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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

The Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) was set up to harness the efforts of government and private industry in a program to train economically disadvantaged people and those with long-term unemployment and to help them get permanent jobs. The new act represents the beginning of an important era in employee training and placement by working through the local community level. The partnership between the public and private sectors is designed to have a long lasting, positive impact on the nation's unemployment problem.

The review of the literature for this study showed that changes in the way the society lives and makes a living have caused job related programs to become central to the total process of public education in this country. It is also observed that the purposes of vocational education and training have become so enmeshed with the purposes of "public sector job creation" that it is not easy to justify in thinking of vocational training programs as a separate and distinct entity set aside from public sector of job creation, such as JTPA.

The Job Training Partnership Act training program is one of the many schemes that constitute America's job
creation effort. Many programs were, for the most part, in operation since in the 1800s. Finding a job is no accident. There are certain things that need to be done. According to Knowles (1970), every person has capacities that, if realized, will contribute to the well being of himself and of society. To achieve these potentials requires skills of many kinds--vocational, social, recreational, civic, artistic and the like. It should be a goal of education to give each individual those skills necessary for him to make full use of his capabilities (p. 3).

This act was not only designed for providing these skills in order to put people to work, it is building a better business environment for all. Moreover, it is important to realize that the JTPA training programs were not greatly different in form from many of the programs that existed before it. They had the same basic formats of classroom training and on-the-job training (OJT). However, it should be noted that there is need to determine ways and means of improving the relationship between the public and private sectors, as these relationships affect needed training and articulation of training requirements and employment opportunities.
Problem of the Study

The problem addressed by the study is to seek the opinion of the Job Training Partnership Act directors regarding the factors that contribute to the success of job placement after being in the training program in the selected states. The study also identifies how improvements and achievements have come as a result of organizing and working with local employers and community through partnerships.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of the study are to:

1. Obtain information from the Job Training Partnership Act training program directors and determine what factors are related to the success of the Job Training Partnership Act training programs.

2. Investigate the incidence of employment of participants being served by the provision of JTPA in Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, and Nebraska.

3. Examine the nature of such employment.

Need for the Study

The Job Training Partnership Act started its financial year (FY 1984) with experiencing the most serious cuts on federal spending on employment training and vocational
education. These cuts raised some questions about the success of the program. One of those concerned with the cuts, Bottoms (1984), remarked that there are fewer dollars available this year under JTPA than last year under CETA. Bottom goes on to say, "Most of the people I talked to felt that the funds provided were far from adequate to address the total change of training needs of disadvantaged people in their communities" (p. 35).

However, in spite of Bottom's remarks, Orring (1984) stated that it is most encouraging that the Job Training Partnership Act seems to be rebuilding the credibility of federally supported programs in our communities and among employers. What the JTPA has exhibited thus far is a tribute to the state and local partnerships throughout the nation (p. 4).

Having noted these two different views about this program, it is imperative to determine the extent of change and achievement thus far in the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) system as compared to its predecessor, the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) which cost the U.S. treasury over 58 billion dollars in its ten years of operation without producing any significant impact on both training and employment (Rist 1984, p. 36).

It is quite apparent that government action on the issue of partnership for job creation would naturally
contribute to the wider economic and social development of a given locality involved in the partnership. Bernick (1984) stated that most local interests perceive economic growth and development as the increase in employment, population, income and total value of area production (p. 4).

All of these measures of growth are interrelated. However, in addition to growth, the objectives of a community or area probably include changing the distribution of income, increasing security, and improving the number and quality of services. Growth measured by increase in the number of workers or jobs is the major focus of the JTPA. This phenomenon of employability is what constitutes the need of this study.

**Objectives of the Study**

The major objectives of the study include the following:

1. To identify the activities most effective in contributing to the overall success of the training program.
2. To describe and analyze the extent of the private sector involvement in the partnership.
3. To identify the pattern of employment among the diversified groups of the participants in the program.
4. To identify the nature and scope of the training programs for the participants.

**Research Questions**

1. Is there a difference in the satisfaction ratings of administrative items by directors in the four states?
2. Is there a difference in the adapted delivery system for training in the program in the four states?
3. Is there a difference in the starting weekly wages of participants in the four states?

**Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses were tested:

1. There are no significant differences in satisfaction ratings for administrative items among directors in the four states selected.
2. There are no significant differences in the adapted delivery system for training in the programs in the four states selected.
3. There are no significant differences in the starting weekly wages of participants in the four states selected.

**Assumptions of the Study**

The following are the basic assumptions underlying this study:
1. Prospective participants in the training program are the targeted group.

2. A carefully planned training program should develop participants' competencies—technologically, economically, emotionally, physically and socially.

3. The directors of the service delivery areas (SDA) in each of the states chosen will be willing to participate in this study.

4. The responses of the directors to the questionnaire items would be a sufficient basis for judging the program.

**Delimitations of the Study**

The limitations which apply to the study for interpreting and generalizing its findings include:

1. Selection of the sample was from four of the midwestern states in the country (i.e., Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, and Nebraska).

2. Securing of information for the study was limited to the review of pertinent literature that was available from the Iowa State University (ISU) library and documents (brochures) received from some directors in charge of service delivery areas as a result of the mailing out of request letters to them.
3. The emphasis of the study is mainly on the Title II of the act that deals with the training programs for the disadvantaged.

**Procedure of the Study**

The following procedure was carried out in conducting this study:

1. A review of the literature was conducted in the areas of relevance to the research study with a view to finding information for designing the study and also to identify the population for the study.

2. Presented a proposal and a questionnaire for the study to author's committee on the program of study (POS) for deliberation. The proposal was discussed and then modified after useful and helpful suggestions were given on various aspects of the study.

3. Letters were written to the directors in charge of each service delivery area (SDA) in all the states involved to solicit their participation in the study.

4. The proposed research project, together with the requisite documents, was presented to ISU Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research for approval.

5. The first approved questionnaire was used to pilot-test the instrument with a sample of directors in Iowa.
6. The revised instrument based upon the results of the pilot-test was finally mailed out to all the directors who agreed to participate in the study.

7. Data were collected as a result of the mailing out of the questionnaires; data were coded and analyzed and then the author wrote the final report and made recommendations as deemed necessary.

**Definition of Terms**

The following terms are defined in the context in which they have been used in this study. It should be noted that some of the definitions are as defined by other authors elsewhere.

**Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA):**

An Act that establishes programs to prepare youth and unskilled adults for entry into the labor force to offer job training to those economically disadvantaged individuals facing serious barriers to employment, who are in special need of such training to obtain productive employment.

**Program:**

Is used in this study to define any approved sequence of courses, experiences, or activities which, upon completion by a student, leads to employment.
Private sector:

This term means, for purpose of this study, persons who are owners, chief executives or chief operating officers of private for-profit employers and major nongovernmental employers, such as health and educational institutions.

Respondent:

This term is used in this study to refer to the person whosoever completed the questionnaire sent to the office administering the program in a particular service delivery area (SDA).

Participant:

Refers to any person who is enrolled in the program and is satisfied with all the requirements of the training.

Vocational education:

Refers to "organized educational programs which are directly related to the preparation of individuals for paid or unpaid employment, or for additional preparation for a career other than a baccalaureate or advanced degree."
On-the-job training:
Instruction in the performance of a job given to the employed worker by the employer during the usual working hours of the occupation. Usually, the minimum or beginning wage is paid.

Direct job creation:
This term is synonymous with public sector job creation and both terms refer to programs designed and sponsored by government in order to create jobs for the disadvantaged persons who have been unemployed for a certain number of weeks.

Employment:
It might be defined as participation in the labor market on the supply side and/or the performance of specific occupational roles.

Unemployed individual:
Means an individual who is without a job, who wants and is available for work, and who has been actively looking for work during the first four weeks.

Dislocated workers:
Those people who have had the same job for years but suddenly find themselves unemployed because of layoffs or company closings.
Perception:

Understanding, awareness, and mental images of those surveyed which influence their judgments.

Organization of the Study

The material presented in this study was divided into five chapters. The first chapter provides an introduction and the setting for the study. Chapter Two presents the review of literature which the author believes to be pertinent to the study. Chapter Three describes the methods and procedures used for the development of the questionnaire, collection and analysis of data. Chapter Four deals with the findings and discussion, and Chapter Five contains the summary, conclusions and recommendations based on the results of the study.
CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The employment and training programs have tended to focus on different types of unemployment in different periods and have always attempted to target demographic groups with the worst unemployment problems. This development has been based primarily on a traditional human capital approach to the labor market.

According to Ehrenberg and Smith (1982), the theory of human capital has been linked with the unemployment problem faced by individual or demographic groups to form the basis for employment and training programs. This theory and the empirical evidence that has been offered to support it shows that an important fact in the growth of earnings, especially for young workers is dependent on training for skills development (p. 83).

Government and legislation constitute major influence on patterns and levels of employment, jobs, wage rates and other labor variables (Abbott 1980, p. 49). If it is accepted that government occupies a key position in the patterns and levels of employment, jobs, wage rates and other labor variables, it is also important to look at the other side of the coin. For instance, Wolansky and McMahill
(1986) stated that "Employment opportunities fluctuate with varying changes affecting the nation's economy." This agrees with Sherman's (1983) contention that the structural changes in the U.S. economy in the past 40 years have far-reaching implications for the skills that young workers will need and for the education and training that will increase their employability (p. 1).

This review of literature traces and describes the ways in which successive governments have attempted to develop or improve the training of youth and adults toward a creative fulfillment of their lives in a free society. Broadly, the review focuses on the following:
- Causes of unemployment and how it relates to training and employment programs.
- The role of vocational education in manpower development.
- Government initiatives in job creation programs
- An overview of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)

Causes of Unemployment and How it Relates to Training and Employment Programs

Theories of unemployment are related to the labor market flows and are designed to account for differences in the proportions of individuals in a given state by time, geographic area, or demographic group. Policies addressing unemployment need to address both the incidence and duration
of unemployment. Evidence indicates that most unemployed experience joblessness very briefly; however, much unemployment may be attributed to a small group who experience unemployment for a relatively long period of time (Ehrenberg & Smith 1982, p. 102).

Accordingly, Ehrenberg and Smith (1982) continue:

Economists delineate four types of unemployment: frictional, structural, cyclical or demand-deficient, and seasonal. In a dynamic labor market where people are frequently between jobs, frictional unemployment occurs. Programs (such as employment services) which address institutional barriers may help alleviate such frictional unemployment. Structural unemployment results from a change in labor demand or in worker skills sought by the employer. The classroom training, on-the-job training (OJT), and work experience components of employment and training programs address structural unemployment. Training develops new skills which enable unemployed persons to match employer demands.

Cyclical or demand-deficient unemployment results from reduced aggregate demand for labor. Firms frequently lay off workers and do not replace those who either quit or retire. The public service employment (PSE) component of employment and training addresses cyclical unemployment. Temporary tax credits might similarly reduce demand-deficient unemployment. Other macroeconomic policies strive to increase aggregate demand by increasing the level of government spending, reducing taxes, and increasing the rate of growth of the money supply. Finally, seasonal unemployment, like cyclical unemployment, results from a decreased demand for labor but follows a systematic pattern over the course of a year (p. 102).

Further on the issue of unemployed, Sherman (1983) remarked:
The fact that approximately 3 million Americans between the ages of sixteen and twenty-two were out of work in 1982 is a matter of grave concern. The lack of appropriate habits, attitudes, and requisite skills—both basic and job-related—contributes to the problem of securing jobs for both young and displaced workers (p. 21).

Gordon (1965) reviewed various studies carried out in unemployment and labor force trends in the 1950s and 1960s. The review showed that chronic unemployment has its root in the supply side of the labor market. The American workers, he argued, require a new approach to worker education and training if the national goal of full employment is to be reached.

Another observation was made by Holt (1970), who says that the continual flow of workers, particularly young and unskilled ones, through the U.S. labor market annually averages between one-third and one-half of the total labor force. This annual flow is very large compared to the stock of unemployed workers at any one time (p. 56). These studies, however, have to be interpreted with some caution, because in the studies many other features such as race, urban-rural residence, minimum wages, and school enrollment were not given serious consideration. It is important to realize that unemployment is a very complex phenomena.
Unemployment situation of youth and adults

The most constructive long-term way of reducing youth and adult unemployment would be to create new durable jobs, especially for the young. The impact of unemployment among these groups extends beyond those affected directly. Evidence of this assertion was substantiated by Bernick (1984) in his studies. He concluded that:

When a worker is unemployed, both he and the country as a whole are losers. The worker loses his wages, the country loses the goods and services he would have been producing. Furthermore, his purchasing power for the goods and services produced by others is lost to the country. When many people are out of work, the decline in their incomes can lead to unemployment for other workers, causing additional hardships for individuals and for the country as a whole (p. 113).

The full extent and duration of unemployment is difficult to quantify, especially before more comprehensive registration was introduced in 1934 (Finn 1987, p. 24). It is, therefore, apparent that unemployment is a very complex phenomena to deal with.

Specific aspects of youth unemployment

Technical and economic development in the period after the war has had a major impact on youth employment. Now, most of these unskilled jobs have become mechanized or been eliminated for economic reasons and the young have to compete to some extent with adult experienced workers.
Unemployment in the teenage group has been a subject of national concern. The fact was clearly indicated by the Secretary of Labor in a report compiled for the U.S. Department of Labor (1973). The report shows that teenagers accounted for 24 percent of all unemployed persons in the nation.

However, it should be recognized that the problem of youth unemployment is not unique to the U.S. Unemployment is among the greatest problems facing the West (OECD 1984, p. 3). In a study of the youth employment in France, reports indicate that: "In the first three years of the present decade recorded unemployment in the West rose by 75 percent from approximately 20 million to 34 million at the end of 1983" (OECD 1984, p. 7). However, in the United States the group was estimated to number 1.8 million persons by the last quarter of 1982. Therefore, to control the unemployment of youth, local job training programs should be developed with a view to building the capacity for economic self-sufficiency.

**Training for the disadvantaged**

The traditional method by which people have been trained to do skilled manual work was by serving an apprenticeship with an employer. The government has not had much direct involvement in the running of apprenticeship schemes.
More recently, there have been special measures whereby the
government has played a more direct role in encouraging all
aspects of training, particularly vocational.

Perry et al. (1975) suggest that the basic contribution
of training programs has been to provide a person with
skills and attributes to facilitate entry or re-entry into
the labor force, rather than to facilitate job mobility or
to serve as a mechanism to alter the present market struc-
ture. Gains are seen most frequently for those persons who
are able to move into jobs impossible to get without
training (p. 64).

There is substantial evidence that classroom training,
on-the-job training (OJT), and work experience have the
strongest impact in terms of increased employment and
increased wage rates on those persons with no previous work
experience or limited recent work experience. The work of
Wening and Wolansky (1972) supported this view; they stated
that "It is important to note that industry considers
cooperative student training as the best type of vocational
and technical education for skill development" (p. 21).

Training for skills development is essential to each
individual who needs it because the value of that individual
is dependent on how much his skills are worth in the labor
market. For instance, Bernick (1984) remarked, "Unemploy-
ment statistics show that people with little education and
without specific vocational educational training are disproportionately strongly represented among the unemployed" (p. 113).

In another report by the U.S. Department of Labor (1980), government experts analyzed data showing that young people with little or no vocational education are harder hit by unemployment than groups with an elevated theoretical or practical education. Government involvement in training, generally, has the effect of creating, modifying, or substituting particular job categories. Therefore, programs for both youth and adults have a major goal, the job of trying to make both youths and adults achieve their potentials and become useful citizens.

**Creating jobs at the local level**

Job creation necessarily requires business creation, and this in large part depends on the vitality of the spirit of initiative and enterprise of the society (OECD 1986). The OECD report goes on:

Government action, especially if it is characterized by a partnership approach between public and private sector, can undoubtedly play an important role in encouraging and underpinning development of this sort (p. 3).

The issue of partnership has been continually debated for a very long time both in the government circle and the private sector. The work of the OECD Co-operative Action
Program on local initiatives for employment creation is concerned with local responses to employment and unemployment questions. Significantly, these responses are not only trying to create employment but to provide worthwhile and satisfying jobs which contribute to the wider economic and social development of the locality.

Rodgers (1983) elaborated on opportunities for local employment. He argued that "for most youth and adults in search of jobs the issue is not one of how many thousand openings exist nationally but of how they can qualify for the particular opportunities available locally" (p. 39).

In another report, (OECD 1985), it was pointed out that this movement at the local level has been paralleled by a number of important changes at the national level. First, the operation of central government programs and the pursuit of national policy objectives has involved the use of local agents or "actors" in implementing manpower program measures. Second, there has been greater awareness of the importance of small firms and the need for administrative, program and sometimes political support system to be located close to the local entrepreneur (pp. 9-10). At an international level, the importance of these new trends and new approaches is recognized by the OECD member countries. Governments are increasingly reluctant to make more and more
income-transfer payments to low income group or the unemploy-oped and are developing new ways of transforming public capital in ways which encourage business activities and permanent employment creation (OECD 1985, p. 11).

The effects of minimum-wage in employment

Minimum wage as a component of on-the-job training (OJT) has been studied by Hashimoto (1981) and Gramlich (1976). Their studies indicate that the minimum wage law reduces employment opportunities for low-skilled workers, increase their unemployment as well as their withdrawals from the labor force and reduces their employment stability in the cause of inevitable fluctuations in economic activities.

The results of these studies have shown that the minimum wage legislation is inconsistent with the policies of enhancing job opportunities for low-skilled workers. The impairment of on-the-job training (OJT) by minimum wage legislation is a very serious issue that needs attention in order to eliminate the harmful effects of the law on the formation of human capital through on-the-job training. Finally, it should be noted that teenagers and young adults are by no means the dominant labor group among the low-wage earners.
Summary

Unemployment and training programs have an indirect relationship and are associated with other labor variables. A case can be made that the application of job related programs to solve unemployment is no longer adequate without considering other labor variables and economic situations and also considering the fact that governments are increasingly reluctant to fund such training. Therefore, the impact of training programs on unemployment can be summarized as follows:

1. For the future of the youth, it is extremely important to see to it that emphasis on training is such that skills for long-term employment are incorporated, since youth employment problems are largely structural in origin.

2. That the minimum wage law could affect the OJT participants in two ways. First, it deprives them of opportunities to acquire skills on the job and retards the growth of learning capacity by causing a reduction in the amount of OJT. So something has to be done.

3. Local employment initiatives require the creation of business as well as firms which will in turn result in both training and employment of prospective workers.
The Role of Vocational Education in Manpower Development

The history of vocational education legislation provides us with major antecedents to the present structure of vocational education in the United States. Many of the legislations have influenced the form of vocational education to this day. It is becoming more than ever clear that the quality of vocational education and training is a major factor in the performance of individuals in their jobs.

Essentially, one of the major goals of vocational education is to help specific groups, such as adolescents and young adults, girls and women, foreign workers and their children to enter into employment and to help adults threatened by unemployment to keep their jobs (OECD 1983, p. 42). However, according to the present theories of vocational developments, a typical worker of today will hold more different jobs during his lifetime than the worker of a generation ago.

Consequently, vocational education and training has a duty to take this trend into consideration in order to reduce disparities in opportunities for access to future employment. This section is designed to explore and explain some pieces of legislation that are critical to the development of vocational education and training especially related to this study.
The Morrill Act of 1862

This act was passed and signed by President Lincoln. It was the first of a series of acts passed by the Congress because of a specific demand for vocational training in identifiable basic need areas. Its purpose was to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of living (Grant 1964, p. 44). Grant continues:

The Morrill Act of 1862 resulted in a major redirection of American education and had long range effects on vocational and technical education in the U.S. According to its provisions, grants of land were set aside to be used for the funding and upkeep of State Colleges specializing in the teaching of agricultural and mechanical arts. This resulted in the development of sixty-eight colleges and universities which have provided leadership in education and research.

The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917

This law came into existence as the result of the report of the Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, created by an act of Congress approved January 20, 1914. The provision of this act included the creation of a Federal Board for Vocational Education. The original act provided for approximately $7 million annually to be granted states for the promotion of vocational education.

The provision has significantly increased the number of programs and students, from 160,000 students in 1918 to
almost 4 million in 1960. Many of the students were adults who wanted better jobs. This act is one of the few bills passed by Congress in which the authorization and the appropriation were together in the original law so that there is no need for an annual appeal to Congress for funds (John 1973, p. 37).

George-Barden Act of 1946

Otherwise known as Vocational Education Act of 1946, this act was passed as an amendment to George-Dean Act of 1937 to provide further development of vocational education. There was evidence of marked increase in federal funding to this act. For instance, Congress added a total of twenty-nine million dollars to the fourteen million dollars authorized in the George-Dean Act. The George-Barden Act authorized funds for the same four areas for which funds had been previously authorized. The total funding consisted of ten million dollars for vocational education in agricultural subjects, eight million dollars for vocational education in home economics, eight million dollars for vocational education in trades and industry, two and one-half million dollars for vocational education in distributive education, and five hundred thousand dollars for administration. These funds were approved for programs of administration, supervision, and teacher training; for salaries and travel
expenses of teachers, teacher-training, and vocational counseling personnel; for program development, for training and work-experience programs for out-of-school youths; for purchase or rent of equipment and supplies for instruction; provided that all expenditures for these purposes were made in accordance with the state plan for vocational education. All federal funds under this Act were to be matched by an equal amount of local or state funds.

**Vocational Education Act of 1963**

Expanded funding for vocational education and changed its focus from providing instructional programs for specific occupational areas to serving all education for work needs of people. The act also encouraged vocational education to shift to broader goals related to the development of human potential and long-term employment and provides for a consolidation of some of the previous acts by amendments that combine and extend portions of the Smith-Hughes Act and the George-Barden Act. The primary aims of the act were:

- To strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the nation
The act does not discriminate against anyone or any group of persons over fourteen years of age, and with exception of those positions generally considered professional or which requires a baccalaureate or higher degree, no occupation was excluded. However, the Act did not become operational because of the lag between legislation and appropriation until 1963 and was evaluated in 1967 by the first evaluation team provided for by the evaluation system which was built into the Act.

Vocational Education Amendments of 1968

Basically, the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 to the Vocational Education Act of 1963 expanded parts of the 1963 Act and began setting up ways of converting the concepts in the 1963 Act into vocational education programs. The 1968 Amendments provided for national and state advisory councils for vocational education, stressed the importance of development of new programs, emphasized programming for the disadvantaged and handicapped, and focused attention on cooperative and work-study programs. Curriculum development and exemplary programming were each considered important enough to be granted separate parts in the Act. Also, provisions for residential schools were outlined. In a small way these amendments began to break down the
traditional lines dividing the vocational programming in a particular area.

Vocational educators on the national, state, and local levels started looking at vocational education in terms of the needs and motivations of the students, rather than in terms of the recognized traditional service areas of vocational education (Grote 1969, pp. 44-48). In his reaction to this act, Allen (1968) had this to say:

It is very significant that the 1968 Amendments were unanimously approved by the U.S. House of Representatives and the Senate. This fact indicates that Congress recognizes the nation's need to expand and improve vocational-technical education programs. The unanimous support of the Congress is an expression of confidence in vocational educators. It also implies a strong belief that vocational education can have a greater impact on some of the human, social, and economic problems of our nation.

The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Act 1984

On October 1, 1984, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Act (P.L. 98-524) became effective. An act to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1963 to strengthen and expand the economic base of the nation, develop human resources, reduce structural unemployment, increase productivity, and strengthen the Nation's defense capabilities by assisting the states to expand, improve, and update high-quality programs of vocational-technical education, and for other purposes. Some purposes of this act are to: (1) assist
states to expand, improve, modernize, and develop quality vocational education programs in order to meet the present and future needs of the nation's work force. The effort is focused on developing marketable skills, improving productivity and promoting economic growth; and (2) provide greater access or answers to people regarding:

- a. quality programs
- b. greater cooperation between public agencies and the private sector
- c. improved high technology education
- d. continued service to employed and unemployed workers in new skills
- e. economically deprived areas of a state
- f. providing a full range of supportive services, programs (i.e., guidance), etc.
- g. providing consumer education, homemaking education and reduce sex-role stereotyping
- h. programs designed to meet national needs and strengthening vocational education research

The identified recipients of the Carl D. Perkins Act are the disadvantaged (22%), the handicapped (10%), men and women entering nontraditional occupations (3.5%), adults needing training and retraining (12%), single parents or homemakers (8.5%), and incarcerated persons (1%). The act was the first to include vocational student organizations as part of the definition for vocational education.

**Factors influencing interest in vocational education**

Over the last several years there has developed in the nation a heightened awareness of the importance of vocational education. This intense public interest that has
been demonstrated in this aspect of education is a most salutary development (N.C.M.P., 1978, p. 1).

Much of this interest in vocational education and training and its rising status, arise because a trained person has better chances of access to employment and satisfying work. Another need for training is increasingly being called for as technological change become more sophisticated (Coates 1982, p. 46).

Cross (1981) analyzed this change and proposed that:

That work-life of the individual is increasing as people are living longer and by the year 2000 the largest age group will be 30 to 44 years of age with a rising curve for 45 to 65 years old. This coupled with the need for many people to continue working to age 65 and beyond, for financial reasons, means that many people will be in the work force for about 45 years (p. 98).

(Apparently, these factors force people to be more interested in vocational education in order to possess required skills and knowledge necessary for employment.)

Further on the issue of vocational education and training, Johnstone and Rivera (1962) conducted a study in the subject matter of courses in which adults participate and found that the vocational area to be most prominent, with approximately one-third of all the courses so labeled. In a similar study by the National Opinion Research Centre about adult participation in courses, the study revealed that the highest enrollments of 37 percent were in vocational training.
Summary

The development process of vocational education and training in the U.S. has experienced many changes. The goals and objectives of vocational education have expanded since 1917. While a major objective is still to prepare people for employment in order to meet the needs of the economy, a second objective emerged in the 1960s which is to increase the employment options available to each person. Another objective is to motivate students to learn basic academic skills.

It is obvious that federal support has always been the impetus for vocational education and training. However, even though this support is declining, vocational education and training has continued to grow. In summary, Bottoms (1984) pointed out that:

No aspect of U.S. education is less well understood than vocational education. . . . It is easy to see why. No area of education is more complex and none has changed as substantially as vocational education has over the past two decades (p. 18).

Government Initiative in Job Creation Programs

An occupation is the most occupying of all human activities; it sets the standard of living, influences family relationships and controls the quality and quantity of civic participation (Mangum & Walsh 1976, p. 32). The manpower
policy has many purposes, but one of the main ones has been an attempt to overcome the mismatch between people and jobs. This mismatch can be most clearly seen in the difference between skilled and unskilled occupations.

A complete analysis of the issue of manpower policy in the United States is beyond the scope of this study. Consequently, the discussion here focuses on three aspects, the evolution of a national manpower policy and two legislated acts—the Manpower Development Training Act of 1962 (MDTA) and the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 (CETA). Although these two pieces of legislation share one common goal, the paths used to reach this goal are many and varied. However, all of these paths are interrelated as the review clearly illustrates.

**The evolution of a national manpower policy**

Because of its complex and evolving nature, manpower development does not lend itself to blueprints or to master plans. In the framework of the changing economy, broad policy directions with flexible guidelines are necessary to permit rolling adjustments to new conditions as they develop (CED 1970, p. 13).

The committee goes on to say that over the last four decades a national manpower policy gradually has been taking shape in this country. In the 1930s, the great problem was
large-scale unemployment, which was attacked on many fronts. In the 1940s, manpower policy concentrated on mobilizing the entire labor force for the war effort, and after the war, on training and reabsorbing the war veterans. In 1946, the Congress passed the historic Employment Act, which for the first time committed the national government to a policy of high employment and economic growth. This broader concern dominated manpower policy during most of the 1950s until the launching of the first Soviet Sputnik shocked the nation into an evaluation of its educational system, and in particular the training of scientists and technicians (p. 31).

Manpower policy took new directions in the 1960s; evolving programs reflected changing perceptions of problems and priorities. Early in the decade the matters commanding main attention were (1) the desperate condition of backward areas of the country, and (2) the rate of unemployment which prevailed during the latter 1950s and continued into the early 1960s.

Out of this recognition of things came several pieces of legislation. One was the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, which emphasized stimulation of economic growth but which also had provisions for manpower training. Another, the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) of 1962,
established a nationwide program of occupational training for unemployed and underemployed workers. A third, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, aimed at providing fresh guidelines and increased funding for vocational education as an adjunct of the regular public education program.

The advent of the "war on poverty" came with the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and led to new programs funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity. One of these was the Job Corps; another program was the Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC).

The Economic Opportunity Act introduced another concept which later came to be important in the administration of training programs: the Community Action Programs, one objective of which was to give representatives of the poor a share in the planning and execution of projects affecting them.

Accumulated experience with the problems of the disadvantaged brought about greater understanding of the elements required to meet the many handicaps of disadvantaged people. Partly as a result of this understanding, partly in response to the need for concentrated efforts and simplified administration, and partly out of the pressure to shift more responsibility onto a representation of the disadvantaged, there emerged in 1967 the last major innovation in
institutional training administration: the Concentrated Employment Program (CEP). In most CEPs, the leading role in administration and planning went to local community action agencies (CED 1970, p. 33).

All these measures brought a substantial increase in federal commitments to manpower programs.

**The Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA)**

The underlying rationale for an employment and training policy is the recognition of the need for governmental intervention in the labor market processes on behalf of the poor and the disadvantaged. During the Sixties, national policy to intervene was expressed in a profusion of federally controlled programs authorized by the Manpower Development and Training Act and the Economic Opportunity Act as earlier indicated.

In 1962, the MDTA was passed by the U.S. Congress to subsidize job training of unemployed, underemployed, and disadvantaged. Doris (1984) states that the MDTA included most of the provisions of the Area Re-development Act, and it extended the focus of program activities to include job training for areas that had a shortage of people with specific skills to fill available jobs. Under MDTA, training requirements (program criteria and goals) were identified and defined at the federal level, and potential
contracting institutions responded with bids. Contracts for training programs were awarded and monitored at the state level (p. 13).

Even today, the view still holds of supporting the disadvantaged people. Glaser (1986) stated that developing employment opportunities is particularly important in low income communities because of limited numbers of job openings and poor employment skills (p. 100). Also, Levy (1981) pointed out that proper attention must be given to the structurally unemployed because experience has shown that teaming of employment training and placement activities is the key for true employment opportunity (p. 56).

The MDTA attempted to resolve debates between advocates of classroom instruction and on-the-job training (OJT) by supporting both. It created a direct link between federal agencies and local program operators and tended to concentrate money on big cities (Doris 1984, p. 1).

As pointed out earlier, Bernick (1984) also stated that:

MDTA (the Manpower Development and Training Act) was designed to help unemployed Americans prepare for jobs. Soon it was supplemented by other training approaches focused on the lower-income unemployed, including the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Job Corps, the Work Incentive Program, the Concentrated Employment Program and the program of the National Alliance of Business, the Job Opportunities in Business Sector program. In 1974, all of the programs except WIN (the Work
Incentive Program) were consolidated in name and administration under CETA (the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act), with, subsequently, a large scale public service employment component added. They continued on a large scale, enrolling hundreds of thousands of persons each year in training (p. 5).

According to Cook, Adams and Rawlings (1985), the largest part of the training under MDTA was done by educational institutions and local community agencies; the number of persons who received training rose from 32,000 in fiscal year 1963 to a peak of 177,500 in fiscal year 1966. The program also made an effort to place unemployed people in jobs with private firms where they could receive on-the-job training (p. 3).

**The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA)**

The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) was passed in 1973, following over a decade of experience with a variety of manpower programs. It consolidated under one legislative umbrella a large number of these previously fragmented and specialized efforts and placed primary reliance instead on local levels of government to plan and deliver a more comprehensive set of services. In other words, CETA moved toward a decategorization of programs and a decentralization of responsibility. This act is a multi-billion dollar program designed to combat unemployment and underemployment (NCMP 1978, p. 3).
In his view, Bernick (1984) stated that the CETA training programs were not greatly different in form from many of the programs in the sixties. They had the same basic formats of classroom training—training in a classroom and subsequent placement in jobs—and on-the-job training. The training was in many of the same fields—secretary, business machine repair, welding, and nursing.

Overall, the CETA programs were improved over their predecessors of the sixties. There was better understanding of the participants, and more importantly, better connections of training to jobs. At the same time, there continued to be a quarter or so of participants who dropped out with very limited impact on the total employment rate (p. 139).

The most significant difference between MDTA and CETA was that the latter placed an increased emphasis on public service employment and the manner of implementing and monitoring the program was developed. State involvement was eliminated both in implementing and monitoring, and these responsibilities were given to local service delivery areas (SDA).

Furthermore, Doris (1984) observed that these changes, however, produced some negative criticism, particularly in regard to the administrative structural changes that were
made. Also, conflicts and struggles to gain power occurred between state and local service areas, and these hindered smooth and effective transfer of administrative responsibilities. Finally, a lack of uniformity and precision in the definition and description of program aspects and interpretation led to abuses (p. 24). Rist (1984) also stated that

For many Americans, Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) gave federally funded job training a bad name. CETA cost the U.S. treasury fifty-eight billion dollars during its ten-year lifetime. And CETA's success stories were lost among charges of alleged fiscal mismanagement and complaints that it did not place enough people in 'real' jobs (p. 36).

The reason for the abuses is obviously clear, according to U.S. Department of Labor report (1986). The law established no specific funding level for each activity. Instead, such sums as necessary are authorized to be appropriated for each program, with the exception of the Job Corps (p. 63).

Indeed, there are two principal direct job creation programs funded under CETA--Title II and Title VI programs for public service employment. After numerous amendments, CETA has eight titles.

Title I provides for comprehensive manpower services (training, work experience, counseling, placement, supportive services) to be delivered at the local level.
Title II provides for a permanent program of public service employment in areas of high unemployment to meet the needs of the structurally unemployed for training and experience which will help them move into regular jobs.

Title III mandates federal responsibility for certain needy groups (such as migrant farmworkers and Native Americans); it also includes several small, largely experimental programs as well as most of the new youth programs enacted as part of the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977 (YEDPA).

Title IV provides for the Job Corps, a primarily residential program for disadvantaged youth, originally mandated by the Economic Opportunity Act.

Title V mandates the National Commission for Manpower Policy.

Title VI provides for a temporary program of public service employment which was added in 1974, amended in 1976, and greatly expanded as part of the economic stimulus package of 1977 to provide jobs primarily for victims of the recession.

Title VII includes the general administrative provisions of the act.

Title VIII establishes the Young Adult Conservation Corps, the only part of YEDPA which is not contained in Title III.

Of the eight titles, two (Titles V and VII) do not authorize funds for employment and training activities and three are focused on youth or other special groups (Titles III, IV, and VIII). Of the remaining three titles (Titles I, II, and VI), two focus almost exclusively on public service employment (PSE). Thus, there is only one title, Title I, which is entirely decentralized and decategorized. All of the
others are either oriented toward meeting the needs of a special group, such as youth or provide only one service such as PSE (Sawhill 1978, pp. 3-5).

Eligibility for the various titles of CETA is broadly established by statute and regulation at the national level. Overall, the findings for the adult programs (Titles I, II and VI) are that about 27 million people were eligible and that about 2.4 million participated in the programs. The findings for the youth programs are even more dramatic. The ratio of eligibles to available slots breaks down as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Ratio of Eligibles to Slots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer Program for Economically Disadvantaged Youth (Title III, Part A.304)</td>
<td>8:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Community Conservation and Improvement Projects (Title III, Part C.2)</td>
<td>169:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Employment and Training Program (Title III, Part C.3)</td>
<td>19:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Corps (Title IV)</td>
<td>132:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Adult Conservation Corps (Title VIII)</td>
<td>1400:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason for the large number of eligibles in the various programs is because the criteria for participation
are not very restrictive (National Commission for Manpower Policy 1978, pp. 10-11).

This law, (CETA), was substantially altered in 1978 by amendments supported by the Carter administration. The amendments were designed to reflect a congressional commitment to improve the effectiveness of the CETA programs in congruence with the national objectives and local practices.

Summary

This section provides a preliminary assessment of the government initiative in job creation programs otherwise known as manpower or employment programs. The process of manpower development by government has been one of many changes. One change relates to the population to be educated, other changes concern the involvement of private enterprise by the government into the training and the amount of information people must know constantly increases.

Therefore, it is fair to say that the implications of major shifts in federal or state policy are seldom known immediately. Moreover, each one of the acts discussed has its own strengths and weaknesses at the time of its creation and execution. Consequently, the issue of what is the best and most appropriate federal policy in terms of manpower is difficult to determine immediately, but rather through accumulated experiences.
An Overview of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)

The success of any educational system depends on its ability to satisfy the changing needs and purposes for which it was established (Banathy 1973, p. 4). The creation of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) seems to be based upon Banathy's statement. The basic premise of JTPA was that local decision makers could design and deliver services more appropriate to their local economies and populations than any nationally uniform program.

According to a report by U.S. Department of Labor (1986), the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) was signed into law on October 13, 1982. Following a one year transition period during which state and local delivery systems were organized, on October 1, 1983, the JTPA replaced the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) as the nation's primary federally funded employment and training program.

Under this act, many administrative and oversight functions have been shifted from the Department of Labor, the federal administering agency, to the states. The act requires that 51% or more of the members be local business leaders, and it gives the council a partnership role in developing, funding and evaluating employment and training programs that meet local private sector labor market needs.
The JTPA aims to train at least one million disadvantaged people annually for private sector jobs.

This section provides some information on the organizational structure of JTPA, functions of the councils, and the five titles of JTPA. Comparison to the previous act (CETA) is carried out, and the few research studies done on JTPA are also discussed.

Ludwing, Crist, and Shoup (1984) stated that "The Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) is the basis for the changing attitude in government toward the private employer. Although this program is government sponsored, it is employer directed by the requirements of a more than 50 percent participation by private business on the Private Industry Council (PIC), the governing body for local programs. JTPA can provide a key role in changing the attitude of industry toward public/private sector collaborations. The law offers the private sector unprecedented latitude in exercising influence over local job training activities" (p. 113).

**Organizational structure of the JTPA**

The structure of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) has three main organs: (1) U.S. Department of Labor, the administering agency for the program; (2) state governor, responsible for the administration of JTPA in the
state; and (3) the Private Industry Council (PIC), the
governing body for local programs in a service delivery area
(SDA). The JTPA program operates on a 2-year planning
cycle. Each state and service delivery area is required to
prepare a 2-year plan describing its JTPA programs and
activities over 2 program years.

Management of JTPA programs, however, is designed to be
developed only at the initiative of interested private and
public sector groups at state and local levels. Moreover,
the act repeatedly encourages the involvement of the
vocational education community in these important partner-
ships (Larry 1984, p. 8).

JTPA is a performance-oriented program. The act states
that the basic measure of performance is the increase in
employment and earnings and the decrease in welfare depend-
ency. To determine if these objectives are met, the act
requires the Department of Labor to establish performance
standards. The Secretary of Labor is given wide latitude to
set standards and to specify outcomes, such as job placement
and improved employability of youths, as well as longer term
outcomes that relate to increased employment and earnings
and decreased welfare dependency (U.S. Department of Labor
1986).
The State Job Training Coordinating Council (SJTCC)

The administration of JTPA is the responsibility of the state governors who share their authority with a State Job Training Coordinating Council that they appoint. The council's overall functions are to plan, coordinate, and monitor state employment and training programs. The governors, based on recommendations by the state council, divide their states into SDAs through which job training services are delivered. SDAs may include the entire state or one or more units of local governments. There are 596 SDAs all over the country.

Each SDA must have a private industry council (PIC), consisting of local business leaders—who are to make up a majority of the membership—and representatives of educational agencies, organized labor, rehabilitation agencies, community-based organizations (CBOs), economic development agencies, and the public employment service. Appointed by the chief local elected officials, the PICs provide overall policy guidance and oversight in partnership with these local officials. In addition, the PICs, in accordance with agreements with the chief elected officials, determine procedures for developing a job training plan and selecting a grant recipient and an organization to administer the plan. They can then use federal funds to establish local training programs that provide the disadvantaged unemployed
with the skills to match identified local employment needs. The councils continually review program operations and evaluate actual results such as the percentage of trainees employed, cost per placement, and other performance criteria. They then determine if new or different skill training programs are needed (U.S. Department of Labor 1986).

The representation on and the responsibilities of the SJTCC are outlined below.

Table 1. The State Job Training Coordinating Council (SJTCC)

| SJTCC Representation | |
|-----------------------|-
| 33% Business and Industry | |
| At Least 20% State Agencies & Organizations | |
| At Least 20% Local Government Units | |
| At Least 20% General Public, Labor, Local Educational Agencies, Eligible Participants, Community Based Groups | |

Principal Responsibilities:
* Recommends a JTPA coordination and special services plan to the Governor
* Recommends a state plan for Service Delivery Area designation (SDA)
* Certifies consistency of Governor's JTPA plans with other state plans
* Recommends changes in state JTPA plans to improve service delivery programs
* Reviews the vocational education needs of the state and the extent to which JTPA coordinates with other programs to fulfill these needs

aU.S. Department of Labor (1986).
The Private Industry Council (PIC)

The Private Industry Council is a three unit partnership of:

1. Units of local government and education
2. Private sector employers
3. Service providers

In all cases, 51% of the PIC membership must be representative of the private sector, and the chairman must be selected from this group. The representation on and responsibilities of the PIC are shown below.

Table 2. The Private Industry Council (PIC)\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation on the PIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chairperson</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(51%) or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested Organizations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rehab Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principal Responsibilities:

- Develop or delegate the development of the job training plan for the service delivery area
- Select grant recipient to administer the plan
- Provide policy guidance to JTPA service providers
- Exercise oversight with respect to the implementation of the JTPA plan

\(^a\)U.S. Department of Labor (1986).
Five titles of the Job Training Partnership Act

Title I  The major thrust of JTPA is found in Title I, which is a new delivery system for employment and training for the economically disadvantaged. This part establishes the fact that the state is responsible for the administrative structure for the delivery of job training services in the following areas:

1. State Job Training Coordinating Councils (SJTCCs)—advisory function.
2. Service Delivery Areas (SDAs)—program implementation.
3. Private Industry Councils (PICs)—program coordination.

Eligible programs under this title are indicated below:

1. **Special Programs (sec. 121):**
   Includes technical assistance to the Service Delivery Areas (SDAs); model programs; offenders programs requiring special attention; special programs for rural areas; special programs in energy conservation and solar energy.

2. **Coordination Grants and Cooperative Agreements (sec. 123):**
   Includes funding of training and coordination service agreements between the designated state education agency and local educational agencies (LEAs), with 50% matching share of funds from the LEAs.
3. **Training for Older Individuals (sec. 124):**
   Includes programs which provide re-training for specific job openings or market demands.

4. **Incentive Grants (sec. 202):**
   Includes special allocations of funds to programs which have exceeded performance standards.

**Title II**

Title II contains the training programs for the disadvantaged. It is the largest program authorized under JTPA in terms of both the number of participants and program fundings. It caters for both youth and adults.

Details of the title are shown below:

1. Principal administrator of funds:
   The Private Industry Councils (PICs) are allotted funds from the Governor. The PIC determines allotments to the service providers.

2. Eligible programs:
   a. **Training Services for the Disadvantaged (sec. 204):**
      Includes job search assistance; job counseling; remedial and basic skills education; skill and voc-ed training; retraining and upgrading; education-to-work transition programs; vocational exploration; high school equivalency certification; pre-apprenticeship training; use of advanced training techniques; customized training for specific employers or job openings.
b. Exemplary Youth Programs (sec. 205):
Includes education for employment programs; pre-
employment skills training; entry employment exper-
ience; school-to-work transition assistance.

c. Summer Youth Programs (sec. 252):
Includes basic and remedial education; classroom
voc-ed training; employment counseling; outreach and
enrollment activities; supportive services.

**Title III**
This title contains special programs for
dislocated workers. It provides for job search for adults
needing retraining as well as the unique feature of training
and relocating disadvantaged workers with little prospects
for re-employment. Further details are shown below:

1. Principal administrator of funds:
   a. Governor's Office with advisory input from the State
      Job Training Coordinating Council (SJTCC). A 50%
      matching share is required from funding recipient.

2. Eligible programs:
   a. Job training, retraining; job search assistance,
      placement, relocation assistance for the following
      individuals:
      (1) victims of mass lay-offs
      (2) victims of natural disasters
      (3) persons affected by the relocation of Federal
          facilities
(4) residents of high unemployment areas or designated enterprise zones

**Title IV**  
Title IV of JTPA authorizes a series of federally administered programs for Native Americans, migrant and seasonal farm workers, veterans, establishes the Job Corp and National Commission for Employment Policy. Activities related to community improvement, such as repair of roads, bridges, and city water systems are all part of this title. It should be reinforced that the intent is to create jobs and put people back to work.

**Title V**  
This title amends the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933 and the Social Security Act provision relating to the work incentive program (U.S. Department of Labor 1980 and 1986).

A Comparison of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) to the Previous Training Act, Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA)

The Reagan administration established JTPA as a program that would eliminate the administrative problems and criticisms associated with CETA.

JTPA is similar to CETA in that it provides job training and employment assistance primarily through locally based delivery systems. For the most part, however, JTPA differs markedly from CETA. Unlike CETA it establishes a partnership between the private and public sectors over all
aspects of local policymaking, planning, administration, and program operations. Furthermore, it allows these private and public partnerships to make fundamental decisions on how to administer JTPA funds and on what types and mix of services to provide. Other key differences of JTPA include
- reducing Labor's role in shifting many administrative and oversight functions to states,
- requiring that most funds be spent on training rather than administration and participant support services, and
- requiring that program performance be measured by standards based on increases in participant earnings and reduced welfare dependency (U.S. Department of Labor, 1986).

The National Alliance of Business has presented the findings of their survey about JTPA and found some basic differences between this program and its predecessor as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government &amp; Control</th>
<th>JTPA</th>
<th>Pre-JTPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Business Involvement</td>
<td>Business in partnership with local and state government</td>
<td>Federal, state and local government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51% or more on each PIC Board and 33% of each state council</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Focus on Training
70% of funds are used for training disadvantaged for local private sector jobs and skills needs.

### Training Provider
- JTPA: PIC-approved training organization or company
- Pre-JTPA: Local government selected training provider

### Performance Criteria
- JTPA: Specific, measurable and required
- Pre-JTPA: None

### Administrative Cost Limit
- JTPA: 15%
- Pre-JTPA: 20%

In addition, JTPA also prohibits federal control of curriculum, thus leaving that concern to state and local policy makers. It is, therefore, obvious that JTPA may benefit from the prominent feature of the new policy on employment and training in many aspects of its activities more than CETA.

#### Research studies on Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)

In this section, previous research that relate to the present study are reviewed. Even though very few studies are available about the JTPA activities in this area.

One of the most relevant studies found is Fortune, Dulton and Martin (1986). They completed a study in a
profoundly rural state of Wyoming, using the Job Training and Partnership Act program to determine the job placement rate of participants. The results were highly encouraging. On the whole, their study indicated that eighty-six percent of the clients were placed in employment. A summary of their findings is given below.

Table 3. Results of successful job placement by training area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Placed</th>
<th>Success Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janitor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rug Cleaner</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Driver</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Maid</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Detailer</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Guard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Set Press</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil, Lube</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total VT</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The National Alliance of Business in 1985 examined the performance of JTPA with 600,000 people served between October 1983 and June 1984. Programs overall surpassed several important national performance standards set by the Department of Labor for placement and costs. Findings are presented in Table 4.
The U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) reviewed all Job Training Partnership Act Title III dislocated worker projects operating between October 1982 and March 1985 to obtain program information concerning placement rates and average wage levels. The Title III project reported having placed 69 percent of their participants in jobs, and the average wage level was $6.61.

Table 4. Results of JTPA performance against national standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National Performance Standards</th>
<th>JTPA Results to Date</th>
<th>Results Before JTPA in 1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult placement rate</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth placement rate</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare recipient replacement rate</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost adult placement</td>
<td>$5,900</td>
<td>$4,297</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost youth &quot;positive termination&quot;</td>
<td>$4,900</td>
<td>$4,488</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Similar to GAO project, Stern (1985) studied the effectiveness of Title III, also of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), in providing employment and training assistance for dislocated workers in Maryland. The author reported that "If success is defined as placements into unsubsidized employment, the Maryland program has certainly been successful." Of the 761 persons who terminated their participation
in JTPA-funded re-employment training in fiscal year 1984, 502 (66 percent) reported entering unsubsidized employment.

In another study of small magnitude, however, Lester (1984) studied a special vocational service in Salt Lake City in June 1984 for food service, meeting the Job Training Partnership Act guidelines. The researcher found that out of 22 students enrolled in the four week program, 19 have been placed in competitive employment.

In Illinois, 26 researchers at the University of Chicago carried out the first comprehensive state-wide assessment of the Job Training Partnership Act program. Their overall conclusion was that JTPA has been a successful program.

However, the Women's Coalition in the country was not satisfied with the question of how women are faring under the Job Training Partnership Act. The lack of concern for women in JTPA programs has been discussed by Roberts (1985), Smith (1985), and Dalby (1985). Also, studies conducted in the aspects of women neglect include Rosenfield (1984), NCEP (1981) and Berryman (1985).

In summary, this overview and studies about the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) tell the story of some of the similarities as well as differences of this program with the previous programs discussed in this chapter. The most
obvious shortcoming of the Job Training Partnership Act is the overall federal budget cuts, because this means that all parts of the program are far less able to serve jobless people with training programs than they were in the late 1970s.

Despite the difficulties in government funding, JTPA placement rates show impressive results. But the situation with women in the program is not only troublesome to women, but to society as a whole.

**General Summary**

This review of literature was undertaken to assess the extent of the relationship among four major components representing a single concept of investment in human capital. First, unemployment and how it relates to training and employment programs; the role of vocational education in manpower development; government initiative in job creation programs, and finally, an overview of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA).

Regarding unemployment and how it relates to training and employment programs, on-the-job training is considered the most effective type of training in leading to permanent employment for both youth and adults. The seriousness of unemployment has been clearly indicated before. Unemployment of some people leads to the unemployment of others.
The role of vocational education in manpower development indicates the facts that the relationship of vocational education and training to job training programs is somewhat interwoven. A good example of this is in the Carl Perkins Act of 1984. Many of the Job Training Partnership Act populations are the same groups being served by the Perkins Act. Moreover, many local and state vocational educators have assumed responsibilities on councils dealing with the training programs and have given much needed technical assistance and advice on planning and designing training programs.

Government initiatives in job creation programs are usually designed to portray some visible success of a particular government in power. For example, MDTA attempted to resolve debates between advocates of classroom instruction and on-the-job training (OJT) by supporting both. However, the implications of major shifts in federal or state policy are seldom known immediately and apparently that is why these policies keep on changing all the time.

The Job Training Partnership Act program is the largest restructuring federal social policy. The decentralization increased the authority of local government and reduced the power of the managers of the individual federal grant program if replaced. Another feature is a major transfer of
administrative authority from Washington to the state capitals. The role of private business became far more important and the role of the public sector much smaller. However, it is quite apparent that several broader issues warrant further examination, for example, federal budget cuts and women's aspects in the program.

The review of the literature provided insights into the history of federal legislation, previous research studies. The outcomes of such review have aided the researcher in the design and implementation of this study.
CHAPTER III. METHODS AND PROCEDURE

This chapter presents the methods and procedures that were used to carry out the study. The chapter is organized into four subsections: sample selection, development of the instruments, data collection, and data analysis.

The Population

The target population for this study consisted of 65 directors who had been administering the JTPA training programs in four states of the Midwest. The four states are Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, and Nebraska. This population was determined from information provided by respective departments of education in each state.

The breakdown of the population is as follows: 26 from Illinois, which has the largest number of SDA, being one of the states experiencing the problem of unemployment; 16 from Iowa; 14 from Missouri; and 9 from Nebraska.

The Sample

The directors who returned the questionnaires for the study (N = 44) became the sample for this study, excluding 10 directors from Iowa who had served as subjects for the pilot testing and one director from Missouri who expressed his preference not to participate in this study. Using the
instrument developed, the directors rated the program and its participants.

**Development of the Instrument**

A questionnaire was developed for gathering data for this study along the guidelines suggested by the author's program of study committee. Based upon the recommendations and suggestions of the committee members, the instrument was revised many times before a final draft was approved by the major professor.

The final draft of the instrument was pilot-tested with a sample of 10 directors of JTPA programs in Iowa. Comments of the pilot test were utilized to further screen and revise the questionnaire. Hence, the validity and clarity of the questionnaire were improved by their constructive suggestions.

**Method of Data Collection**

A mailed questionnaire was used as the means for the data collection in this study. Before the questionnaire was mailed to each of the respondents (directors), a letter was first sent to each of them informing them about the research project as well as soliciting their participation in the study.
The questionnaires were mailed out on December 12, 1987 to each of the subjects (N = 54), together with an explanatory cover letter and a stamped self-addressed envelope to facilitate completion and prompt return. Two weeks were allowed for questionnaires to be returned.

Within the two weeks period allowed, 38 of the 54 questionnaires were returned. However, an additional week was given due to the good response in order to avoid a second mailing. Eventually, a total of 44 questionnaires were received. This represented about 82% return. Table 5 below shows the questionnaire returns from the four states.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number Sent</th>
<th>Number Returned</th>
<th>Percent Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>80.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Methods of Data Analyses

The data collected from the returned questionnaires were processed in preparation for key punching and subsequent statistical analyses using the SPSSX package. Discussions were held with the investigator's major
professor as well as some consultations were also made in deciding on the most appropriate statistical techniques to be used in order to provide answers to the research questions which helped to derive the hypotheses for this study.

Both descriptive and inferential statistic methods were used; in particular, the following statistical methods were employed in data analysis:

1. Frequency counts, to determine background information on both the respondents and the participants.

2. Principal factor analysis, to find the factor structure of items related to the administrative aspects of the programs.

3. Analysis of variance (ANOVA); this procedure was used to test the hypotheses of the study.

The results of these statistical data analyses are presented in the next chapter.
CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this chapter is to present the research findings generated from the analyses of the questionnaires sent to the JTPA directors in four states of the Midwest. The presentation includes (1) results of descriptive statistical analyses of some general characteristics of the sample, (2) results of statistical tests of the hypotheses relating to the questions of the study, and (3) discussion about the results of the statistical analyses.

Descriptive Analyses

Forty-four (44) respondents provided the data for this study. The composition of this sample is shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Distribution of the respondents by state

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consideration was given to the sex of the respondents. Table 7 indicates that 26 (59%) of the respondents were male and 18 (41%) were female.
The educational qualifications attained by the respondents is presented in Table 8. As the table shows, only 1 respondent had earned a doctorate degree, 13 had earned master's degrees, and 21 had received bachelor's degrees. Nine respondents possessed "other" non-degree qualifications.

In order to establish some guidelines about each SDA, the respondents were asked to indicate how industrialized their areas were. The results are shown in Table 9.
Table 9. Industrialization status of SDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDA Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heavily industrialized</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately industrialized</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly industrialized</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not industrialized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents were also asked to state some demographic variables about the program participants. It was found that about 57% of the respondents were male and the rest (43%) were female.

Educational levels among the participants in the programs were examined. Table 10 indicates that the most common educational level was senior high school (77%) and junior high school (23%).

Table 10. Distribution of participants by educational levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior high school</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior high or middle school</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 shows the percentages of the only two categories of persons who participated in the training programs.
Table 11. Categorical status of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economically disadvantaged youth</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically disadvantaged adult</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training aspects

Table 12 shows the duration of programs as indicated by the directors. A careful examination of this table reveals that about 62% of the participants spend between 4 to 6 months, while another 26% spend between 7 to 9 months in training.

Table 12. Duration of training programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 and above</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The system of delivering the training programs was examined. The respondents were asked to check as many systems as applied to their areas. Details are shown in Table 13.
Table 13. Delivery system used in training programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System used</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community based organization</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational agency</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training center</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The method of developing participants' competencies was considered also. Table 14 shows the responses of the directors in this regard.

Table 14. Development of participants' competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job specific</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster of skills</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic skills</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher wanted to know whether the nature of the training was derived from a labor market survey or not. Table 15 represented the directors' responses.

Table 15 represents the opinions of the directors about the integration of business content into the training
Table 15. Training derived from a labor market survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

programs in order to make the participants be more helpful to their respective employers.

Table 16. Integration of business content into the training programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contrary to what one would expect, the majority of the respondents (77%) had no opinion or did not agree entirely with integration of business content into the training programs.

Opportunities for both participants and employers in designing the standard of training were also asked. Table 17 and Table 18 presented the results, respectively.
Table 17. Opportunity for participants' input in training standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18. Opportunity for employers' input in training standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Status of enrollment in the training programs was also investigated. As shown in Table 19, about 35% of the respondents reported a substantial increase in enrollment. In only 1 case was a decrease in enrollment indicated; about 12% of the respondents indicated that enrollment stayed static, and 52% reported that the enrollment fluctuated.
Table 19. Status of enrollment in the training programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased substantially</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased substantially</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed static</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluctuated</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment aspects

The opinion of respondents as regards to how long it took a trainee to get a job after training is completed is presented in Table 20.

Table 20. Time taken to get a job after training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of waiting</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 2 weeks</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 4 weeks</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 6 weeks</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 and above</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In an effort to know employers' willingness to hire trainees after their training, respondents were asked to state their reactions. Table 21 clearly indicates this fact.
Table 21. Employers' willingness to hire trainees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very willing</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just willing</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reluctant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variable of wages was believed to be the most common motivator for the participants. Consequently, respondents were asked about it. This factor is presented in Table 22.

Table 22. Average starting weekly wages of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$100 - $150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$151 - $200</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$201 - $250</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$251 or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rate of unemployment in each SDA was considered very important to this study. Table 23 revealed the situations as reported by the respondents.

Self-employment was believed to be an important variable that should be encouraged in the training process. Table 24 shows that about 34% supported the idea while
Table 23. Average rate of unemployment in SDAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate of unemployment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0% - 4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% - 8%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9% - 12%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13% or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

another 34% are indifferent; about 27% disagreed with the idea, and only 5% strongly disagreed.

Table 24. Preparation of participants for self-employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results From Factor Analysis

Factor analysis was applied to the 15 items in section A of the questionnaire, dealing with administrative aspects of the programs. Table 25 shows that most of the correlations were highly positive.

The 15 items were further analyzed by the principal factor method. Twelve of the 15 items produced three major
Table 25. Correlation among fifteen items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
factors. The factors together with the variables with significant loadings in order of magnitude were as follows:

Factor I, titled skills training procedure, is presented in Table 26. The items which made up this factor were primarily concerned with skills training adequacy.

Factor II, titled program linkages, is presented in Table 27. The items which made up this factor primarily dealt with outside involvement.

Factor III, titled organizational set up, is presented in Table 28. The items which made up this factor were intended to deal with the organizational structure of the JTPA training programs.

Table 26. Factor I: Skills training procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Statement</th>
<th>Rotated Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>Reliable assessment for skills training</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>Guidance and counseling services</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 9</td>
<td>Appropriateness of occupational skills</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A15</td>
<td>Conducting a follow-up of graduates</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>Communication between employers &amp; agency</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 8</td>
<td>Achievement of program objectives</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examination of these factors revealed that item A6 (working with business community) and item A10 (reliable assessment for skills training) loaded significantly. This
Table 27. Factor II: Program linkages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Statement</th>
<th>Rotated Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 6</td>
<td>Working with business community</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 5</td>
<td>Working with private industry council</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14</td>
<td>Sources of information about program</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28. Factor III: Organizational set up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Statement</th>
<th>Rotated Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 4</td>
<td>Local organizational structure of JTPA</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 2</td>
<td>Composition of service delivery areas</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 3</td>
<td>State organizational structure of JTPA</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

means that the four groups of directors considered the items very important.

Careful examination of Table 28 also indicated that Item A4 (the local organizational structure of JTPA) loaded higher than item A3 (the state organizational structure of JTPA). This shows a real commitment of the local community.

Testing of the Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

The hypothesis that there are no significant differences in the ratings of items related to the administrative aspects of the program including (1.1) skills training
procedure, (1.2) program linkages, and (1.3) organizational set up in the four selected states was tested using a single classification analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure.

**Hypothesis 1.1** This hypothesis of no significant differences was not rejected ($F(2,41) = 1.780, P < .18$). The means and standard deviations for the states are shown in Table 29 and the results of the analysis of variances are shown in Table 30.

Table 29. Means and standard deviations of ratings of skills training procedure by state directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iowa &amp; Nebraska$^a$</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Combined in view of the small Ns (5 and 7, respectively).

Table 30. Analysis of variance of ratings of skills training procedure by state directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12.54</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Hypothesis 1.2** Table 31 shows the means and the standard deviations for the states and Table 32 shows that the ANOVA procedure supports the null hypothesis of no difference \((F(2,41) = .77, P<.47)\).

Table 31. Means and standard deviation of program linkages ratings by state directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iowa &amp; Nebraskaaa</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\)Combined in view of the small Ns (5 and 7, respectively).

Table 32. Analysis of variance of program linkages ratings by state directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20.70</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis 1.3** The directors do not differ significantly on organizational set up ratings scale \((F(2,41) = 1.42, P<.26)\). Table 33 shows the means and standard deviation and Table 34 shows the analysis of variance supports the null hypothesis of no difference.
Table 33. Means and standard deviation for organizational set up in selected states

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iowa &amp; Nebraska^</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^Combined in view of the small Ns (5 and 7, respectively).

Table 34. Analysis of variance for organizational set up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20.01</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 2

The hypothesis that there are no significant differences in the adapted delivery system for training in the programs among selected states was tested using the single classification ANOVA Procedure. This analysis also supported the null hypothesis of no difference (F(3,40) = 0.47, P < .71). The means and standard deviations for the states are represented in Table 35 and the results of the analysis of variances are shown in Table 36.
Table 35. Means and standard deviations of programs delivery systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36. Analysis of variance of programs delivery systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>112.59</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis 3**

The hypothesis that there are no significant differences in the starting weekly wages of participants among selected states was tested using the single classification ANOVA Procedure. The analysis produced no significant differences ($F(3,39) = 1.53, P < .22$). The means and standard deviations for the states are shown in Table 37 and the results of the analysis of variance are shown in Table 38.
Table 37. Means and standard deviations of weekly wages ratings for participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 38. Analysis of variance of weekly wages by state

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

The results of the statistical analyses of this study reveal a number of interesting features about directors' views of the JTPA training programs. It was interesting to note that about 77% of the participants had attained the senior high school diploma. Moreover, the majority (84%) of the participants were disadvantaged adults. These figures are consistent with the assertion of most literature about this group of people.
### Training aspects

The analysis on the training aspects of the programs indicated that 87% of the respondents reported that the training lasts between four to nine months. It is believed that the time is reasonable to conduct such a training. With regard to the system of delivering the programs, educational agency scored high in comparison with other alternatives with about 37%. This may be because of the available resources at these places. About 27% had used community based organizations, 17% had used training centers, and the remainder used other means.

Although there was no clear opinion about assessing training needs from labor market survey, the analysis shows that about 33% agree, 33% had no opinion, and another 33% disagree. Contrary to what one would expect, involvement of both employers and participants in designing the training standard was as low as 18% in all cases. However, enrollment increased by about 35%, which means the programs were fully accepted on the whole by the communities.

### Employment aspects

The overall picture which emerges from the results of the analysis on employment aspects of the participants who completed the training requirements was very encouraging. Specifically, the following variables were highly supported
by the respondents as indicated by the mean ratings:
1. A majority of the respondents (68%) indicated that it took only between 2 to 4 weeks for a trainee to get a job after training is completed.
2. Starting wages were reasonably high, between $151 and $250 per week, as indicated by 95% of the respondents.
3. Local employers were very willing to employ the participants; this fact was reported by 93% of the sample respondents.
4. Participants were encouraged to be self employed; this again will reduce the problem of unemployment to some extent.

**Hypotheses testing**

In all the hypotheses of the study, single classification of ANOVA procedure was used to test each hypothesis. Among the five main hypotheses tested for this study, in all cases the null hypothesis of no difference was not rejected by the results of the analysis.

However, it is important to realize that the preliminary analysis of items which made up the factors tested in hypothesis 1 did not receive a very high ratings by the respondents. Therefore, the findings indicated that the directors were not very satisfied with the administrative aspects of the programs.
Summary

In summary, the results of the statistical analysis of this study were presented in this chapter. Preliminary analysis was conducted which included frequency counts and factor analysis.

Frequency counts revealed some background information on both the respondents (directors of the SDAs) and the participants in the program as regards to both categorical and continuous data.

Factor analysis was applied to some items of the instrument of the study to discover whether the items coalesced into a number of different factors.

Single classification of ANOVA procedure was used to test all the hypotheses of the study. In all cases, the results of the analysis supported the null hypothesis of no differences. The findings strongly suggest that the JTPA training program works. It has significant, measurable economic benefits.

A general summary of the results of this study as well as the conclusions and recommendations based upon the findings are presented in the next chapter.
CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The final chapter of the study includes (1) a general summarization of the findings of the study, (2) conclusions and implications, and (3) recommendations for further study.

Summary

This study was undertaken to assess the state of the literature on training programs for employment with particular reference to JTPA training programs and to obtain information from the JTPA training programs' directors with a view to examine such information in order to be able to understand the specific factor structure relating to the JTPA programs variables of: the administration, nature of training, and the incidence of employment among the participants in the programs.

Following are the previous chapters included in the study:
1. An introduction, describing the problem, purposes, need, objectives, assumptions, delimitation, and procedure of the study as well as definition of terms related to the study.
2. A review of related literature on investment in human capital in terms of training programs. Specifically,
the review dealt with unemployment phenomena and how they relate to training for employment, the role of vocational education in manpower development, government initiative in job creation programs and, finally, an overview of the JTPA training programs.

Although the literature review revealed very interesting and important information regarding the areas mentioned above, there seems to be a heavy bias in most of the literature toward costs of programs rather than benefits, the need for considering such programs for economic as well as social benefits was not well recognized.

Another rather disturbing observation is that the literature fails to explore the relevant roles of the various actors in administering the programs. Moreover, follow-up process for proper evaluation of people who participated in the training programs was not given prominence.

3. The chapter describing the methods and procedures used explains how the sample was derived from the population, development of the instrument used to gather the data for the study, as well as statistical methods employed to analyze the data.
4. In a presentation of the findings, three different statistical techniques were used in the data analyses: frequency counts, factor analysis, and single classification of ANOVA procedure. The results of the analysis, discussion and summary were well documented in that chapter.

The methods of analysis used, particularly the descriptive analyses, represent a way of exploring and presenting information in a tabular form so that similarities and differences can be identified and reported. Revealed in the data found in the tables are facts that existed in the states involved in this study as perceived by individual directors in each respective SDA.

The results from ANOVA procedure that was used in testing the hypotheses of the study revealed that there were no significant differences in satisfaction ratings of items related to the administration of the JTPA training programs among the directors in the four states selected. States with high numbers of SDAs rated the programs the same way as states with low numbers of SDAs, while at the same time, states with low rates of unemployment rated the items the same way as states with slightly higher rates of unemployment.

Another interesting feature was that all the states adapted almost the same delivery systems for the training
programs. Moreover, the starting wages seem to be somehow the same in all the states.

The findings of this study provided insight into the structure and nature of the JTPA training programs. It is, therefore, hoped that the study will be useful in contribution to the growing research in human capital development and should be viewed as an attempt to identify, analyze and evaluate a large body of literature and data in order to be able to use the knowledge gained for personal development, especially for the betterment of my home country, Nigeria.

Conclusions

Based on a review of the literature and the findings of the study reported in the previous chapter, the following conclusions were derived by the researcher:

Hypothesis 1.1

It was hypothesized that there was no significant difference in the ratings of items related to skills training by directors in the four states selected.

Based on the analysis of data reported in Table 30. It was found that there was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis. The results indicate that the directors did not differ significantly in their ratings of skills training (Table 26 items) regardless of the state.
The states with the highest rating, namely Iowa and Nebraska combined, had a mean rating of 3.89 and a standard deviation of 0.52. The state with the least rating, Missouri, received a mean score of 3.45 and a standard deviation of 0.68.

In conclusion, therefore, skills training was considered a very important factor in all the four states selected for the study.

**Hypothesis 1.2**

It was hypothesized that there was no significant difference in the ratings of items related to program linkages by directors in the four states selected.

The results of this analysis were presented in Table 32. It was also found that there was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, program linkages (Table 27 items) were considered very important factors.

**Hypothesis 1.3**

It was hypothesized that there was no significant difference in the ratings of items related to organizational set up by directors in the four states selected.

The results of this analysis were presented in Table 34. It was also found that there was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, organizational set
Table 28 items) were also considered very important factors.

**Hypothesis 2**

It was hypothesized that there was no significant difference in the ratings of delivery system adapted for the training in the four states selected.

Based on the analysis of data reported in Table 36, it was found that there was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis. The directors did not differ significantly in their ratings regardless of the state.

This implies that program directors are fully aware of the need to utilize various systems to suit different needs of participants and the nature of the occupation involved.

**Hypothesis 3**

It was hypothesized that there was no significant difference in the starting weekly wages of participants in the four states selected.

Based on the findings presented in Table 38, it was found that there was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis. The results suggest that the starting weekly wages in all of the four states are very similar.

The starting minimum wage of a participant ranges between $150 and $250 per week. It is important to note
that different participants may be working for different numbers of hours per week. This could be a good reason for the big gap in the range.

Other conclusions related to the findings of the study include the following:

1. Based on the findings reported in Table 18, contrary to what one would expect, employers did not have much opportunity in terms of inputs in the planning and administering the training programs, in spite of the fact that the act gave them more than 50% control in the venture.

2. The JTPA training programs participants are almost 50% male and 50% female. This finding seems to contradict the authors of some literature which state that the new partnership does not place a high value for women in the training programs.

3. It is quite apparent from the overall findings that the JTPA training programs increased the employment status of its participants.

4. Although the overall assessment of JTPA is favorable, it is believed that performance in subsequent years could be quite good or quite disappointing, depending on what needs assessment, close monitoring, improved program assessment and continued research was done to the program.
Researcher's Observations

Following are some observations made by the researcher as a result of his investigation of the program for this study.

1. Directors of the JTPA training programs generally rated the program very low. This means that most of the variables responded to by the directors were not very pleased with.

2. Standards and procedures for promotion of the programs varied in content and nature, and it appears that coordination and cooperation among the directors does not seem to exist between one SDA to another or one state to another state.

3. It appears to the researcher that the directors of the JTPA training program do not consider followup of the students after their graduation as important exercise. This could be a serious problem for the program in the future.

4. Another serious observation of the findings of this study is on proposal, implementation and execution of a similar program by the researcher in his home country, Nigeria. The United States and Nigeria have very few things in common; there are obvious differences in culture, social values, and other
economic considerations which would require radical and systematic modification of such programs to suit the needs of the people as well as what the economy could afford to bear.

Recommendations for Further Research

In view of the experiences gained in this study, the following observations and suggestions for future research are presented.

1. If similar research is to be conducted, the researcher should try to increase the number of subjects in the study. Also, he or she should use other types of measurement tools, for instance, Likert scale with different point-scale or some other scales.

2. There should also be an in-depth study dealing directly with the participants in the programs. However, this will require more time, money and effort because of the large number of participants being dealt with by each SDA.

3. Some of the items in the instrument need not be there because it appears in some cases that two items may mean nearly the same thing to a respondent.

4. Careful consideration must be given to the missing data problem. It causes a degree of uncertainty in the findings from a study. This is because the researcher
may not know whether the presence or absence of data would effect the outcome.

5. Similar research, with an improved research design and advanced analysis, can also be done with other populations from different states other than the midwestern states.

6. Finally, dissemination of the research findings to the programs directors may be very useful in assisting them in developing strategies to improve the performance of the training programs. Moreover, follow-up process for all persons who participated in the training programs should be given more emphasis in order to make some useful data available for further action.
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APPENDIX A.

LETTERS OF CORRESPONDENCE

WITH STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION
September 15, 1987

Mr. Charles Moench
Acting Director Of Career Education
Iowa Department of Public Instruction
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, IA 50319

Dear Sir:

I am a graduate student in Industrial Education and technology at Iowa State University. I am interested in conducting a study relating to Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) as a research project within my program of study.

Dr. William D. Wolansky; Coordinator of International Education Programs at Iowa State University, suggested that I contact you about the names of persons involved with JTPA activities in your state for information and further assistance with this study. The information I need from you is the name and addresses of the Directors of your JTPA Training Centers in your state.

The purpose of the study is to investigate the incidence of employment of persons being served by the provision of JTPA and examine the nature of such employments resulting from the training. The states chosen for this study are Missouri, Nebraska, and Iowa.

I hope this request will receive your kind and immediate attention. Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Haldiru/M. Munir

Mr. William D. Wolansky
Coordinator, International Educational Programs
September 24, 1987

Dr. William D. Wolansky, Coordinator
International Educational Programs
College of Education
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa 50011

Dear Bill:

This letter is written in response to the letter request that we received from Halliru Munir and yourself regarding a research project relating to the Job Training Partnership Act. Enclosed is a listing of the names and addresses of the JTPA directors for each of the JTPA Administrative Entities in Iowa.

In addition to contacting each of the JTPA directors, I would recommend you contact Stephen Morris, administrator of the JTPA Grants Management Unit at the Iowa Department of Economic Development (IDED) as IDED is the state administrative entity for JTPA programs in Iowa. Stephen is responsible for the state Management Information System (MIS) for JTPA programming and should be invaluable to you in your quest for obtaining employment results for JTPA. The IDED's address is:

Iowa Department of Economic Development
200 East Grand
Des Moines, Iowa 50309

Stephen's telephone number is (515) 281-3813.

If you have specific questions regarding JTPA State Education Coordination Grants funds, please call me at (515) 281-3590. We would appreciate receiving a copy of your research project study when it is completed.

Myril A. Harrison, Consultant
Bureau of Area Schools

/bjs
Enc.
September 28, 1987

Stephen Morris
Administrator of the JTPA Grants
Management Unit
Iowa Department of Economic Development
200 East Grand
Des Moines, IA 50309

Dear Mr. Morris:

I am a graduate student in the Department of Industrial Education and Technology, Iowa State University. I am interested in conducting a study relating to the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) as a research project within my program of study.

Mr. Myril A. Harrison, Consultant Bureau of Area Schools in Iowa, recommended that we contact you since you are responsible for the State Management Systems (MIS) for JTPA programming in Iowa. I am soliciting your participation as one of the resource persons for this study. I am also requesting your permission to come and meet with you on items I intend to put on the instrument for the study. Attached is a draft copy of the instrument for your perusal. Please consider deleting or adding items as you deem necessary.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the incident of employment of persons being served by the provision of JTPA and examine the nature of such employment resulting from the training. The states chosen for the study are Missouri, Nebraska and Iowa. It is hoped that the result of this study will be helpful to vocational and technology educators as well as administrators both in the U.S. and my home country, Nigeria.

Please suggest any day of the week that will be convenient to you for a short meeting. I hope this request will receive your kind and immediate consideration. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dr. William D. Wolansky
Coordinator, International Education Programs
Iowa State University
(Major professor)

Enclosure
October 18, 1987

Stephen Morris
Administrator of the JTPA Grants
Management Unit
Iowa Department of Economic Development
200 East Grand
Des Moines, Iowa  50309

Dear Mr. Morris:

As a follow-up to my letter of September 29, 1987, copy attached, I would like to remind you that I am still waiting to receive your response about the instrument I enclosed a copy for you regarding items I intend to send to the directors of the JTPA in the state.

Please may I suggest that you may return the instrument to me with your reactions to the items on it. I may be reached at this number, (515) 296-7781. Thank you.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
October 19, 1987

Halliru M. Munir
Graduate Student
ISU, College of Education
Dept. of Industrial Ed and Technology
Ames, Iowa 50011

Dear Mr. Munir:

I am responding to your letter of September 28, 1987, regarding your JTPA Questionnaire.

The information your survey seeks should be completed by Service Delivery Area Directors. However, before proceeding further, I suggest you discuss your objectives and share the questionnaire with a JTPA director(s) to learn more about the operation of the program. This would facilitate the formulation of questions to obtain the specific information you are seeking.

Carl Wilburn is the director for SDA XII. He is also the Chairperson of the SDA Association, and would be a good resource person to contact. His address is Region XII Council of Governments, 104 West 6th Street, P.O. Box 768, Carroll, Iowa 51401.

I am also available to meet with you and would be glad to schedule an appointment soon. Do contact me at the above address or call me at (515) 281-3813 should you wish to meet with me.

Sincerely,

Stephen H. Morris, Chief
Bureau of Administrative Support
September 15, 1987

Dr. Frank Drake  
Assistant Commissioner  
& Director of Vocational Education  
State Department of  
Elementry & Secondary Education  
P.O. Box 480  
Jefferson City, MO  65102

Dear Sir:

I am a graduate student in Industrial Education and Technology at Iowa State University. I am interested in conducting a study relating to Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) as a research project within my program of study.

Dr. William D. Wolansky, Coordinator of International Education Programs at Iowa State University, suggested that I contact you about the names of persons involved with JTPA activities in your state for information and further assistance with this study. The information I need from you is the name and addresses of the Directors of your JTPA Training Centers in your state.

The purpose of the study is to investigate the incidence of employment of persons being served by the provision of JTPA and examine the nature of such employments resulting from the training. The states chosen for this study are Missouri, Nebraska, and Iowa.

I hope this request will receive your kind and immediate attention. Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Coordinator, International Educational Programs
Mr. Halliru M. Munir  
c/o Dr. William D. Wolansky, Coordinator  
International Education Programs  
College of Education  
Department of Industrial Education Technology  
Ames, Iowa 50011  

Dear Mr. Munir:  

Dr. Frank Drake, Assistant Commissioner of Vocational Education has asked me to respond to your September 15, 1987, letter requesting JTPA placement information.  

While our agency works closely with JTPA, information on the placement/employment of its participants is retained by the State Agency responsible for JTPA; the Department of Economic Development, Division of Job Development and Training (JDT).  

I have contacted JDT and they have asked that you contact Mary Jane King, Research Analyst, Job Development and Training, 221 Metro Drive, Jefferson City, Missouri 65101 or at 314-751-4750.  

Good luck on your study.  

Sincerely,  

[Signature]  

Employment Training Section  

DE/js  

cc: Mary Jane King
Mary Jane King  
Research Analyst  
Job Development and Training  
221 Metro Drive  
Jefferson City, MO  65101

Dear Ms. King:

I am a graduate student in the Department of Industrial Education and Technology, Iowa State University. I am interested in conducting a study relating to the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) as a research project within my program of study.

I have contacted Dr. Frank Drake, Assistant Commissioner of Vocational Education, about the names of persons involved with JTPA activities in Missouri and he directed me to contact you. The information I need from you are the names and addresses of the Directors of the JTPA Training Centers in your state.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the incident of employment of persons being served by the provision of JTPA and to examine the nature of such employment resulting from the training. The states chosen for the study are Missouri, Nebraska and Iowa. It is hoped that the result of this study will be helpful to vocational and technology educators as well as administrators both in the U.S. and my home country, Nigeria.

I hope this request will receive your kind and immediate attention. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Approved by:  
Dr. William D. Wolanski  
Coordinator, International Education Programs  
Iowa State University  
(Major professor)

Haltiru M. Munir
September 15, 1987

Dr. Marge Harouff
Assistant Commissioner for Vocational Education
State Department of Education
301 Centennial Mall South
P.O. Box 94987
Lincoln, NE 68509

Dear Dr. Harouff:

I am a graduate student in Industrial Education and Technology at Iowa State University. I am interested in conducting a study relating to Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) as a research project within my program of study.

Dr. William D. Wolansky, Coordinator of International Education Programs at Iowa State University, suggested that I contact you about the names of persons involved with JTPA activities in your state for information and further assistance with this study. The information I need from you is the name and addresses of the Directors of your JTPA Training Centers in your state.

The purpose of the study is to investigate the incidence of employment of persons being served by the provision of JTPA and examine the nature of such employments resulting from the training. The states chosen for this study are Missouri, Nebraska, and Iowa.

I hope this request will receive your kind and immediate attention. Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Halirru M. Munir

[Signature]

Dr. William D. Wolansky
Coordinator, International Educational Programs
September 21, 1987

Dr. William D. Wolansky
Coordinator
International Ed. Programs
Iowa State University
College of Education
Dept. of Indus. Ed & Technology
Ames, IA 50011

Dear Dr. Wolansky:

Enclosed is a copy of the information you requested.

If you have any questions or need further information, the contact person at the Nebraska Department of Education for JTPA is Jack Steven (402) 471-4823.

Sincerely,

SHIRLEY GRUNTORAD, Secretary
Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)
October 22, 1987

Jack Steven  
State Department of Education  
301 Centennial Mall South  
P. O. Box 94987  
Lincoln, NE 68509  

Dear Mr. Steven:

I am a graduate student in the Department of Industrial Education and Technology, Iowa State University. I am interested in conducting a study relating to the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) as a research project within my program of study.

Ms. Shirley Gruntorad, Secretary, JTPA advised that I should address all my inquiries to you for assistance with regards to JTPA activities in the state. The assistance I need from you concerns publications, such as brochures, etc. Could you please send me, or direct me to, any material relating to the administration of JTPA programs in Nebraska.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the incidence of employment of persons being served by the provision of JTPA and to examine the nature of such employment resulting from the training. The states chosen for the study are Missouri, Nebraska, and Iowa. It is hoped that the result of this study will be helpful to vocational and technology educators as well as administrators both in the U.S. and my home country, Nigeria.

I hope this request will receive your kind and immediate attention. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Hamiru M. Muir
November 20, 1987

Halliru M. Munir  
College of Education  
Department of Industrial  
Education & Technology  
Iowa State University  
Ames, IA 50011

Dear Mr. Munir:

In response to your request for material, brochures, publications, etc. relative to the administration of JTPA programs in Nebraska, I am enclosing a Coordination Directory which contains addresses of persons who would be best to contact for the types of information requested. In addition, the address and name of the person in charge of the State JTPA administration is:

Mrs. Patricia Meisenholder, Director  
Job Training Program Division  
Department of Labor  
550 South 16th Street  
PO Box 95004  
Lincoln, NE 68509

Nebraska has three JTPA Service Delivery Areas which are responsible for administering the greatest share of the JTPA activities and gather the type of statistical information which should be beneficial to your study. I have encircled the names of the Directors of these SDAs in the enclosed brochure.

Hopefully this will be helpful to you.

Sincerely,

JACK L. STEVEN, Program Manager  
Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)
October 26, 1987

Ted Sanders, State Superintendent of Education  
State Board of Education  
100 N 1st Street  
Springfield, IL 62777

Dear Mr. Sanders:

I am a graduate student in the Department of Industrial Education and Technology at Iowa State University. I am interested in conducting a research study relating to the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) in partial fulfillment of the requirements for my graduate program of study. The primary purpose of this study is to investigate the incidence of employment of participants being served by the provision of JTPA and to examine the nature of such employment. The states chosen for this study are Illinois, Missouri, Nebraska and Iowa.

Dr. William D. Wolansky, Coordinator of International Education Programs at ISU, suggested that I contact you about the names of persons involved with JTPA activities in the state for information and further assistance with this study. The information I need from you are the names and addresses of the directors of your JTPA Training Centers in Illinois.

I hope this request will receive your kind and immediate attention.

Sincerely,

Haitham M. Muhtadi
December 9, 1987

Mr. Halliru M. Munir
Iowa State University
College of Education
Department of Industrial Education and Technology
Ames, Iowa 50011

Dear Mr. Munir:

In response to your request of November 15, 1987, I have enclosed a copy of our automated JAPA - MIS statewide on-line summarization report for the different titles of 2A, 180 (3%), 18E (8%), 3, and 30 for the period of July 1, 1986 to June 30, 1987. The 1st quarter (July 1, 1987 to September 30, 1987) report is also enclosed for the same titles along with 4 quarters of 2B. I have included the performance measures, since I did not know exactly what data besides the entered employment rate would be useful to you.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at (217) 785-6006. Tim Harmon and Rosie Christy of my staff will be able to assist you.

I am glad that I was able to assist you in your research.

Mr. James Galloway at DAVTE would be able to give you more pertinent data to the IBE program since he does receive funding from our office.

Once again good luck.

Sincerely,

John D. Taylor, Manager
Job Training Programs Division
APPENDIX B.

LETTERS OF CORRESPONDENCE
WITH JTPA DIRECTORS
September 25, 1987

Paula Reece
112 11th Street
Des Moines, IA 50309

Dear Ms. Reece:

I am a graduate student in the Department of Industrial Education and Technology, Iowa State University. I am interested in conducting a study relating to the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) as a research project within my program of study.

As a follow up to the telephone conversation between yourself and Dr. Donald J. Mckay about the JTPA participants, the members of my committee for program of study suggested that I deal with the people administering the program rather than the participants. Consequently, I am soliciting for your permission to come and meet with you on items I intend to put on the instrument for this study. Attached is a draft copy of the instrument for your perusal. Please consider deleting or adding items as you deem necessary.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the incident of employment of persons being served by the provision of JTPA and examine the nature of such employment resulting from the training. The states chosen for the study are Missouri, Nebraska and Iowa. It is hoped that the result of this study will be helpful to vocational and technology educators as well as administrators both in the U.S. and my home country, Nigeria.

Please suggest any day of the week that will be convenient to you for a short meeting. I hope this request will receive your kind and immediate consideration. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Approved by:
Dr. William D. Wolapsky
Coordinator, International Education Programs
Iowa State University
(Major professor)

Enclosure
September 28, 1987

I am a graduate student in the Department of Industrial Education and Technology, Iowa State University. I am interested in conducting a study relating to the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) as a research project within my program of study.

Mr. Myril A. Harrison, Consultant Bureau of Area Schools in Iowa, released to us your name as one of the Directors involved with the JTPA program in the state. Consequently, I am soliciting your participation as one of the resource persons for this study.

The purpose of the study is to investigate the incidence of employment of persons being served by the provision of JTPA and examine the nature of such employment resulting from the training. The states chosen for this study are Missouri, Nebraska and Iowa. It is hoped that the result of this study will be helpful to vocational and technology educators as well as administrators both in the U.S. and my home country, Nigeria.

I will be contacting you from time to time regarding the activities of your program. I hope this request will receive your kind consideration. Thank you.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Approved by:
Dr. William D. Wolansky
Coordinator, International Education Programs
Iowa State University
(Major professor)
October 1, 1987

Halliru M. Munir  
College of Education  
Department of Industry Education and Technology  
Iowa State University  
Ames, IA 50011

Dear Halliru:

I am in receipt of the recent letter from you regarding a study you were conducting on JTPA and the incidents of employment of people being served under the Act.

We would be most happy to participate in this study. However in order to best be able to serve you, it would be most helpful if we could have your questions in writing prior to your contact with us. This will allow us to better integrate your requests with present workloads and also allow us to draw on several staff (if necessary) in case your question(s) require a somewhat more detailed response.

You did not mention in your letter what kind of contact you would be making—whether you will be calling for information or seeking an appointment. Here again if we could have a little more knowledge, it would allow us to be better prepared to assist you.

I look forward to hearing from you. I would also be most interested if we would be allowed to review your finished product.

Signatures have been redacted for privacy

Executive Director

DP:xmp  
ED1/38

pc: Dr. William D. Wolansky  
Iowa State University
October 26, 1987

Halliru M. Munir
Iowa State University
College of Education
Department of Industrial Education and Technology
Ames, Iowa 50011

Dear Mr. Munir,

In response to your letter dated October 22, 1987 requesting publications or materials relating to the administration of JTPA programs in Iowa, I am sending some of the local materials produced in Service Delivery Area 12. There are a variety of materials locally produced in each Service Delivery Area (SDA) which more accurately reflect the local policies for JTPA implementation. The materials available from the State Administrative Entity or the Department of Labor are very broad in scope and are sometimes misleading as to which services the local Private Industry Councils have authorized in each SDA.

Your request to send "any material relating to the administration of JTPA programs in Iowa" is a very broad request and I'm not sure I have given you what you need. If you have any questions or need more information please feel free to contact me at (712) 792-9914.

Carl Wilburn
Job Training Director
Region XII Council of Governments
November 10, 1987

Halliru M. Munir
Department of Industrial Education
& Technology
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa 50011

Dear Mr. Munir:

I regret that we are not in a position to participate in your investigation of the incidence of employment of persons being served by the provision of JTPA. Locally, we are devoting our full attention to the correction of major literacy issues (among other factors) which impact on our program's annual expenditure rate. Until that issue is substantially resolved, we are limiting our external commitments until further notice.

I wish you well in your study of such an important issue and trust that the study results will be beneficial planners, educators and administrators in our respective countries.

Sincerely,

Vanetta E. Rogers
Executive Director

VER:vc
Ola Anderson  
Greater Omaha Office of Employment Resources  
5002 South 33rd Street  
Omaha, NE  68107

Dear Ms. Anderson:

I am a graduate student in the Department of Industrial Education and Technology, Iowa State University. I am interested in conducting a study relating to the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) as a research project within my program of study.

Dr. Marge Harouff, the Assistant Commissioner for Vocational Education in Nebraska released to us your name as one of the Directors involved with the JTPA program in your state. Consequently, I am soliciting your participation as one of the resource persons for this study.

The purpose of the study is to investigate the incidence of employment of persons being served by the provision of JTPA and examine the nature of such employment resulting from the training. The states chosen for this study are Missouri, Nebraska and Iowa. It is hoped that the result of this study will be helpful to vocational and technology educators as well as administrators both in the U.S. and my home country, Nigeria.

I will be contacting you from time to time regarding the activities of your program. I hope this request will receive your kind consideration. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dr. William D. Wolansky  
Coordinator, International Education Programs  
Iowa State University  
(Major professor)
October 1, 1987

Halliru M. Munir  
c/o Dr. William D. Wolansky  
Coordinator, International Education Program  
College of Education - Iowa State University  
Ames, Iowa 50011

Dear Halliru,

I received your letter concerning your JTPA research project, and this agency is definitely interested in participating.

Please direct your requests for information to Mr. Gil Janssen, Program Specialist. The correct address is:

Job Training of Greater Nebraska  
941 "O" Street, Suite 500  
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

Phone No. (402) 471-3181

Sincerely,

Mollie Anderson, Director  
Job Training of Greater Nebraska

MA/JNJ/es
October 2, 1987
FL/240

Mr. Halliru M. Munir
College of Education
Department of Industrial Education and Technology
Ames, IA 50011

Dear Mr. Munir:

The Office of Employment Resources will provide assistance to your research project, as our time permits. Initial inquiries should be addressed to my attention so that you and I can coordinate the information requested.

Sincerely,

Fernando Lecuona III
Director

cc: Dr. William D. Wolansky
November 13, 1987

Halliru M. Munir
Dr. William D. Wolansky, Coordinator
International Education Programs
Dept. of Industrial Educ. & Technology
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa 50011

Dear Mr. Munir:

As you requested, I have attached for your review a copy of material from our contract Scope of Work that describes, in detail, the training programs offered in our SDA.

I will respond to your questionnaire when I receive it.

Sincerely yours,

Larry Markway,
Area Administrator

LM/syk

Enclosure
November 16, 1987

Mr. Halliru M. Munir
Iowa State University
College of Education
Department of Industrial Education and Technology
Ames, Iowa 50011

Dear Mr. Munir:

I would like to make you aware of some of the specific programs and services offered by our office:

On-Job Training (OJT) - Reimbursement to an employer of 50% of a participant's wage during training time. Employers maintain employee on their payroll after training is completed.

Customized Training - Employer specific training designed for new and/or expanding business which may consist of OJT, Vocational Training or a combination of the two.

Vocational Education - Payment of the costs of tuition, books, and/or supplies at a State approved vocational/technical school which offers marketable training programs.

Job Search - An "in-house" operated program where clients who are "employment ready" learn skills and techniques for obtaining a job.

Try-Out Employment - A program designed for in-school youth having little or no work experience. Our office pays the salary for their first 250 hours of training time with the goal of permanent employment.

Summer Work Experience - Placement of youth (ages 14-21) in non-profit agencies for summer employment. We pay their salary and provide counseling activities to assure a successful experience for both the youth and employer.
Summer Remediation - Operated in conjunction with the Summer Work Experience program, this project provides remediation activities in math and reading areas for participants assessed in-need.

In addition, we are cooperating with the St. Charles County Community College in their development of a "Learning Center" to provide a continuing remediation program.

If you have any questions, or need additional information, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Marvin G. Freeman
Executive Director
I am a graduate student in the Department of Industrial Education and Technology, Iowa State University. I am interested in conducting a study relating to the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) as a research project within my program of study.

Mr. James R. Galloway, the Assistant Superintendent in the Department of Adult Vocational and Technical Education, released to us your name as one of the persons involved with the JTPA program in the state. Consequently, I am soliciting your participation as one of the resource persons for this study.

The purpose of the study is to investigate the incidence of employment of persons being served by the provision of JTPA and examine the nature of such employment resulting from the training. The states chosen for this study are Missouri, Nebraska, Iowa and Illinois. It is hoped that the result of this study will be helpful to vocational and technology educators as well as administrators both in the U.S. and my home country, Nigeria.

I will be sending a questionnaire for you to respond to regarding the activities of JTPA in your area. Please, may I also request that you send me some materials explaining the program in detail in your area. I hope this request will receive your kind consideration. Thank you.

Sincerely,

---

Dr. William D. Wolansky
Coordinator, International Education Programs
Iowa State University
(Major professor)

Halliru M. Munir
Coordinator, International Education Programs
Iowa State University
December 2, 1987

Halliru K. Munir  
IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY  
College of Education  
DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY  
Ames, Iowa 50011

In response to your letter of inquiry, this Service Delivery Area (SDA), through its professional staff, will provide you with the necessary data to participate in your study of resultant operational data generated as a grant recipient since the inception of the Job Training Partnership Act of 1982 (JTPA).

Enclosed you will find our latest Annual Report.

Please forward your study questionnaire at your convenience.

Should you require any specific additional materials or information with regard to our program(s), please contact the undersigned at (312) 443-4740 or by mail.
December 4, 1987

Mr. Halliru M. Munir
College of Education
Department of Industrial
Education and Technology
Ames, Iowa 50011

Dear Mr. Munir:

Please find enclosed a brochure we have for the JTPA program in three counties. This may help you with your graduate work and research project.

Yes, we would be happy to respond to your questionnaire; please address it to me and I will try to give it prompt attention.

We wish you well with your study and would appreciate a copy of your final product should they be available.

Sincerely,

Tom Woodstrup
Planner

TW:ta
December 8, 1987

Halliru M. Munir
Iowa State University

Dear Mr. Munir:

Enclosed are materials explaining our program in detail per your letter addressed to Mr. Richard J. Mark.

If I can be of further assistance, feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Carol A. Davinroy, Program Planner

CAD/cad

enclosures
APPENDIX C

LETTERS OF PILOT TESTING, QUESTIONNAIRE
COVER AND JTPA PROGRAM QUESTIONNAIRE
November 5, 1987

Dear Sir/Madam:

Re: Pilot Testing of Questionnaire

I am a graduate student in the Department of Industrial Education and Technology at Iowa State University. I am interested in conducting a research study relating to the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) in partial fulfillment of the requirements for my graduate program of study. The primary purpose of this study is to investigate the incidence of employment of participants being served by the provision of JTPA and to examine the nature of such employment.

As a follow-up to my previous letter to you and based upon your willingness to participate in my study, I have enclosed a questionnaire for you to respond to. The success of this research depends on people like you. It would therefore be greatly appreciated if you would sacrifice about ten minutes of your time to complete the questionnaire. You may feel free to make some comments on the items that could improve them.

Please be informed that the responses on the questionnaire will be analyzed on a group basis and that no attempt will be made to associate responses with individuals. Please do not put your name on the questionnaire. If there is any information you may wish to know, please feel free to call me at (515) 296-7781 or (515) 294-8529. A project summary will be shared with the financial sponsor of the project, the Bureau of Area Schools of the State Department of Education.

Please, may I also request that you send me some materials explaining the program in detail in your area. It would be appreciated if you would please complete this questionnaire and mail it to me by November 12, 1987 in the enclosed self-addressed envelope. Thank you.

Sincerely,
A Note to Respondents

As a follow-up to my previous letter to you about my research study relating to the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) in partial fulfillment of the requirements for my graduate program of study, I attached a questionnaire for you to respond to. It would therefore be greatly appreciated if you would sacrifice about ten minutes of your time to complete the questionnaire. Please remember that the success of this research depends on people like you.

Please be informed that the responses on the questionnaire will be analyzed on a group basis and that no attempt will be made to associate responses with individuals. Please do not put your name on the questionnaire. If there is any information you may wish to know, please feel free to call me at (515) 296-7781 or (515) 294-8529. The primary purpose of the study is to investigate the incidence of employment of participants being served by the provision of JTPA and to examine the nature of such employment.

It would be appreciated if you would please complete this questionnaire and mail it to me by December 24, 1987, in the enclosed self-addressed envelope. Your input is very much appreciated.

[Signature]

Approved by:

Dr. William D. Wolansky
Coordinator, International Education Programs
Iowa State University
(Major professor)
Your reactions and responses about your program activities are a major component for this study. Any information provided will be held strictly confidential. Thank you.

Section A

Using the rating scale below, indicate how satisfied you were with aspects of JTPA program activities for your clients. Please circle your response.

Very satisfied . . . .5
Satisfied . . . . .4
Neutral . . . . .3
Dissatisfied . . . .2
Very Dissatisfied . .1

1. State Job-training Coordinating Council 5 4 3 2 1
2. The composition of your service delivery area (SDA) 5 4 3 2 1
3. The State organizational structure of the JTPA Agency 5 4 3 2 1
4. The Local organizational structure of the JTPA Agency 5 4 3 2 1
5. Working with Private Industry Council 5 4 3 2 1
6. Working with the business community 5 4 3 2 1
7. Funds disbursement for the program execution 5 4 3 2 1
8. Achievement of the program objectives 5 4 3 2 1
9. Appropriateness of occupational skills selected for training 5 4 3 2 1
10. Reliable assessment of the need for training of such skills 5 4 3 2 1
11. Guidance and counseling services to participants 5 4 3 2 1
12. Keeping a central record for each participant 5 4 3 2 1
13. Communication process between prospective employers or partners and your agency 5 4 3 2 1
14. Source of information about the program for prospective participants 5 4 3 2 1
15. Conducting a follow-up of graduates 5 4 3 2 1
Section B

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?
Please circle your response using the following response categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Training derived from a labor market survey

17. Program participants should be prepared for self employment

18. Development of human relations skills should be part of the training program

19. Integration of business content into the training program will be helpful to the employers

20. Many program participants would prefer to be their own bosses

21. The program provided instruction in job-related skills

22. Facilities and equipment were adequately available

23. Participants have an input in deciding the training standards

24. Qualified and appropriately experienced instructors were available to the program

25. Employers have an input in deciding the training standards

26. The percentage of clients who terminate the program before completion is very small

Section C

Please check one response below.

27. The average length of training program in all occupational skills is:
   - 0 - 3 months
   - 4 - 6 months
   - 7 - 9 months
   - 10 months or more
28. In which category does your training program develop participants' competencies?
   ___ job-specific
   ___ cluster of skills
   ___ basic skills
   ___ other (please specify___________________________)

29. What delivery system did you adapt in conducting the program?
   ___ community based organization
   ___ educational agency
   ___ training center
   ___ other (please specify___________________________)

30. Enrollment in the program by participants since its inception has
   ___ increased substantially
   ___ decreased drastically
   ___ stayed static
   ___ fluctuates from time to time

31. What is the average rate of unemployment in your SDA for the most recent twelve months?
   ___ 4% or less
   ___ 5 - 8%
   ___ 9 - 12%
   ___ 13% or more

32. How willing are employers to hire your trainees?
   ___ very willing
   ___ just willing
   ___ reluctant
   ___ not willing

33. What percent of trainees get a job after training is completed?
   ___ 0 - 25%
   ___ 26 - 50%
   ___ 51 - 75%
   ___ 76% or more

34. What would be the average weekly wage participants start with immediately after training?
   ___ $100 - 150
   ___ $151 - 200
   ___ $201 - 250
   ___ $251 or more

35. How long does it take to get a job for most trainees after training is completed?
   ___ 0 - 2 weeks
   ___ 3 - 4 weeks
   ___ 5 - 6 weeks
   ___ 7 or more weeks
36. How industrialized is your SDA?
   _____ heavily industrialized
   _____ moderately industrialized
   _____ fairly industrialized
   _____ not industrialized

37. Who, among the following categories, constitutes most of your trainees?
   _____ economically disadvantaged youth
   _____ economically disadvantaged adults
   _____ dislocated workers
   _____ other (please specify)

38. The predominant educational level of the participants is:
   _____ elementary
   _____ junior high or middle school
   _____ senior high school
   _____ college

39. The age category within which most participants fall is:
   _____ 16 - 21 years
   _____ 22 - 27 years
   _____ 28 - 33 years
   _____ 34 years and over

40. Program participants gender:
   _____ % male
   _____ % female

41. The ratio of selected participants to eligible populations: 1: _____ ratio

42. Your sex: _____ Male _____ Female

43. The educational level you have attained:
   _____ Ph.D.
   _____ M.S./M.A.
   _____ B.S./B.A.
   _____ Other (please specify)

44. How much previous experience did you have in training program projects similar to JTPA?
   _____ 1 - 5 years
   _____ 6 - 10 years
   _____ 11 - 15 years
   _____ 16 years or more

THANK YOU
APPENDIX D.

LETTER OF NOTICE OF CHANGE TO MY THESIS
525 Pammel Court  
Ames, IA 50010  

April 14, 1988  

To: The Chairman  
Human Subject Review Committee  
201 Beardshear  

Through: Dr. William D. Wolansky  
(Major Professor)  
Department Of Industrial Education & Technology  

Dear Sir,  

Notice of change on my Thesis  

This is to inform you that a change of procedure for my study with regard to the subjects, was recommended by my P.O.S. Committee and effected accordingly. The change allowed me to deal with the directors of the program (i.e. JTPA) concerned with my study instead of the participants.  

The change became necessary because of insufficient and inadequate information to contact the participants directly, due to their characteristic nature. The new title of my thesis is given below.  

AN ANALYSIS OF THE FACTORS INFLUENCING JOB PLACEMENT UNDER THE JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT PROGRAM (JTPA) IN THE SERVICE DELIVERY AREAS OF MISSOURI, NEBRASKA, ILLINOIS AND IOWA.  

I am sorry for my inability to bring this notice to you much earlier. Thank you.  

Habiru M. Mumin