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1. INTRODUCTION

The 1979 Budget statement reasserted the Government's commitment to full employment as a policy objective but considered that inflation and the balance of payments limited the scope of monetary and fiscal measures to increase aggregate demand. It therefore proposed the use of "structural and demand management policies" supplemented by the "positive and imaginative use of job creation programmes". The Budget Estimates indicated an expenditure of $20m on subsidies for private sector job creation in 1979/80 (this includes the Additional Jobs Programme, the Skill Promotion Programme, the First Jobs Programme and the Farm Employment Programme), and $97m on subsidies for public sector job creation. The latter consists of various Temporary Employment Programmes (TEP) which involve short term project oriented employment additional to the employing organization's normal work programmes.

Despite the magnitude of the costs involved, there has been little formal evaluation of these job creation programmes. The Southland Flood Relief TEP has provided an opportunity to evaluate such a programme. In October 1978, severe flooding occurred in the lower reaches of the Clutha River in Otago, and the Aparima, Oreti and Mataura Rivers in Southland. Flood losses
in Southland have been estimated at 26,000 sheep and lambs, and damage or destruction of 1250 ha of crops, 850 beehives, 10,000 ha of pasture and 340 km of fencing. Total costs of the flood in Southland have been put at about $25 million (Bell 1978).
2. ORIGIN AND ORGANIZATION OF THE SCHEME

The Southland Flood Relief TEP was initiated by Lincoln College through discussions with the then Minister of Labour, The Hon. C.B. Gordon. After further consultation with Southland Federated Farmers, the Government approved the employment of TEP workers on flood relief work and agreed that suitable persons enrolled with the Department of Labour for employment would be accepted. Assistance was made available to Local Authorities and other appropriate community organizations, as well as to individual farmers, to assist with work such as road clearance, disposal of dead stock, clearance of drains, and the repair of fencelines and other farm equipment damaged by floodwaters. The wages and other associated costs of these workers were to be reimbursed through the TEP by the Department of Labour. Accommodation was to be arranged by the farmer.

The Southland County Council agreed to be the employing agents (although farmers directed the day-to-day work) and to oversee the administration of the scheme. A liaison officer was appointed under the TEP and employed by the Southland County Council. The workers
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completed time sheets and returned these to the liaison officer for preparation of wages. The Southland County Council was bound only to pay for a 45 hour week's work as defined by the Farms and Stations Award No. 1215 (see Appendix 1). Overtime payments were the responsibility of farmers.

The liaison officer's job involved examining requests or complaints from either the farmer or the worker, and striving for a compromise. This meant representing the Southland County Council as employer, the Department of Labour, and the Flood Relief Committee. The organizational structure is presented in Figure 1.

Figure 1
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Two other administrative features should be noted. The estimates of the amount of work to be carried out were vetted by the Flood Relief Committee. Second, workers eligible for employment under the TEP were defined as those eligible to receive the unemployment benefit i.e. school leavers, university students and registered unemployed.
3. EVALUATING MANPOWER PROGRAMMES

In order to make satisfactory estimates of national costs and benefits of employment programmes (or any other national undertaking) it is necessary to estimate the net impact of the programme on society, as compared to the situation in the absence of the programme. In the case of employment or training programmes, there are particular data requirements if it is intended to accurately measure the impact on the individuals involved, whether they are employees or employers. Generally speaking, it is necessary to have either a control group, against which the performance of the individuals concerned may be compared or to study the individuals before and after their work experience to see whether the programme leads to a change in, say, their employment status or income earning.

The present study fulfills neither of these criteria, being an ex post study at a point of time. It relies primarily on the responses of individuals to survey questions as to the situation in the absence of the scheme and their future intentions. It thus suffers from the common limitations of attitudinal and motivational research,
such as poor recall, unwillingness to impart information, inability to perceive to the situation in the absence of the programme and the fact that intentions do not always become realities. Nonetheless, the authors are confident that the survey results have allowed a reasonable evaluation of the TEP.
4. THE SURVEYS

Separate questionnaires (as Appendix 2) were produced for farmer and worker participants. A postal survey was used rather than personal interviewing because of lower costs and the relatively straightforward information requested. The questionnaires were posted on April 9, 1979, with a covering letter explaining the purpose of the survey. A follow-up letter was sent two weeks after the questionnaire. The cut-off date for return of questionnaires was set at May 25, 1979. The effective response rates were high - 74.4 percent for farmers and 82.9 percent for workers. Response details are presented in the following table.

TABLE 1

Response Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Farmers</th>
<th>Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total participating farmers</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable responses</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned after cut-off date</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker overseas, or returned by Post Office</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1 Farmer Responses

The responding farmers mostly operated sheep farms (49 percent) or ran sheep in conjunction with some other activity (an additional 38 percent); the median size was 229 ha; the median "normal taxable income during the 1970's" was estimated to be $12,800; the median number of dependants living at home was 3.2; and these contributed a median amount of ten hours part-time farm work per week.

The respondents' normal employment pattern during the 1970's is presented in the following table (Table 2). The data suggest that the employment of casual labour only was the most common practice; this is supported by data, not presented here, relating to employment during 1978.

TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normal Employment Pattern During the 1970's</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employ No Labour</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ Casual Labour only</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ Permanent Labour only</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ Both Casual and Permanent Labour</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eighteen respondents stated that their employment pattern had changed during the 1970's; ten of these reported a fall in labour requirements, and four an increase. Cost increase was the most important explanation proffered for reduced labour requirements.

The vast majority of respondents (79 percent) found the TEP either very satisfactory or satisfactory, as is indicated in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farber Opinions of TEP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly Satisfactory/Patrly Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of this 79 percent nonetheless had some reservations about aspects of the TEP, and these were expressed in their answers to the open ended questions (Farmer Questionnaire, questions 16, 17 and 22). The most common negative expression concerned
the lack of experience of workers (9 responses), although this was usually combined with a positive view of the worker as a person, and with a satisfactory overall view of the programme; some workers were described as physically incapable of farm work (6 responses), and some were regarded as lazy, untrustworthy, or not at all interested in farm work (5 responses).

Farmers were asked whether or not they would have employed labour for flood relief work in the absence of the TEP. Their replies are presented in the following table, which shows that 54 percent would have employed labour at award wages and another 25 percent at half the award wages.

**TABLE 4**

**Farmer Intentions if No TEP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would have employed labour</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>at award wages</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but only if government met half the wage costs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not have employed labour</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reply</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Eleven of the 12 who stated that they would not have employed labour in the absence of the TEP indicated that they could not afford to have done so.

Another related question is whether the flood relief would have been accomplished without the TEP. Responses are summarized in the following table and are consistent with the intentions shown in the previous table.

TABLE 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Flood Relief Work have been Accomplished Without the TEP?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, by self and family labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, by employing labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, not in the foreseeable future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: <sup>a</sup>About half of these qualified their reply, normally by referring to the need to neglect normal farm work.

A number of farmers expressed the view that their attitude towards employing labour had changed, ten positively and five negatively. The reason for
the positive changes can be summed up in the words of one farmer "I realized that if you have got the right kind of worker, a lot can be achieved". Several farmers also commented that they now wanted to regularly employ students during the vacation period. Thirteen farmers indicated that they intended to employ additional labour in 1979, compared with 1978, and five indicated that this intention was the result of their experience with the TEP.

It is worth commenting on the use of workers on farm work unrelated to flood relief. This was justified by farmers in several ways. A number indicated that they had completed part or all of the flood recovery operations prior to the arrival of their worker(s); in this case, they felt justified in using their worker to help deal with the backlog of seasonal farm work. Others felt it unfair and/or inefficient to use the worker full time on "dirty" flood relief work; hence they worked with their workers on both flood relief and normal farm work.

4.2 Worker Responses

As is shown in Table 6, the vast majority of respondents were University (including Lincoln College) students, and these were supplemented by
school leavers and registered unemployed. One fifth were female.

TABLE 6

Origin and Sex of Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Leavers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered unemployed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Students</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A wide range of motives was suggested for undertaking work under the TEP (see Table 7), but the need for money, the desire to experience the rural way of life and the need to meet practical work requirements were all important. Table 8 indicates the opinion of workers as to their likely employment status in the absence of the TEP. Over half replied that they would have been probably or definitely unemployed.

Worker opinions of the TEP are summarised in Table 9. The majority were highly satisfied or satisfied, and of the others, wages were the major source of dissatisfaction, being mentioned by nine
TABLE 7

Main Motive for Accepting TEP Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motive</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To earn money</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To experience rural way of life</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical work requirements</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 8

Likely Employment Status Without TEP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely unemployed</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably unemployed</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment elsewhere</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is evidence, not presented here, that younger workers (under 20 years) were particularly dissatisfied with the wages they received. Certainly their wages were substantially lower than for workers of 20 years and over (see Appendix 1). Personality conflicts with farmers, poor living conditions and the nature of the work were mentioned by six workers as contributing to an unsatisfactory opinion of the TEP.
TABLE 9
Worker Opinion of TEP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worker Opinion</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfactory</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly satisfactory/partly unsatisfactory</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsatisfactory</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The opinion data are supported by worker attitudes to future farm work presented in Table 10. Over two thirds stated that they would definitely like more farm work, although this was less marked in the case of those who had no previous farm experience compared with those who had previous farm experience.

TABLE 10
Attitude Towards Further Farm Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous farm-work experience</th>
<th>Like more farm work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. COSTS AND BENEFITS OF THE PROGRAMME

Of the various criteria available, the ratio of resource benefits to resource costs was considered to best reflect the worth of the programme to the nation as a whole. Resource benefits (costs) represent direct impacts on the nation's resources - in this case, the value of the work done (not done) as a result of the operation of the programme. Transfer payments do not involve the actual use of resources but are transfers of purchasing power from one individual or group to another: they reflect control over resources but do not use up real resources and to that extent are not resource benefits or costs. Transfer payments, sum, by definition, to zero.

It is the ratio of resource benefits to resource costs which determine the worth of the programme to the nation as a whole. An examination of the distribution of transfer payments is also a useful exercise because it reveals which groups in the economy\(^1\) are net gainers and which are net losers as a result of the programme. There may be reservations about a programme under which the poor were net losers

\(^1\) For a discussion of this point, see Mishan (1971), especially pp. 67 - 78.
and the rich were net gainers.

5.1 Resource Costs

It is reasonable to assume that the value of production of those who would have been unemployed in the absence of the programme is equal to zero. i.e. the opportunity cost of their involvement in the programme is zero (Mishan, 1971. p75). In this case, the only resource costs of the scheme are any additional travel and administrative expenses incurred as a result of the programme.

It might be considered that account should be taken of the other jobs that were unfilled because of the TEP scheme. However, in a situation of relatively high unemployment (and during school holidays) it is likely that these other jobs would have been filled. Hence the opportunity costs of TEP employment are assumed to be zero.
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Additional travel expenses are estimated at the rate of $10 for each of the 80 workers for each of 10 weeks ($8,000) and additional administrative expenses at 5 percent of the total wage bill ($3,600). Wages paid under the programme ($72,000) and accommodation costs ($10,800) are transfer payments\(^2\). It is assumed that the accommodation expenses met by farmers were all variable costs (e.g. food, electricity).

5.2 Resource Benefits

Benefits may be classified as either short-term, which accrued during the operation of the programme or longer term impacts which occur after the end of the programme. The resource benefit is the value of labour to all farmers and this is estimated to be $23,040\(^3\).

In addition, there are some intangible benefits. One of the aims of the proposers of the programme was the vacation employment of tertiary students, and this was extended to include registered unemployed and school leavers. It is not possible to place a monetary figure on this benefit but several points should be noted. For some students, the

---

\(^2\) These figures are based on the employment of 80 workers for 10 weeks at $90 per week; accommodation costs were based on the award rate of $13.50 per worker per week.

\(^3\) This represents the total wage bill ($72,000) multiplied by 0.197 (the proportion of farmers in Table 4 who would not have employed labour if there had been no TEP) plus $72,000 multiplied by 0.246 and then 0.5, to account for those farmers who would have employed labour but only if the government had met half the wage costs.
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programme provided a way of meeting compulsory practical work/farm experience requirements. For some students the TEP enabled them to accumulate savings to meet fees in the ensuing academic year.

As regards the registered unemployed and school leavers, some (perhaps half) appeared to be waiting for seasonal work to recommence. Others, however, appeared to have been unemployed in the longer term and for them the programme may have been particularly valuable. In the first place it may have improved their morale and self esteem which are inevitably damaged by long term unemployment. In addition, for some it provided their first experience of farm work and revealed a not unattractive employment option.

Related to this is the possibility of important impacts occurring after the end of the programme. Reference has been made to the change in attitude towards the employment of labour by some farmers. Therefore, more farm jobs may be available. In addition, there may be a greater willingness on the part of participants in the scheme to work after the end of the scheme. This stems directly from the programme and may result as follows: if some of the registered

"This is particularly important for school leavers; evidence from the United States (e.g. Schweitzer and Smith, 1974) suggests that unemployment has a negative impact on individuals which persists in the long term."
unemployed and school leavers who otherwise would have been unemployed for substantial parts of each year are inspired to work (perhaps particularly at farm work) as a result of the programme, long term impacts in the form of higher net earnings and saved unemployment benefit payments will occur. There are probably too few registered unemployed and school leavers in the present analysis to draw any firm conclusions, but almost all respondents stated that they both enjoyed their work experience and would like to do more farm work in the future (see Tables 9 and 10). An attempt to follow-up⁵ those participants who were registered unemployed before taking on TEP work, brought five responses. Four were employed, and three were employed in farming but these three had had farm work experience prior to the TEP. There is no evidence to suggest that such an inspirational effect in fact occurred. These potential long term benefits have not been included for the purpose of calculating the benefit : cost ratio. It should be noted that any such longer term impact assumes that there has been a net employment creating effect, i.e. that new workers do not merely displace existing workers from their jobs.

---

⁵ In June, 1979.
CALCULATION OF BENEFIT COST RATIO

From the previous section, we may calculate the benefit: cost ratio (B/C) for the programme i.e. resource benefits: resource costs:

\[
B/C = \frac{\text{Value of labour to farmer} (\$23,040)}{\text{Additional travel costs} (\$8,000) + \text{additional administrative costs} (\$3,600)}
\]

= 1.98

That is, the value of additional work done as a result of the programme was about twice the costs incurred as a result of the programme.
6. TRANSFER PAYMENTS

The changes in transfer payments which occurred under the programme are presented in Table 11. Thus the government saved transfer payments in the form of unemployment benefits of $20,680 and worker participants "lost" an equivalent amount. Overall, the government increased its transfer payments by $51,320 and farmers by $10,800 with workers receiving a corresponding net increase of $62,120.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Gains ($)</th>
<th>Losses ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Wage payments</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saved unemployment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>benefit payments(^a)</td>
<td>20,680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker</td>
<td>Wage earnings</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participants</td>
<td>Lost unemployment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>benefit receipts(^a)</td>
<td>20,680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saved accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>expenses</td>
<td>10,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>Accommodation expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: \(^a\) Assumes average unemployment benefit payment of $47, p.w., and 50 workers who would have otherwise received the benefit.
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### Appendix 1

**Pay Rates**

As Per Farm and Stations Award No. 1215

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Wage per 45 hour week ($)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 years</td>
<td>69.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 years</td>
<td>79.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 years</td>
<td>87.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 years and over</td>
<td>95.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: <sup>a</sup> These rates are increased by $13.50 per week where board and lodgings (including food) are not provided.
Appendix 2

SOUTHLAND FLOOD RELIEF TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT

PROGRAMME SURVEY - FARMER QUESTIONNAIRE

LINCOLN COLLEGE, 1979

A. FARM CHARACTERISTICS

1. Size of Farm _______ acres

or _______ na

2. Type of farm (following the Department of Statistics classification). Please tick one box.

Explanatory notes

1 = 75 percent or more of gross income is derived from the stated activity.

2 = between 51 and 74 percent of gross income is derived from the first named activity and between 20 and 40 percent from the second.

3 = two or more activities of roughly equal proportions.

4 = two or more activities of roughly equal proportions, one of which is cropping.

5 = more than 50 percent of gross income is derived from the stated activity.

Dairy
Sheep
Beef
Pig
Cropping
Dairy with sheep
Dairy with beef
Dairy with Other
Sheep with dairy
Sheep with beef
Sheep with cropping
Sheep with Other
Beef with dairy
Beef with sheep
Beef with Other
Cropping with sheep
Cropping with Other
Cropping with other
Pig with Other
Mixed livestock
General mixed farming
Poultry
Market gardening
Orchards
Tobacco growing
Other farming

3. What do you regard as "normal taxable income" from your farm during the 1970's?

4. What has been your normal employment pattern during the 1970's?

employ no labour
employ casual labour when needed
employ permanent labour
employ both permanent labour and casual labour
B. EMPLOYMENT PATTERN

5. Has your "normal employment pattern" changed during the 1970's? If it has, could you say how it has changed and why?

How? ____________________________________________

Why? ____________________________________________

6. If your answer to question 4 was EMPLOY NO LABOUR, could you say why this is?

________________________________________________________________________

7. Do you have any Farm Employment Programme workers (i.e. additional farm workers whose pay is two-thirds paid by the Department of Labour)?

Yes, I have one or more at present
Yes, I have employed one or more in the past.
I have not used the F.E.P.

C. SOUTHLAND FLOOD RELIEF TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMME.

8. How many workers did you employ during the course of this programme?

________________________________________________________________________

9. If the TEP Scheme had not been available, would you have tried to employ labour to deal with flood damage etc?

Yes, at the award wages
Yes, but only if the Government met half the award wages
No, neither at the award wage nor at half the award wage.

If you answered No, could you say why? ____________

10. Could you give your opinion about the scheme as it affected you personally.

Very satisfactory
Satisfactory
Partly satisfactory/partly unsatisfactory
Unsatisfactory
Highly unsatisfactory
11. If you answered Partly satisfactory/Partly unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory or Highly unsatisfactory, could you say why?

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

12. What was the origin of your worker or workers, e.g. Lincoln College, Otago University, registered unemployed, etc?

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

13. Could you say what were the main types of work that the worker or workers did?

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

14. Would you have got this work done without your TEP worker(s)?

Yes, by myself and/or family labour.
Yes, by employing someone else (not under TEP).
No, not in the foreseeable future.

15. Do you think that your attitude towards employing labour has changed as a result of the TEP?

Yes
No
Don't know.

16. If you answered YES to question 15, please say in what ways?

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
17. Apart from TEP workers, did you employ labour in 1978? If yes, please fill in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent labour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual labour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programme labour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Will you try to employ, or are you already employing, additional labour in 1979? i.e. additional to your normal employment pattern during the 1970's.

Yes
No
Don’t know.

19. If YES to question 18, is this because of your experience with the TEP?

Yes
No
Don’t know

Will not employ additional labour in 1979.

20. Here is a list of statements about the scheme. If they were true for you tick YES. If they were not true, tick No. If you had more than one worker, use a tick for each one.

Examples (two workers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partly Yes, Partly No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The worker was interested and keen to work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were personality conflicts with my worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The worker was interested and keen to work
b. The worker accepted my advice easily
c. There were personality conflicts with my worker
d. The worker was familiar with farming work
e. My worker left without any warning
20. (cont'd) Yes No Partly Yes, Partly No

f. The Department of Labour and the Southland County Council were slack in their oversight of the scheme

[blank]

[blank]

[blank]

g. I would have taken on a student or other worker even without the scheme

[blank]

[blank]

[blank]

h. Some farmers I know made substantial use of TEP workers on non-flood damage work

[blank]

[blank]

[blank]

i. I probably expected too much from my worker(s)

[blank]

[blank]

[blank]

21. Are there any other comments you would like to make about your worker(s) or the TEP?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

D. PERSONAL INFORMATION

22. Your age ____________ years

23. Dependents living at home No. Ages

Sons [blank] [blank]
Daughters [blank] [blank]
Other [blank] [blank]

24. If any of these are full- or part-time workers on the farm, please fill in the table below:

Full time workers, e.g. sons 17, 21 _______________________

Part time ____________________________________________
25. Could you estimate how many hours per week are contributed by all your dependants who work part-time on the farm?

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR HELP.

COULD YOU PLACE THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE STAMPED ENVELOPE AND POST IT. A COPY OF THE FINDINGS WILL BE SENT TO YOU.
SOUTHLAND FLOOD RELIEF TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT
PROGRAMME SURVEY - WORKER QUESTIONNAIRE

Lincoln College, 1979

1. Which of the following categories describes you at the time of the TEP?
   school leaver
   registered unemployed
   university student
   Lincoln College student

2. (a) How long did you work on the TEP? _____ weeks.

(b) Was this the period which the farmer expected, or did you leave before that?
   period farmer expected
   left before that

(c) If you left before the farmer expected, could you say why?

3. Could you describe the work which you spent most of your time on?

4. Would you have been unemployed if you had not worked under the TEP?
   yes, definitely
   yes, probably
   no

5. What was your main motive in working under the TEP?
6.  (a) Could you give your general opinion of the scheme as it benefitted you personally.

very satisfactory
satisfactory
partly satisfactory/partly unsatisfactory
unsatisfactory
highly unsatisfactory

(b) If you answered one of the last three answers, could you say why?


7. Here are three statements about the TEP. Could you give your opinion about each one, and also why you gave the answer you did?

i The farmer for whom I worked was a good employer (tick one) -

true
partly true/partly untrue
untrue

ii My farmer used me on FLOOD RELIEF WORK only. (tick one) -

true
partly true/partly untrue
untrue

iii My farmer definitely cheated on the TEP (tick one) -

true
partly true/partly untrue
untrue

8. Was this your first real experience of farm work?

Yes
No
9. Do you want to do more farm work in the future, if you can?
   Yes
   No
   Not sure

10. What are you doing now?
    full time study
    registered unemployed
    working - please say what kind of work

11. Your sex?
    male
    female

12. Your age? ____ years.

13. Your origin?
    Pakeha
    Maori
    Pacific Islander
    Asian
    Other

MANY THANKS FOR YOUR HELP. PLEASE POST IT BACK TO ME IN THE ENCLOSED ENVELOPE. A COPY OF THE RESULTS WILL BE SENT TO YOU, PROBABLY IN JUNE.

--ooOoo--
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