. Also, when it comes to measuring client's satisfaction with services, researchers should use questions based on an attitudinal and continuous scale rather than a dichotomous scale. This is because binary or dichotomous scales present respondents with blunt yes or no choices for social
issues and perceptions that are better served on a broad scale of opinions. In addition, when dealing with issues like employment lay-offs and social services, modelling of parameters to explain access should incorporate indicators of a laid off worker's political affiliations and attitudes toward applicable government policies. This is important because it may very well affect both the respondents' perceptions of services provided to displaced workers and the perceptions about the need and role of a study. In turn, a researcher may want to conduct his/her study when the political climate is not too volatile, resulting in low interest by the displaced in responding to a study. To reduce some of the methodological dilemmas discussed above, this study recommends the use of surveys, both preceded and supplemented by focus group interviews. This helps to clarify the intensity of the problem in question and highlights the relevant issues that must be emphasized in the study.

Service agents should adopt a more proactive approach to providing means-tested services such as Labour Adjustment, Job Search, Job Creation and Mobility Assistance services. Outreach is one way to ensure that information is not just available, but also readily accessible. In the words of Harter: "Whatever the objections to a particular program, a commitment is made when the program is instituted. All who are eligible have the right to participate, they are, in fact, entitled to benefits" (Harter, 1977, p.1122). Outreach activities should include posters and leaflet distribution, mass mailing, newspaper announcements, television advertisements and appearances. In
addition to these activities, service agencies need to adopt a supportive and participatory approach so that the displaced feel in control of decisions regarding their future employment. A recent attempt at a participatory intervention to displacement and provision of services is the Counselling/Advocacy Service in Etobicoke (CASE) (Meurer S. 1990). Targeted at older displaced workers, CASE uses peer counselling programs by former laid off workers working in conjunction with professionals or agencies. Peer counsellors help to validate workers experiences and put the individual’s problem into perspective. Settings for meetings with clients are innovative and include: a parking lot, a nearby donut shop, in a park or perhaps in a worker's home. CASE's employment assistance includes various bridging processes to aid displaced workers decide on their preference based on their skills, ability and general circumstances. Some may prefer immediate/appropriate re-employment assistance including help on self-employment options. Others may prefer on-the-job retraining and other may prefer formal educational retraining in community colleges.

In brief, CASE's approach is not only proactive in outreach to displaced workers but also provides participatory assistance and, at the very least, it provides an understanding and effective entry point for accessing employment and adjustment services. It is a model worth pursuing and adapting for assistance to displaced workers in Windsor/Essex county.
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Please complete all of the questionnaire as it applies to you.

1. What is your present employment situation?
   ___ self-employed
   ___ employed, full time
   ___ employed, part time
   ___ unemployed, seeking employment
   ___ unemployed, not seeking employment
   ___ retired
   ___ other (please explain) ______________________________

2. (a) Have you recently experienced a layoff?
   ___ yes ___ no If yes when? ____________________________

   (b) Was the layoff due to a plant closing?
   ___ yes ___ no

SECTION 1: PAST

1. Who was your employer at the time of layoff?______________

2. What was your position?
   ___ clerk
   ___ labourer
   ___ production worker
   ___ skilled trades-person
   ___ foreperson/supervisor
   ___ manager
   ___ other (please specify) ______________________________

3. How long have you worked there?
   ___ 0 - 5 years
   ___ 6 - 10 years
   ___ 11 - 15 years
   ___ 16 - 20 years
   ___ over 21 years

4. Was your job:
   ___ full-time?
   ___ part-time?
5. Do you belong to a union?

_____ yes _____ no

6. (a) Did the company provide official advance notification of your layoff?

_____ yes _____ no

(b) If yes, how much advance notification did you receive?

_____ less than one day
_____ less than one week
_____ less than one month
_____ more than one month

7. In your opinion, what groups or organizations should do something, to help those affected by layoffs?

_____ government
_____ union
_____ management
_____ volunteer/religious
_____ business organizations
_____ no group/organization can help
_____ other

8. (a) Are you satisfied with the efforts management made to help the workers?

_____ very satisfied
_____ fairly satisfied
_____ not very satisfied
_____ not satisfied at all

(b) Are you satisfied with the efforts the Union made to help the workers?

_____ very satisfied
_____ fairly satisfied
_____ not very satisfied
_____ not satisfied at all
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9. (a) Have you heard of the Labour Adjustment Services?
    _____ yes    _____ no

(b) If yes, have you used the Labour Adjustment Services?
    _____ yes    _____ no

(c) If yes, are you satisfied?
    _____ very satisfied  
    _____ fairly satisfied 
    _____ not very satisfied 
    _____ not satisfied at all

(d) Please explain:

10. If your company relocates operations, and offers to keep you on, would you transfer to a new location?
    _____ yes    _____ no

    If yes, why would you move?  

    If no, why would you not move? 

11. (a) While you were working for the company, did you try to find a job elsewhere?
    _____ yes    _____ no

(b) If yes, what type of job were you looking for?
    _____ clerk
    _____ labourer
    _____ production worker
    _____ skilled trades-person
    _____ foreperson/supervisor
    _____ manager
    _____ other (please specify)  
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SECTION 2: PRESENT (If you are currently unemployed, please answer Question 1. If you have found work, please go to question 2.)

FOR THOSE UNEMPLOYED:

1. (a) Have you looked for work, since you were laid off?  
   ______ yes ______ no

   (b) If no, why have you not looked for work? ________________

   __________________________________________________________________________

   (If you answered NO, please go to section 3, question 1.)

   (c) Please evaluate the effectiveness of all the job search methods you have used. (check all that apply)

   effective not-effective

   __________ __________ Canada Employment Centre
   __________ __________ private employment agency
   __________ __________ company personnel departments
   __________ __________ contacted friends/relatives
   __________ __________ sent letters/resumes to employers
   __________ __________ telephoned employers
   __________ __________ newspaper want ads
   __________ __________ referrals
   __________ __________ other (please specify)_________________

   (d) What type of job have you been looking for?

   ______ clerk
   ______ labourer
   ______ production worker
   ______ skilled trades-person
   ______ foreperson/supervisor
   ______ manager
   ______ other (please specify)_________________
(e) Where did you look for work? (check all that apply)

_____ manufacturers
_____ offices
_____ retailers
_____ services (eg. restaurant, hair salon, bank, etc.)
_____ government institutions
_____ other

(f) Did you look for work outside the Windsor-Essex County area?

_____ yes  _____ no

If yes, where did you look for work? __________________________

If no, why not? _____________________________________________

IF YOU HAVE FOUND WORK, PLEASE ANSWER QUESTION 2, OTHERWISE PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 5.

2. Please specify:

(a) present job title/position _______________________________
present company ____________________________
how long employed there _________________________

(b) How long did it take to find this new job? __________

(c) How many places did you apply?

1  2 - 3  4 - 5
6 - 10  11 - 15  16 - 20
over 20
Please evaluate the effectiveness of all the job search methods you have used. (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>effective</th>
<th>not-effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canada Employment Centres
private employment agency
company personnel departments
contacted friends/relatives
sent letters/resumes to employers
telephoned employers
newspaper want ads
referrals
other (please specify)

What is the status of your present job?

_____ permanent  _____ temporary

How does it compare with your old job? (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>wages</th>
<th>better</th>
<th>worse</th>
<th>same</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>benefits</th>
<th>better</th>
<th>worse</th>
<th>same</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>working conditions</th>
<th>better</th>
<th>worse</th>
<th>same</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>career development</th>
<th>better</th>
<th>worse</th>
<th>same</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| responsibility | better | worse | same |
|               |        |       |      |
|               |        |       |      |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>other</th>
<th>better</th>
<th>worse</th>
<th>same</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have found work since you were laid off, would you be willing to participate in a further interview, to discuss how you got a job? If yes, please give your name and phone number. This information will be kept confidential.

Name: ___________________________ Phone no. ______________________
5. (a) FOR THOSE ACTIVELY LOOKING FOR WORK: Would you like to change your occupation from what it was before you were laid off?  

_____ yes  _____ no

(b) If yes, what kind of work would you consider?


6. Would you consider re-training to obtain a new job?  

_____ yes  _____ no

7. What wage would you consider starting at? $_____ per hour.

SECTION 3: PERSONAL FEELINGS ABOUT PLANT CLOSURE.

1. How did your family react when you were laid off?  


2. Before the layoff/plant closing, how often did you socialize with the following; (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>weekly</th>
<th>monthly</th>
<th>yearly</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>relatives</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-workers</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighbours</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friends</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. After the layoff/plant closing, how often did you socialize with the following; (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>weekly</th>
<th>monthly</th>
<th>yearly</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>relatives</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-workers</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighbours</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friends</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. In the past three years, how has your health been? (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>physical</th>
<th></th>
<th>excellent</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>fair</th>
<th>poor</th>
<th>bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spiritual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Since the layoff, have you had any health problems? (check all that apply)

- depression
- anxiety
- hypertension
- substance abuse
- weight change
- other (please specify) ____________________________
- no health problems

6. Has the condition of your health made your employment search more difficult?

- yes
- no

If yes, please explain: ________________________________________________

7. (a) Do you feel more stress now that you are unemployed, compared to when you were employed?

- yes
- no

(b) If yes, do you feel that this stress is affecting your personal well-being?

- yes
- no

8. Has your self-esteem changed since you have been unemployed?

- more
- less
- same
9. Since the layoff, have there been any noticeable changes in family relationships, such as communication breakdowns, family problems, etc.?

____ yes ______ no

10. Here are some things which people tell us are important to them. Which one of these is most important to you?

____ job
____ family
____ religious group
____ work group
____ social group

SECTION 4: PRESENT AND FUTURE PROBLEMS

1. At the time of your layoff, what was your family’s financial position? (check all that apply)

____ substantial savings to draw on
____ very little savings to draw on
____ no savings to draw on
____ no debt
____ small amount of debt
____ considerable amount of debt
____ other (please specify) ________________________

2. Please list your current income sources.

____ income from employment
____ income from spouse’s employment
____ unemployment benefits
____ supplementary unemployment benefits
____ savings account
____ rental income/investments
____ general welfare benefits
____ family benefits
____ old age security
____ guaranteed income security/spouses’s allowance
____ Canadian pension plan
____ private pension
____ other (please specify) ________________________

3. Do you have any savings now?

____ yes ______ no
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4. Where are your debts? (check all that apply)

______ car
______ home
______ furniture/appliance
______ land
______ boat/trailer
______ other (please specify) ____________________________

5. Do you now owe more, or less money to creditors, than you did when you were working?

______ more
______ less
______ no change

6. How would you compare your current standard of living, to your standard of living prior to your layoff?

______ better
______ worse
______ no change

7. Have you, or your household experienced, any of the following financial effects, of unemployment since your layoff? (check all that apply)

______ you had to borrow money to make ends meet
______ you had to use savings
______ items purchased on credit were repossessed
______ eviction from residence
______ missed payments on rent/mortgage
______ missed utility payments
______ missed payments on car
______ missed payments on other major purchases
______ delayed or cancelled purchase of major appliance

8. Please indicate your past, and present spending habits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Before Layoff</th>
<th>After Layoff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly grocery</td>
<td>$ _____</td>
<td>$ _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monthly clothing</td>
<td>$ _____</td>
<td>$ _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monthly household items (linens, cook ware, tools, etc.)</td>
<td>$ _____</td>
<td>$ _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of meals outside home per week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of recreational outings per month (theatre, bowling,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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9. During the past 12 months, have you or any member of your household, needed to find emergency housing?

____ yes  ______ no

10. Which of the following sources of help, have you used, or would like to use, to resolve problems? (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of help</th>
<th>Received help from</th>
<th>Preferred help from</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Social Service Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Social Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. If you did receive help from social service agencies, were you satisfied with the kind of help you received?

_____ yes  ______ no

12. If you did not obtain help with personal problems from social service agencies, why not? (check all that apply)

_____ did not know where to go for help
_____ didn't believe anyone would be willing to help
_____ didn't believe anyone could help
_____ embarrassed or ashamed to ask
_____ didn't believe I should ask
_____ didn't have transportation
_____ location of provider
_____ could not afford help
_____ attitudes of people who work there
_____ application procedures
_____ wait for services
_____ expecting to be sent to a number of different places before receiving help
_____ problems were solved without outside help
_____ didn’t have any personal problems
SECTION 5: CANADA EMPLOYMENT CENTRE

1. Have you sought help from the Canada Employment Centre?
   ______ yes   ______ no

2. Did you apply for unemployment compensation (UIC)?
   ______ yes   ______ no
   If yes, Are you receiving UIC?
   ______ yes   ______ no
   If yes, how many weeks will you draw UIC?
   ______ (weeks)
   If no, why not? ____________________________________________

3. Will you receive supplementary unemployment benefits?
   ______ yes   ______ no   ______ don't know
   If yes, how many weeks will you draw?
   ______ (weeks)
   If no, why not? ______________________________

4. Which of these Canada Employment services, do you know about and/or have used?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Know about</th>
<th>Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>job placement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mobility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>job creation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>testing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creative job search</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJS (Canadian Job Strategy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Have you used the job board?
   ______ yes   ______ no
6. Have you made an appointment with a counsellor?
   ______ yes     no
   (IF NO, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 13)

7. If yes, did you wait long?
   ______ yes     no

8. Do you think the counsellor understood your needs, skills, etc.?
   ______ yes     no

9. Were you comfortable talking with the counsellor?
   ______ yes     no

10. Did you talk about all your employment concerns?
    ______ yes     no

11. Did you understand everything you discussed with the counsellor?
    ______ yes     no

12. What was the result of the interview?

13. In your opinion, what can employment and training agencies do to help laid off workers get jobs?

14. If you needed financial assistance, do you know which agencies (other than the Canada Employment Centre) to apply to for assistance?
    ______ yes     no

15. How do you rate re-training programs offered to workers?
    ______ good
    ______ fair
    ______ poor
SECTION 6. SPECIAL GROUPS: OLDER WORKERS (50 YRS & OVER), WOMEN AND VISIBLE MINORITIES (If section #6 does not apply, please go to section #7).

1. In your opinion, are any of the following obstacles to finding a job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacle</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of date skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial barrier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language barrier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been away too long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know what to do in an interview</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can’t compete with younger people</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Won’t be able to do the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking a job away from someone else</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to fit with other responsibilities</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOR OLDER WORKERS: (Fifty years and older)

2. As an older worker, how do you compare job opportunities for yourself with those of a younger worker?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. As an older worker, would you be willing to re-train in order to retain your old job, or to acquire a new job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FOR VISIBLE MINORITIES:

4. (a) As a part of a visible minority, are you aware of affirmative action programs?
   ______ yes ______ no

   (b) Have you used any of the affirmative action programs?
   ______ yes ______ no

   (c) If yes, have these affirmative action programs helped you in any way?
   ______ yes ______ no

FOR WOMEN:

5. The following is a list of problems many women face in the workforce. Have you experienced any of the following? Please check as many that apply to your past and present situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>In the last year</th>
<th>Prior to the last year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unequal employment opportunities</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay inequity (received less pay for work equal to that of men)</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination for women in non-traditional jobs</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate and/or no day care</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate skills as a result of technological change</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of respect as a person</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 7. PERSONAL INFORMATION

1. Age: ______ (years only)

2. Sex: male _____ female _____

3. Marital status:
   ______ single
   _____ married Is your spouse employed? ____yes____ no
   _____ widowed
   _____ divorced
   _____ separated
   _____ common-law

4. (a) How many children are dependant on you for support? __

   (b) How many other persons are dependent on you for support? (aged parents, etc.) _____

5. Place of birth: _____________________

6. Citizenship: _____________________

7. Language(s) - Mother tongue: _____________________
   Other: _____________________

8. (a) What was your highest level of education?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Incomplete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>elementary</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high school</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apprenticeship</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>college</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>university</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   (b) In what year did you finish your formal education? 19__
(c) Did you receive any vocational or technical training in school?

_____ yes  _____ no

i) If yes, what type of training did you receive, and how long did it take?

ii) Where did you receive your training?

(d) What is your occupation?

(f) Have you had any other training or education since leaving school?

_____ yes  _____ no

10. Please compare your annual income levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before layoff</th>
<th>After layoff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>under $10,000</td>
<td>under $10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$11,000-$20,000</td>
<td>$11,000-$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$21,000-$30,000</td>
<td>$21,000-$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$31,000-$40,000</td>
<td>$31,000-$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$41,000-$50,000</td>
<td>$41,000-$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$51,000 and over</td>
<td>$51,000 and over</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. (a) What is your place of residence?

_____ a home you own
_____ a trailer you own
_____ home/apartment you rent
_____ live with parent or relative
_____ other (please explain)

(b) Do you own any assets, other than your place of residence?

_____ house
_____ farm
_____ business
_____ land
_____ car
_____ other (please explain)
_____ none
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