

Summary of Research on the Employment Readiness Scale™

Valerie G. Ward Consulting Ltd.
Service-Growth Consultants Inc.
Vancouver, Canada

March 2002 (revised August 2018)

The Employment Readiness Scale™ (ERS) is an online tool that helps clients identify their strengths and challenges in becoming employment ready and measures their changes over time. It also provides organizations with roll-up reports across clients for use in program planning, evaluation, and accountability reporting. So the ERS offers a unique combination of benefits to individuals, agencies providing career and employment services, and sponsors who fund the provision of such services. It is currently the only known standardized and outcome validated measure of employment readiness.

This document describes the process of its development, which began with the Employment Readiness Model™, and the statistical results of the three years of field research that went into validating first the Model and then the scale to measure the Model. This document represents the officially-approved summary of the data contained in the six confidential research reports (listed in Annex B) that are the property of the Government of Canada in right of Her Majesty the Queen. The ownership of the both the Model and the ERS itself was formally transferred in 2001 to Valerie G. Ward Consulting Ltd. The Employment Readiness Model™ continues to be owned by Valerie G. Ward Consulting Ltd., while the ERS itself is now owned by ERS Scale Inc.

1. The Employment Readiness Model™

Under government contract, the Contractors' first step involved creating a valid model of employment readiness that could be demonstrated statistically to contain all of the key factors relevant to work life success. The Model's development was based on research in Australia, Canada, Sweden, the U.K., and the U.S.A., and then formally validated. Its finalized structure is outlined below.

Employment readiness is defined as being able, with little or no outside help, to get and keep appropriate work as well as to be able to manage transitions to new work situations as needed. Being "employment ready" involves achieving three interrelated goals:

- 1. Being self-sufficient on four Employability Factors that prepare individuals to manage their work life:**
 - Career decision-making, or knowing what type of work suits them
 - Skills enhancement, or having the skills for the work they want
 - Job search, or having the skills to find work
 - Ongoing career management, or being able to manage changes in work setting and occupational focus
- 2. Being strong on five Soft Skills that help an individual manage challenges and perform effectively in their work life:**
 - Self-efficacy, or a sense of being able to perform well
 - Outcome expectancy, or whether or not the individual expects to succeed and

is willing to take responsibility for creating that success

- Social supports, or the individual's network and ability to get help
- Work history, or the individual's feeling that they have performed well in previous work contexts, paid or unpaid
- Job maintenance, or having the skills to keep work once found

3. Understanding the particular stresses or challenges one faces:

- Personal challenges, which pertain to the individual themselves
- Environmental challenges, relating to their broader work life context, often involving other people
- Systemic challenges, which are structural issues beyond the individual's power to change but that they still need to cope with or manage

2. The Employment Readiness Scale™

Once the Employment Readiness Model™ had been validated, the Contractors were asked to develop a scale to measure the Employment Readiness Model™. The resulting validated scale—the Employment Readiness Scale.™ (ERS)—is the intellectual property of Valerie G. Ward Consulting Ltd. It is available in English, French, and Spanish and has been converted into four websites: www.EmploymentReadiness.org (Canada), www.EmploymentReadiness.org/au (Australia), www.EmploymentReadiness.com (U.S.A.), and www.EmploymentReadiness.co.uk (U.K.).

Because the ERS was validated for repeat administration, its use can provide organizations with three types of benefits:

- a. Initial triage into Fully Ready (able to transition successfully on their own without staff assistance), Minimally Ready (close to ready, though still requiring a modest level of assistance), and Not Ready (requiring more in-depth assistance).
- b. Assessment and re-assessment (up to 12 times) of clients' strengths and where they need assistance.
- c. Roll-up analyses across clients to show patterns of need and change for program planning and program evaluation purposes.

Research with the ERS has shown that just being self-sufficient on the four Employability Factors is not enough. Most clients face a number of barriers or challenges that act as stressors and can be incapacitating if not managed well. Clients facing significant challenges without assistance in handling them are likely to fail at work even if they are successful in acquiring work. The five Soft Skills that help clients manage challenges and perform effectively are becoming increasingly significant. So all three parts of the Employment Readiness Model™ are equally important.

3. Summary of Field Testing Results

Field testing with 758 participants on either Employment Insurance or Income Assistance showed that the four Employability Factors (Career Decision-Making, Skills Enhancement, Job Search, and Ongoing Career Management), the five Soft Skills (Self-Efficacy, Outcome Expectancy, Social Supports, Work History, and Job Maintenance), and the challenges faced by clients were being measured by the ERS in a manner that showed internal and test-retest reliability, construct validity, concurrent validity, and predictive validity. Specific findings were as follows:

- a. Client scores on the ERS were able to correctly predict 79.2 percent of the clients who became employed within 12 weeks of taking the ERS, thus validating the predictive ability of the ERS.
- b. Client self-ratings on the four Employability Factors were significantly related to staff ratings of client self-sufficiency on these dimensions.
- c. Client self-ratings on Soft Skills were significantly related to staff ratings of clients on these dimensions.
- d. Client self-ratings on Challenges faced were significantly related to staff ratings of clients on these dimensions.
- e. Persons who were self-sufficient on all four Employability Factors and the five Soft Skills were the most likely to be employed within 12 weeks.
- f. While staff and clients agreed as to whether or not clients were self-sufficient on specific employability dimensions, staff subjective assessments of overall “job readiness” corresponded to self-sufficiency on all four Employability Factors for only 36 percent of the clients participating. In general, staff tended to rate clients as “job ready” when they were only self-sufficient on two or three Employability Factors.
- g. Persons were most likely to become employed if they were at least self-sufficient in Job Maintenance skills, had strong Social Supports, were self-sufficient in Job Search skills, and were self-sufficient in Skills Enhancement.
- h. High client scores on two Soft Skills in particular—Job Maintenance and Social Supports—more than doubled clients’ chances of being employed within 12 weeks, raising the potential importance of providing life skills training for clients prior to job search.
- i. Self-sufficiency in Career Decision-Making or in Ongoing Career Management were not strong predictors for immediate employment, but appear to play a longer-term role in successful continuation of employment.

4. Benefits Provided by the ERS

During field testing, the ERS demonstrated the capacity to document the following for individual clients:

- a. Initial status at the point of intake, providing a starting point for creating an action plan to address gaps in readiness.
- b. Changes in a client’s employment readiness as a result of interventions.
- c. The point at which an individual is likely to become employed within 12 weeks (i.e., when the client has become Fully Ready).

In addition, the online ERS version has been programmed to provide automated roll-up reporting of client ERS results for a given agency, plus roll-up reporting across agencies. This roll-up reporting function provides the additional capacity to document:

- a. The efficacy of different interventions or clusters of interventions for specific client groups (“what works”).

- b. A comparison of the relative success of different local programs of the same intervention type in different types of labour markets.
- c. The types of challenges most commonly faced by clients in particular agencies or service areas for program planning and budget allocation purposes.
- d. The demand for different types of interventions by service area for program planning and budget allocation purposes.
- e. The relationship between the interventions provided and successful employment (helping to justify the dollars spent and identify the return on investment), provided that employment status is documented through client follow up.

While individual results have the potential to be very useful in working with clients, the roll-up of scale scores across clients can also provide excellent objective input for agency review of intervention efficacy and accountability reporting to funders, as well as for ministry-level program planning and accountability reporting to Treasury Board.

5. Design and Research Methodology

Before beginning the instrument design for the ERS, an extensive review of the national and international research literature was conducted. That review examined all research studies on what the relevant factors were in client employability and how to measure them (including an analysis of measuring instruments such as Copilot). Special attention was given to studies with Canada's employment equity groups—i.e., Aboriginal peoples, persons with disabilities, visible minorities, and women. The factors identified in the literature review were then validated by focus group and individual key informant and subject matter expert interviews.

In translating the Employment Readiness Model™ into a measurement instrument, the following guidelines from the Steering Committee were utilized:

- a. The instrument should be easy to fill out, using non-technical vocabulary.
- b. The process of completing the instrument should be empowering to clients, meaning that they should learn what the critical factors are in their becoming successfully employed.
- c. The instrument should be as short as possible, while being able to measure the appropriate constructs.
- d. The instrument should not be a substitute for an in-depth interview, but rather complement an in-person assessment process.
- e. The items included should cover all of the key predictor variables found in the literature review.
- f. The instrument should be robust regarding the ability to measure client change over relatively short periods of time.
- g. The primary purposes of the instrument should be to support decision-making with respect to addressing client needs and to measure changes as a result of interventions.

In its final form, the Employment Readiness Scale™ was designed to be completed early in the intake process in order to be useful for client planning purposes. It could then be re-administered up to a total of 12 times.

Three features of the ERS content make it distinctive in the employment readiness measurement field. First is the incorporation of Ongoing Career Management as an employability factor in order to address the pattern of multiple career choices over time rather than a single career path. Second is the treatment of challenges faced as sources of stress for the client. Once the most common 30 challenges had been identified, they were rated by a panel of ministry staff with regard to their relative stress levels so that they could be weighted appropriately in the overall ERS scoring. Third was the incorporation of Soft Skills or facilitators of successful handling of challenges.

Three phases of field testing were undertaken:

- Phase 1: With primarily HRDC-funded clients to measure the reliability and validity of the initial version of the ERS and test its ability to detect significant changes in clients' employment readiness as a result of interventions.
- Phase 2: With primarily provincially-funded income assistance clients to measure the reliability and validity of the revised ERS with persons not engaged, or only marginally engaged, with the labour market.
- Phase 3: With primarily HRDC-funded clients considered "job ready" to see if the revised ERS could accurately predict 12-week employment outcomes as well as the individual's ability to sustain employment for at least six months.

The participating field test sites are listed in Annex A. The client characteristics of the 758-person sample are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Client Characteristics

Client Variable	Percent of Field Test Sample
Aboriginal persons	6.5%
Persons with disabilities	11.3%
Visible minorities	27.6%
Women	47.5%
Age: under 25 years old	20.3%
25-45 years old	55.4%
46-65 years old	24.3%
Intervention status*:	
Pre-employability	3.4%
Transition program	7.4%
Starting an intervention	56.4%
Ending an intervention	17.2%
Looking for work**	15.6%

*Based on the 626 participants in the first two field tests.

**Additionally, in the third field test, 100% of the sample were looking for work.

As part of the field testing, clients were asked to self-assess themselves using the ERS. Simultaneously, staff were asked to rate the clients on the same factors as part of a validity check. Staff were also asked to rate whether or not they thought a particular client was "job ready."

In creating an Internet-based version, the website was designed with three gateways: Client, Agency, and Sponsor (funder). The online version provides the client with access to take the ERS up to 12 times, a Client Feedback Report, and an online action planner. The Agency site allows staff to view client feedback reports and action plans, track client progress, and generate accountability reports for funders. The Sponsor site provides the ability to code agencies by key analytical variables, customized to reflect reporting categories of interest to that organization. Sponsors can obtain roll-up reports, aggregating all data across their Agency sites, or may choose to compare specific agencies and interventions for accountability reporting and program planning purposes.

6. Specific Research Findings

The following is a combined summary of all hypotheses tested in the three field test studies (with the null hypotheses of “no difference” implicit for each one). The hypotheses are grouped as follows:

- Internal reliability, or whether or not the ERS measures behaviour consistently.
- Construct validity, or whether or not the ERS items measure what they are purported to measure (i.e., the underlying construct).
- Concurrent validity, or the degree of relationship between ERS scores and the judgement of professionals (i.e., agency staff).
- Predictive validity, or how well ERS scores can predict future employment status.
- Robustness, or “test-retest reliability” over time.

Content validity, or whether or not the ERS items represent the behaviour domain to be measured, was also addressed through the literature review and the focus group and expert interviews. The detailed statistical tables are contained in the reports listed in Annex B.

In the results reported below, “Part A” refers to the component of the ERS that measures the four Employability Factors and the five Soft Skills. “Part B” refers to the portion of the ERS that measures the Challenges.

Internal Reliability

Hypothesis #1: For each of the nine factors measured in Part A, there will be a significant reliability coefficient (as measured by a Cronbach's Alpha of greater than 0.50).

Results: All nine of the factors measured in Part A yielded reliability coefficients *greater than 0.63* based on the average covariance among the factor items, indicating that the Part A items are reliable measures of the nine factors.

Construct Validity

Hypothesis #2: For each of the nine factors measured in Part A, the five items in the factor will be significantly related to the factor composite score (as measured by a corrected Pearson correlation coefficient of greater than 0.30).

Results: All of the items on the Part A factors had item-total Pearson correlation coefficients of *greater than 0.58*. These correlations indicate that each of the items is a good predictor of the factor of which it is a part.

Hypothesis #3: Each of the five items measuring a factor in Part A will be significantly related to the others.

Results: All of the inter-item correlations were statistically significant with a probability of less than 0.02.

Hypothesis #4: Persons with disabilities and visible minorities will score higher than others on *Total Challenges*.

Results: Persons who self-identified as having a disability rated themselves as facing significantly more challenges in all three “challenges” areas than did persons not reporting themselves as having a disability ($t=5.49$, $df=236$, $p<.001$), and were also most likely to rate themselves as "high" on total challenges faced ($X^2=21.44$, $df=2$, $p<.001$). Visible minorities were more likely than others to rate themselves as facing a "moderate" number of total challenges ($X^2=5.81$, $df=2$, $p<.001$). Thus, Part B is able to differentiate those clients known to be facing more challenges.

Hypothesis #5: *Previous work success* will be significantly related to clients' self-sufficiency in *ongoing career management*.

Results: A self-reported successful work history was significantly related to clients' self-ratings of self-sufficiency in ongoing career management ($X^2=17.16$, $df=2$, $p=.000$), indicating that Ongoing Career Management is measuring a dimension linked to an individual’s perceived ability to perform well and navigate transitions from job to job. This finding supports the theory that we learn ongoing career management skills in part from successful previous work experiences.

Hypothesis #6: Ratings of *self-efficacy* will be significantly related to clients' self-sufficiency in *job maintenance* and *ongoing career management*.

Results: A strong sense of Self-Efficacy was significantly related to client ratings of themselves as being self-sufficient not only in Job Maintenance ($X^2=6.14$, $df=2$, $p=.023$) and Ongoing Career Management ($X^2=5.60$, $df=2$, $p=.030$), but also in Career Decision-Making ($X^2=10.41$, $df=2$, $p=.002$), Skills Enhancement ($X^2=6.81$, $df=2$, $p=.017$), and Job Search ($X^2=5.04$, $df=2$, $p=.040$). These findings confirm that self-sufficiency on all four Employability Factors as well as Job Maintenance is linked to a sense of personal competence. They also support research indicating that a strong sense of one’s own competence is key in maintaining work and transitioning between jobs.

Hypothesis #7: Ratings of *social supports* will be significantly related to clients' self-sufficiency in *career decision-making*.

Results: Clients rating themselves as being self-sufficient in Career Decision-Making were also perceived by staff as having strong social supports ($X^2=7.37$, $df=2$, $p<.012$). This finding reinforces the notion from other research that the availability of a support network with whom to discuss career options helps with clarity about career choices.

Hypothesis #8: **Client ratings of self-sufficiency will be significantly related to their intervention status (e.g., prior to or after an intervention).**

Results: In the initial review of literature, there was a discussion about whether “readiness” was a linear or a multi-dimensional concept. International research indicated that, while for first-time job seekers there may be a somewhat predictable staged progression, for job seekers with work experience “readiness” does not increase in a step-wise fashion. The average ERS scores support the concept that, while there is a significant difference in readiness between “pre-employability” and “ending intervention” / ”looking for work” ($X^2=97.68$, $df=4$, $p<.001$), there is not a uniform linear sequence of scores. Thus, the data support a “multi-dimensional” construct rather than a “staged” construct.

Hypothesis #9: **Clients are more likely to rate themselves as self-sufficient in *career decision-making* after completing a Career Exploration intervention.**

Results: Clients were only likely to rate themselves as self-sufficient on Career Decision-Making if they had just completed an intervention such as Career Exploration or a Job Club ($X^2=27.01$, $df=4$, $p<.001$). Data specifically on the 35 clients who completed Career Exploration showed a statistically significant shift, from an average score of 14.37 before the intervention to an average score of 19.74 after the intervention.

Hypothesis #10: **Clients are more likely to rate themselves as self-sufficient in *job search* after completing a job search intervention.**

Results: The clients attending a Job Club did score significantly differently over time ($F=13.82$, $df=1$, $p<.001$), with a statistically significant increase in their average scores from 14.86 before the intervention to 17.39 after the intervention.

Concurrent Validity

Hypothesis #11: **Client and staff ratings of self-sufficiency on each of the Employability Factors will be significantly related.**

Results: There was a statistically significant relationship between client and staff ratings of self-sufficiency on Career Decision-Making ($t=4.05$, $n=259$, $p<.001$), Skills Enhancement ($t=3.29$, $n=261$, $p<.001$), Job Search ($t=2.31$, $n=254$, $p<.011$), and Ongoing Career Management ($t=3.40$, $n=258$, $p<.001$). For all four factors, the variances were homogeneous. These data provide validation that there are four distinct employability factors and that there is a shared sense of what "self-sufficiency" means for each one.

Hypothesis #12: **Client and staff ratings for *Challenges* will be significantly related.**

Results: Client and staff ratings for the total challenges, or degree of stress, clients face were significantly related ($X^2=25.96$, $df=2$, $p=.000$). As well, the variances were homogenous. These data provide validation that there is a shared client and staff understanding of the meaning of the construct being measured.

Hypothesis #13: Client and staff ratings on each of the Soft Skills will be significantly related.

Results: Client and staff ratings on Soft Skills were significantly related for Self-Efficacy ($r=.256$, $df=265$, $p=.001$), Outcome Expectancy ($r=.139$, $df=261$, $p=.012$), Social Supports ($r=.221$, $df=263$, $p=.001$), Work History ($r=.291$, $df=247$, $p=.001$), and Job Maintenance ($t=3.77$, $n=260$, $p<.001$). For all five factors, the variances were homogeneous. These data provide validation that there is a shared understanding of the meaning of the constructs being measured.

Hypothesis #14: Client ERS scores will provide a more accurate prediction of who becomes employed within 12 weeks than the 64 percent successful placement rate expected by HRDC.

Results: Client ERS scores were able to predict correctly 79.2 percent of the clients who became employed within 12 weeks. In other words, the ERS scores were predictively valid four out of five times.

Predictive Validity

Hypothesis #15: Persons who are “self-sufficient” on all four Employability Factors are more likely to be employed at the point of 12-week follow-up than are persons who are not “self-sufficient” on all four Employability Factors.

Results: Clients who scored as “self-sufficient” on all four Employability Factors were indeed more likely to be employed at the point of 12-week follow up ($X^2=3.37$, $df=1$, $p=.037$). It should be noted, however, that only 36 percent of those clients judged “job ready” by staff rated themselves as self-sufficient on all four dimensions. Since client self-assessments were already validated in previous field tests, this leads one to conclude that staff are willing to assign a designation of “job ready” when clients are not in fact self-sufficient on all four employability factors (perhaps due to a felt pressure to “place clients quickly”).

The data also showed a significant difference between those who were or were not “self-sufficient” on at least three employability factors ($X^2=6.36$, $df=1$, $p=.006$), with regard to whether or not they were employed at 12 weeks. If clients rated as self-sufficient on only two employability factors, they had a 37.9 percent chance of being employed at 12 weeks. If clients rated as self-sufficient on three employability factors, their chances of being employed at 12 weeks increased to 52.4 percent. Self-sufficiency on four employability dimensions (without consideration of Soft Skills or “challenges”) increased their chances of being employed at 12 weeks to 68.8 percent.

Hypothesis #16: Persons scoring “strong” on Soft Skills are more likely to be employed at the 12-week follow-up than are those scoring “weak.”

Results: Overall, clients scoring high on Soft Skills were more likely to be employed than were those scoring lower. This was particularly true with

regard to Social Supports where 70.2 percent of clients who scored “high” were employed at 12 weeks. For Self-Efficacy, the percent scoring “high” and employed at 12 weeks was 56.8 percent.

Hypothesis #17: **Persons scoring “low” on *Total Challenges* are more likely to be employed at the 12-week follow-up than are those scoring “high.”**

Results: With regard to total challenges faced, those clients reporting few challenges were more likely to be employed in 12 weeks although the difference was not statistically significant ($X^2=1.42$, $df=1$, $p=.165$).

Hypothesis #18: **All else being equal, some factors may be better predictors of 12-week employment status than others.**

Results: Based on logistic regression analyses, Table 2 shows whether or not high scores on particular variables would increase the likelihood that the client would be employed at 12 weeks.

Table 2: Likelihood of Becoming Employed in 12 Weeks

If self-sufficient, or high scoring, on:	The likelihood of being employed is increased by:
Job maintenance	190%
Social supports	160%
Job search	96%
Skills enhancement	58%
Ongoing career management	28%
Career decision-making	3%

Scale Robustness Over Time

Hypothesis #19: **Client ratings on the various items in Part A will reflect a non-random distribution (meaning that they would not have occurred simply by chance).**

Results: Inspection of the response frequency data for the items in Part A indicates a lack of patterned response, supporting the hypothesis that client ratings would be non-random.

Hypothesis #20: **Client ratings on the various items in Part B will reflect a response pattern that is not biased towards social acceptability.**

Results: No bias towards socially acceptable responses was evident from inspection of the response frequency data for the items in Part B. The data indicate strong representation from items that would not be considered socially desirable responses but that have been demonstrated in the research literature to be characteristic of multi-barriered clients.

Hypothesis #21: Clients who successfully complete an intervention will rate themselves, and be rated by staff, more positively than before the intervention.

Results: Clients who completed an intervention did score significantly differently over time ($F=11.1$, $df=1$, $p=.002$), indicating that the ERS could detect differences non-randomly. Further, the changes identified were primarily in the areas of focus of the interventions: career decision-making ($F=26.03$, $df=1$, $p<.001$) and job search ($F=13.82$, $df=1$, $p<.001$). Clients also showed a significant increase in self-sufficiency in ongoing career management as a result of interventions ($F=8.83$, $df=1$, $p<.001$).

Annex A
ERS Field Test Sites
(all in British Columbia, Canada)

Alberni-Clayaqout Innovation Society, Port Alberni
ALDA (Adult Learning Development Association), Vancouver
Ardent Training Services, Vancouver
Assessment & Referral Centre of Nanaimo, Nanaimo
BC Paraplegic Association, Vancouver
Burnaby Community Skills Centre, Burnaby
Canadian National Institute for the Blind, Vancouver
Career Development, Nelson
Christine Bowman & Associates, Maple Ridge
Clearwater Employment Services, Clearwater
Cornerstone Academy
Éducacentre, Vancouver (tested the ERS in French)
Gordon House Youth S.E.A.R.C.H.
Hal Klein & Associates (2 sites)
IAM Cares, Burnaby
Immigrant Services Society, Vancouver
Interconnect, Terrace
Job Search Central (Vancouver School Board)
The Joslin Group, White Rock
Landell and Associates Consulting Ltd., Vancouver
M. Magas & Associates
Metro Training Institute
Native Education Centre
New Westminster School District #40
North Shore Continuing Education
Open Learning Agency (2 sites)
O-Zone Career Action Cafe, Mission
Pacific Justice Service [PJSA Career Development]
PACT Employment Services, Vancouver
POLARIS, Burnaby
Pride Centre
Reva K. Dexter & Associates, Vancouver
Sanctuary Foundation
Steps to Employment, Victoria
S.U.C.C.E.S.S.
Training Innovations Inc.
Transitions Career & Business Consultants, Vancouver
United Native Nations
Vancouver Community College
Vancouver Cultural Alliance, Vancouver
VEEES - Job Start
YES Canada BC, Burnaby

Annex B Development Background

The development of the Employment Readiness Scale™ resulted from a pilot project launched under the Canada-British Columbia Labour Market Development Agreement in 1998 whose purpose was to develop a valid and reliable instrument to assess client employment readiness. The initial focus of the project was “to determine whether the [existing] Client Readiness Scale (CRS) has any validity as a tool to categorize a client's employment readiness, to suggest suitable interventions and to contribute to employment training curriculum and outcomes.” As a result of a comparison of the CRS against the critical factors identified in a review of the international literature on measuring client employment readiness, an alternate "employment readiness" conceptual model was proposed, focus tested, and subsequently developed into the Employment Readiness Scale™ (ERS).

The research and development process for the Employment Readiness Scale™ was undertaken by Valerie Ward (Valerie G. Ward Consulting Ltd.) and Dr. Dorothy Riddle (Service-Growth Consultants Inc.). It was overseen by a Steering Committee of staff from Human Resources Development Canada (HRCC Vancouver), the BC Ministry of Human Resources (MHR), and the BC Ministry of Advanced Education, Training and Technology (later changed to Ministry of Social Development and Economic Security, and then merged with MHR).

The detailed research results were reported in the following confidential reports submitted by the Contractors to Human Resources Development Canada and the provincial ministries. The rights to those reports belong to the Government of Canada in right of Her Majesty the Queen.

- a. *Refinement and Testing of the Client Readiness Scale: Review of Research Findings* (October 26, 1998).
A review of the national and international literature regarding measuring and documenting client employability issues.
- b. *Refinement and Testing of the Client Readiness Scale Project: Focus Group Summary* (November 4, 1998).
Focus groups with ministry staff responsible for employment services.
- c. *Refinement and Testing of the Client Readiness Scale Project: Summary of Interviews* (November 16, 1998).
Interviews with 21 key informants or subject matter experts including officers from HRDC, MAETT, and MHR; agency and college staff providing programs and services to unemployed adults; and academic researchers on employability.
- d. *The Employment Readiness Scale: Field Test Results and Recommendations Final Report* (May 1999).
The results of the field testing of the initial version of the ERS with 309 participants (primarily clients on Employment Insurance) in HRDC-funded programs and services, including pre-post testing of 56 participants in Career Exploration and Job Club interventions.
- e. *Testing the Validity and Reliability of the Employment Readiness Scale with Provincially-Funded Clients: Field Test Results and Recommendations Final Report* (March 31, 2000).

The results of field testing the revised ERS with 317 participants (primarily clients on Income Assistance) in provincially-funded programs and services.

- f. *Testing the Ability of the Employment Readiness Scale to Predict Employment Outcomes: Final Report on Field Test Results (September 29, 2000).*

The results of field testing the revised ERS with 132 participants that had just completed HRDC-funded programs and services and whose employment status was checked 12 weeks after beginning to look for work and then again at six months.