

mathematics, biological sciences, psychology and social sciences, and arts and humanities (excluding junior college faculty and teaching assistants) would rise from 143,000 in 1965 to 258,000 in 1975.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BAYER, ALAN E. 1967 "Nurse Supply: It's Better Than We Thought." *Modern Hospital*, 109, no. 1:75-79.
- BLANK, DAVID M., AND GEORGE J. STIGLER 1957 *Demand and Supply of Scientific Personnel*. General Series, No. 62. New York, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- BUREAU OF HEALTH MANPOWER 1967 *Health Manpower Perspective: 1967*. Public Health Service Pub. No. 1667. Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office.
- BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS 1966 *Technician Manpower: Requirements, Resources, and Training Needs*. Bulletin No. 1512. Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office.
- COMMISSION ON HUMAN RESOURCES 1970 *Human Resources and Higher Education*. New York, Russell Sage Foundation.
- COOMBS, PHILIP H. 1960 "Educational Planning in the Light of Economic Requirements." Organization for European Economic Cooperation, *Forecasting Manpower Needs for the Age of Science*. The Hague, Office for Scientific and Technical Personnel. Pages 25-35.
- DENISON, E. 1962 *The Sources of Economic Growth in the United States*. New York, Committee for Economic Development.
- GORDON, KERMIT, ed. 1968 *Agenda for the Nation*. New York, Doubleday.
- LECHT, LEONARD A. 1966 *Goals, Priorities, and Dollars: The Next Decade*. New York, Free Press.
- LECHT, LEONARD A. 1969 *Manpower Needs for National Goals in the Nineteen Seventies*. New York, Praeger.
- MCGINNIS, ROBERT, ed. 1970 *Report of the Cornell Conference on Human Mobility*. Ithaca, N.Y., Cornell University Press.
- NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES. COMMITTEE ON UTILIZATION OF SCIENTIFIC AND ENGINEERING MANPOWER 1964 *Toward Better Utilization of Scientific and Engineering Talent*. Washington, D.C., The Academy.
- NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES. COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND PUBLIC POLICY 1965 *Basic Research and National Goals*. Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office.
- NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON HEALTH MANPOWER 1967 *Report*. Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office.
- NATIONAL MANPOWER POLICY TASK FORCE 1969 *The Nation's Manpower Programs*. Washington, D.C., The Task Force.
- NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION 1961 *The Long-range Demand for Scientific and Technical Personnel*. Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office.
- U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION 1968 *Education in the Seventies*. Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office.

WILLIAM C. KELLY

## MANPOWER POLICY, NATIONAL

In terms of governmental concern for the operation of the labor market, the 1960's has been called the era of the manpower revolution. During

this decade the United States constructed the foundation for a national manpower policy. Although the evolution of this policy has been piecemeal and at times more hortative than substantive, it represents a significant departure from past attitudes regarding society's responsibilities to its members.

Manpower policy incorporates all programs designed to prepare the labor force for employment. Historically, this role has been performed largely by the private sector. Recent events, however, have dictated that the federal government assume an active role in forging additional instruments to assist the process.

Manpower policy is not a synonym for human resources development, which embraces a wider spectrum of undertakings—comprehensive health care, adequate housing, efficient transportation, ample recreational facilities, available fine arts programs, implemented antipollution measures, innovative functional architecture, and a broad array of educational offerings. However, for most citizens it is a truism that access to the cultural, spiritual, and material offerings of life is dependent upon the income received from employment. The kind of job for which one can qualify usually determines most of the income which makes the options of life available. Furthermore, as Kenneth Clark (1965) has so poignantly written, what you do is what you are in America. Those who do little have little status in a society that rewards achievers and tends to ignore the others. For this reason, manpower policy is prominent among the policy measures designed to improve living standards in the United States.

**Emergence of manpower policy.** American history is resplendent with vestiges of isolated manpower programs. The Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862, the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act of 1917, the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933, the National Apprenticeship Act of 1937, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, the George-Barden Act of 1946, and the National Defense Education Act of 1958 are notable examples. However, on the eve of the 1960's there were only two ongoing manpower programs: vocational education and vocational rehabilitation. Both programs had few full-time enrollees, were narrow in focus, had little concern for the economically disadvantaged, and were subject to only minimum federal standards. Limited federal funds for these programs were available to the states on an automatic

formula basis. Accordingly, performance varied widely.

To understand the new manpower programs, it is necessary to review the circumstances which produced them. In mid-1957 the U.S. economy began to slip into a recession. The official unemployment rate exceeded 5 percent and remained above that high level until early 1964. Despite the fact that all other economic indexes showed that prosperity had returned by mid-1961, the unemployment rate contracted only grudgingly. As a result, unemployment continued to command public attention. One school of policy-makers argued that unemployment was the result of inadequate aggregate demand and proposed a tax cut to stimulate total spending. Another group asserted that changing labor market conditions were to blame. It contended that in an increasingly technical age the expanding employment occupations were those that placed a premium upon well-educated and highly skilled applicants; simultaneously, job opportunities for those without these qualifications were disappearing rapidly. The paradoxical coexistence of unemployment and vacant jobs meant that employment opportunities were available for which unemployed people could not qualify. The remedies proposed by the advocates of this latter view were remedial education and specialized job training.

The debate between the proponents of the two views was never one of an either-or nature; rather, it was a question of how much of each. Subsequent events revealed that most attention was given to traditional fiscal policy solutions—government spending and tax policies. However, alternative policy measures were undertaken on a smaller scale. The Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 marked the beginning. Drawing attention to one feature of the problem—the existence of geographic pockets of unemployment—the ARA initiated the use of direct federal funds for the occupational training of the unemployed residing in designated distressed areas. In 1962 the Manpower Development and Training Act was passed. This act was premised upon the belief that accelerating technological change was rapidly making obsolete the skills of a major portion of the work force. Accordingly, the MDTA initially focused upon the needs of the semiskilled workers already part of the labor force. Federal funds were made available to state, municipal, and other nonprofit agencies to retrain these individuals for jobs in occupations with

shortages. The original MDTA paid scant attention to the special employment problems of youths or of older unskilled workers from economically disadvantaged backgrounds.

Coupled with the high unemployment rate of 1962 were the demands of congressional skeptics for immediate results from these untested training ventures. It is understandable, therefore, that the more accessible groups were the first to be included. In this sense, however, the long-range mission of the MDTA was obfuscated. To the original enrollees, the MDTA represented a subtle form of social insurance. The enrollment slots were filled by semitrained people whose alternative to participation was unemployment. The unskilled worker was excluded by program neglect.

In subsequent years the decline in the national unemployment rate has been paralleled by the inclusion in the MDTA of a broader spectrum of the truly needy. By 1968 it had been administratively determined that at least 65 percent of the total enrollees were to be drawn from the ranks of the economically disadvantaged. Although the term “disadvantaged” is ambiguous, several groups are characteristically included under it: young people (ages 16–21) who are school dropouts; long-term unemployed (15 weeks or longer) males; female family heads seeking employment; individuals with criminal arrest records; and older workers (over age 55) who are unemployed and who lack basic education or job skills.

In addition to providing occupational training, the MDTA was subsequently amended to make possible more effective recruitment, counseling, and placement activities for these hard-core groups. As the program clientele has changed, experience has demonstrated that remedial education is the prerequisite to meaningful occupational training. Until the issue of functional illiteracy is overcome, training can be available for only the most menial tasks. Thus, instruction in the three R's has become an integral part of the curriculum of most MDTA programs. For many enrollees the lessons taught in these remedial classes—coupled with instruction in good work habits (how to complete an application form, how to read want ads, how to understand bus schedules and routes, and how to take discipline from supervisors)—have been as significant as the specialized occupational training itself.

In addition to the early fears about the restructuring effects of technological change on the de-

mand and supply conditions of the labor market, there was a second powerful stimulant to the advent of a national manpower policy. This was the blossoming in the early 1960's of the civil rights movement, which changed its approach from a policy of brotherhood rhetoric into a serious drive by Negroes for equal participation in all phases of American life. Initial attention focused upon the artificial barriers designed to demean the black man at every turn. Through the use of boycotts, demonstrations, oratory, publicity, and finally statutory enactments, the overt obstacles began to recede. However, behind the tide of reform there was a residue of stifled occupational aspirations, poor job preparation, inadequate educational attainment, and lack of labor market information. It became readily apparent that the victories won on the picket line, in the courtroom, and in the legislative chamber would be meaningless if simultaneous efforts to upgrade the skills and educational levels of Negroes were not launched immediately.

The discriminatory employment practices of the past have relegated Negroes to the lowest paying, least skilled, and most competitive occupations in the economy. For the most part, these jobs are the most susceptible to technological displacement. Typically, these jobs cannot provide sufficient income to support a family. Moreover, they are usually dead-end jobs that offer no hope for advancement, regardless of the degree of effort expended. They are jobs, as Elliot Liebow (1967) has so vividly described, that society places little value upon. Hence, it is not surprising that the people who hold these jobs share this depressing attitude.

With almost half the Negro population living below or slightly above the annual income defined as the poverty level, their need for special training and remedial education endeavors is obvious. Of course, not all of those living in poverty (blacks or whites) can benefit from manpower programs. Some are too old, too young, or too ill. For these groups other human resources or income maintenance programs are required. However, after those who cannot work are factored out, the truth remains that most of the poor do work but earn insufficient income. These individuals have the right to expect that a humane society will provide opportunities for those among their ranks who wish to improve themselves if given the chance. The issue is not what the government can do for

poor working people but, rather, what poor people can do for themselves if given encouragement by the government.

A third force has provided momentum to the advancement of manpower policy—the need to curb inflation. It is now widely recognized in all Western nations that there is a basic incompatibility between the pursuit of full employment and the maintenance of price stability. Experience since the end of World War II has demonstrated that policy-makers are faced with a trade-off decision between these two economic objectives. As an economy moves toward full employment, the labor market tightens. Skill bottlenecks develop that inhibit production increases. Less efficient—and therefore more costly—workers must be substituted. Unions meet less resistance in their wage requests because employers become confident that product demand will be sustained even if prices rise. Similarly, shortages in capital goods and raw materials usually develop because of the sustained demand for the limited supplies available.

Again, manpower policy does not represent the total solution to the inflationary pressures of a tight labor market, but it does play an ameliorating role. By upgrading and providing skills to individuals, the rate of tolerable price increases can be made consistent with a lower level of unemployment than hitherto thought possible.

In discussing manpower policy as an anti-inflationary measure, however, it must be recognized that the level of expenditures on these programs cannot be curtailed during inflationary periods. Government expenditures on programs that deal with the training and education of human beings can never be equated with appropriations for dams, highways, moon probes, or post offices. Spending on programs for the improvement of people cannot be turned on and off like a faucet. Moreover, the beneficial role that manpower policy can play in combating inflation presupposes that these programs be exempted from blanket reductions in government spending during such periods. If they too are slashed, their anti-inflationary impact will probably diminish proportionately.

**Manpower training effort.** The MDTA and subsequent companion statutes—the Economic Opportunity Act (EOA) of 1964, the Vocational Education Act (VEA) of 1963, and the amended Social Security Act (SSA) of 1967—fostered a new system of manpower training for the nation. By the end of the 1960's at least 30 separate training ventures

were in operation, each with a specific task. As one might expect with such a broad array, there was some duplication of effort. Yet, with the meager funds appropriated for these undertakings, it is doubtful that wasted energy because of overlap was extensive. Moreover, with virtually no successful precedents to emulate or past failures from which to learn, the program should be recognized precisely as a social experiment. Bulwarked by experience and weeded of shortcomings, funding at a meaningful level in the future will probably result in more extensive inroads and accomplishments than has been true to date.

In broad terms the MDTA emphasized the training of breadwinners. Through classroom instruction in occupational skills or on-the-job training, MDTA was the dominant weapon in the total assault. The EOA focused upon the needs of people from impoverished backgrounds. Its manpower undertakings centered largely upon the young and the old. Concern for the young was manifested through the Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Special Impact Program, and the Head Start Program. The thesis is simple: by attacking poverty at its weakest point, it is hoped that the young can be saved from becoming the parents of the next generation of poor people. To rescue older people from poverty is infinitely more difficult than preventing the young from being similarly entrapped. For these older workers who are unskilled and uneducated, the EOA provided adult basic education classes, special training programs, and work experience programs.

One poverty group that received additional attention was welfare clients. In most instances the special problems they face (that is, they are usually women with children whose father is absent, deceased, or incapacitated) preclude their active entry into the labor force. On the other hand, there are situations in which some welfare clients desire to become self-sufficient. For such individuals the SSA of 1967 created a training program, an outgrowth of an earlier EOA venture. Participation was generally voluntary, as was the case with all other manpower programs. Unfortunately, there are some punitive provisions of this program that seek to make participation compulsory under certain circumstances. Despite this clear perversion of the ideal of manpower policy in a free society, the long-range potential of the undertaking—the Work Incentive Program—should not be overlooked. Those welfare clients who believe that their per-

sonal circumstances can be improved by entry into the labor market usually need assistance in making the transition. Burdened with family obligations, they are usually fearful that they will be unable to find employment in an occupation that will provide a sufficient income for financial independence. By upgrading their skills and educational levels, the WIN program seeks to calm these fears.

In contrast to the older training system mentioned earlier, the new manpower undertakings were financed almost entirely by federal funds. They were designed as national solutions to national problems. They concentrated increasingly upon those left behind during the most prosperous period in U.S. history. However, unlike the federal intervention of the 1930's, the new programs relied almost exclusively upon local institutions for implementation. The federal government provided the money, but it was the local school system, the state employment service, the county welfare board, and private employers that performed the recruiting, selection, training, and placement. Except for the operation of some Job Corps Conservation Centers, the federal government did not handle any of the training itself.

**Assessment.** The United States does not have a formal manpower policy. Rather, it has pieced together a series of legislative enactments and administrative determinations into a loose but pragmatic array of program offerings. Each undertaking has its designed clientele. Because of the diversity of target groups, each program differs in precise format. The link that joins these efforts is their common objective—to render the participants employable. The priorities assigned to the individual parts of the wide range of offerings are determined by Congress.

As significant as these legislative breakthroughs have been, they are overshadowed by the change in public attitude which they reveal. Embodied in these programs is implicit recognition that the factors that render people unqualified for present-day employment are not solely within the remedial control of the individual. In sharp contrast to public response of bygone eras, there is no reliance upon make-work projects or subsidized unemployment. As innovative as were the public works accomplishments of the 1930's or the liberalized unemployment compensation provisions of the 1950's, neither approach did anything to equip the unemployed with the skills and educa-

tion needed to prevent them from again facing unemployment in the future, for these were holding actions. The new manpower programs seek to enhance the earning power of each participant by imparting skills and overcoming educational deficiencies. Obviously, the task of resolution and prevention is infinitely more difficult than the temporary mollification of human needs by providing a stream of subsistence income.

The fundamental goals of a comprehensive manpower policy are threefold: to endow those lacking in job preparation with productive capabilities; to prevent others from becoming victims of skill obsolescence; and to upgrade over the long run the quality of the U.S. educational system. Since manpower policy is currently in its adolescent stage, the stress to date has been placed on the first of these—human renewal. Virtually all of the current programs share this primary mission.

The preventive function of manpower programs has not been fully realized. Eventually, if the attainment of equal economic opportunity for all is to become more than a slogan, steps must be taken to stop the continual replenishment of the ranks of the disadvantaged. Today, with respect to its labor market policies, the United States is on a treadmill. Despite efforts to deplete the number of individuals in need of assistance, each year a new crop of school dropouts or poorly educated graduates joins the permanent labor force. To this degree, it has been necessary for public policy to run just to stand still. If allowed to continue, the frustrations of community leaders who can see no demonstrable progress and of policy-makers who must be content with success that is measured in negative terms (that is, that a bad situation has not become worse) can endanger the entire manpower effort.

Preventive measures in the short run are intrinsically tied to long-run educational development programs. Today education is the vehicle to both lateral and vertical job mobility. Too often in ghetto school districts, however, students are offered a sterile curriculum with indifferent teachers straitjacketed by a rigid administrative structure. Since the public schools represent a Hobson's choice with respect to attendance alternatives to most disadvantaged children, education is often viewed as a punitive sentence rather than as a source of enlightenment and opportunity for advancement. With costs rising and tax sources strained, most cities have found themselves in a

tightening financial vise. In the face of society's need to enhance the retention powers of its schools, the advent of federal aid to education has come as the only alternative. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and several relevant sections of the Higher Education Act of 1965 are historic milestones in the quest to make government policy responsive to the dire human needs of its population. By making available to low-income school districts additional funds for facilities, teaching aids, and teacher training and by the establishment of the National Teacher Corps to attract dedicated instructors to these areas, the potential manpower significance of these enactments cannot be overestimated.

In the future the lessons learned from these initial experiments can be used to increase the number of beneficiaries. In time it may be possible to understand the relationship between learning in school and earning in the labor market; to know the role that public training should play relative to the responsibilities of the private sector; to predict with greater accuracy the occupations that will expand and those that will become obsolete in the sweep of technological advancement; to increase the supply of trained personnel needed to train the untrained; to determine whether the economically disadvantaged are to remain the primary concern of public training programs; to ascertain the proper mix of supportive services (health care, counseling, child care, and remedial education) necessary to make a program viable; and to determine the proper balance between social necessities and economic efficiency as the guide to program development.

A national manpower policy is not a panacea. Its significance rests in its development as a contributing partner to the nation's total concern for the development of its human resources. When combined with welfare, education, housing, and health programs, it assumes consequence. The recognition of the links between these separate areas and the interdependence of all has been a major policy accomplishment of the 1960's. Matching this awareness with commensurate financial resources is the challenge to the future.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- CLARK, KENNETH 1965 *Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power*. New York, Harper.
- GINZBERG, ELI 1968 *A Manpower Agenda for America*. New York, McGraw-Hill.

GORDON, ROBERT AARON 1967 *Toward a Manpower Policy*. New York, Wiley.

LEVITAN, SAR A., AND GARTH MANGUM 1967 *Making Sense of Federal Manpower Policy*. Ann Arbor, Michigan, Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations.

LIEBOW, ELLIOT 1967 *Tally's Corner: A Study of Negro Streetcorner Men*. Boston, Little, Brown.

VERNON M. BRIGGS, JR.

## MANPOWER TRAINING IN WESTERN EUROPE

Government emphasis on economic development has become an international phenomenon since the end of World War II. The experience that several countries have gained in attempting to achieve optimum development has invariably indicated that the availability of skilled human resources ranks with the availability of capital investment as a major factor in determining the degree of development possible. As a result, programs for the preparation of workers have assumed major importance in the economic planning of virtually every concerned country.

Worker training has been in existence as long as work itself, occurs in many forms and places, and is sponsored by various agencies within a country. Training is provided in public and private schools, and it is offered as a service by labor and management associations, by separate businesses, by federal agencies, and by combinations of these groups. No single country has a coordinated national system of training sufficiently well organized to respond optimally to the manpower needs of the country. As a result, major government support in most countries is given to that form of vocational training considered capable of most immediate response, while continuing efforts are made to unify all the forms into a productive program. The basic forms of vocational training are (1) those occurring within the schools of the country's organized educational system and under public supervision; (2) those found within the private business or industrial sector and largely under private supervision; and (3) those directly sponsored and/or operated by the national government.

**School-based programs.** The major objectives of school-based vocational education programs in public education tend to vary considerably from one country to another. In some countries youths are trained to enter business and industry as fully

prepared workers, while in others occupational education does little more than aid students in choosing an occupation to learn after leaving school.

There has been an increasing trend in the schools of all countries to provide an opportunity for youths to evaluate their aptitudes and interests prior to entering a vocational program. Students get vocational guidance or enter nonspecialized vocational programs before starting specific occupational training. Specialized programs may involve from one to five years of training and instruction. A wide variety of courses are available, preparing students for skilled trades or technical occupations.

**Work-based programs.** The formal program offered within business or industry for the occupational preparation of youth is generally referred to as apprenticeship training. In this program, out-of-school youth enter into an agreement with an employer which obligates the employer to provide a prescribed program of training in a given occupation and the apprentice to observe the requirements of the employer.

To discourage the exploitation of youth, most countries conduct apprenticeship programs under federal legislation which specifies those occupations that may have apprentices and provides for complete job descriptions, outlines of training, and completion standards for each occupation. An apprentice coordinator is responsible for implementing the legislative regulations as they directly affect the apprentice and may be appointed or employed by a union, management, or the state regulatory agency. Until the passage of the Industrial Training Act in 1964, no such legal provisions existed for regulating apprenticeships in England; program content and standards were determined at the national level by collective bargaining between employers and employees.

While most countries have restrictions by unions and other groups on the number of apprentices in training, this practice is not as widespread as it is in the United States and is gradually disappearing. Usually, the individual is free to enter any trade for which he has the necessary aptitude, and he can generally locate an employer who will initiate a training program.

In most countries apprentices begin at age 15; in England and the Netherlands they start at 16 and 12, respectively. Apprenticeships last from one to five years depending upon the complexity of