7-10-1970

Retraining Efforts and Labor Force Status: Differential Effects of Selected Demographic Variables

John Terry Abrahamson

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO 87106

Policy on Use of Theses and Dissertations

Unpublished theses and dissertations accepted for master's and doctor's degrees and deposited in the University of New Mexico Library are open to the public for inspection and reference work. *They are to be used only with due regard to the rights of the authors.* The work of other authors should always be given full credit. Avoid quoting in amounts, over and beyond scholarly needs, such as might impair or destroy the property rights and financial benefits of another author.

To afford reasonable safeguards to authors, and consistent with the above principles, anyone quoting from theses and dissertations must observe the following conditions:

1. Direct quotations during the first two years after completion may be made only with the written permission of the author.

2. After a lapse of two years, theses and dissertations may be quoted without specific prior permission in works of original scholarship provided appropriate credit is given in the case of each quotation.

3. Quotations that are complete units in themselves (e.g., complete chapters or sections) in whatever form they may be reproduced and quotations of whatever length presented as primary material for their own sake (as in anthologies or books of readings) ALWAYS require consent of the authors.

4. The quoting author is responsible for determining "fair use" of material he uses.

This thesis/dissertation by John Terry Abrahamson has been used by the following persons whose signatures attest their acceptance of the above conditions. (A library which borrows this thesis/dissertation for use by its patrons is expected to secure the signature of each user.)

NAME AND ADDRESS	DATE
S. P. Wolff, Indiana University Southeast, New Albany, Ind.	11/7/23

Oct. 1968—1,000—GS

This dissertation, directed and approved by the candidate's committee, has been accepted by the Graduate Committee of The University of New Mexico in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in Education

RETRAINING EFFORTS AND LABOR FORCE STATUS:
DIFFERENTIAL EFFECTS OF SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Title

John Terry Abrahamson

Candidate

Educational Foundations

Department

David T. Bushnell

Dean

July 10, 1970

Date

Committee

D. N. Baerlein

Chairman

Joseph J. Fashing

Richard M. Gorman

Alberto Vargas

RETRAINING EFFORTS AND LABOR FORCE STATUS: DIFFERENTIAL EFFECTS OF SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

BY
JOHN TERRY ABRAHAMSON
B.S., University of Oregon, 1961
M.A.T., Reed College, 1965

DISSERTATION

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Education
in the Graduate School of
The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico
July 1970

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The data for this study were provided with the consent of Mr. Eldon Cone, Director, Oregon State Employment Service and Mr. Wesley E. Zellner, Director, Research and Statistics. Both units are divisions of the Oregon State Department of Employment. They placed no restriction on the use of the data except the legally required one that it be provided in such a manner that individuals could not possibly be identified. Those who have attempted to obtain government data for research purposes can appreciate their willingness to co-operate. Of course, they are not responsible for conclusions made or for possible errors in presentation or interpretation.

Dissertation Committee members were Professors David L. Bachelor (Chairman), Joseph J. Fashing, Richard M. Gorman and Albert W. Vogel. All were both patient and helpful. A special note of appreciation is extended to Professor Bachelor whose time and assistance were given far in excess of what is normally expected even of one's major professor.

RETRAINING EFFORTS AND LABOR FORCE STATUS: DIFFERENTIAL EFFECTS OF SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

BY
John Terry Abrahamson

ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in Education
in the Graduate School of
The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico
July 1970

RETRAINING EFFORTS AND LABOR FORCE STATUS: DIFFERENTIAL EFFECTS OF SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

John Terry Abrahamson, Ph.D.
Department of Educational Foundations
The University of New Mexico, 1970

The Manpower Development and Training Act (M.D.T.A.) is the largest and one of the oldest of the federal manpower programs. This study is of the M.D.T.A. experience in one state during a one and one-half year period. The sample was limited to those who completed institutional type training programs.

Data used were collected in the normal process of program operation and included characteristics of trainees, individual trainee termination information and the post-training report one year after completion of training. The problem was to create sets of relationships, of both theoretical and practical significance, between pre-training characteristics of trainees and post-training Labor Force Status (the criteria variable) which included the categories of Employed, Unemployed and Not in Labor Force. The various training projects were treated as constant.

The total N was 1197. The effective N was restricted to the 919 for whom complete follow-up data were obtained. Over 50 variables were initially considered. Final selection of variables for further analysis was determined by the use of techniques of theoretical, rather than statistical, sampling. Elaboration was in the form of multivariate cross-tabulation with particular attention given to deviant cases.

Selected independent variables were Sex, Age, and Grades Completed. They were also treated against each other as intervening variables in addition to Marital Status, Prior Labor Force Status, Years Employed and Public Assistance Status. Males were found to be more sensitive than Females to the influences of intervening variants in each Labor Force Status. Age Group categories were compliant, indicating that Age, alone, is not a strong determining factor in post-training employment experience. Although differences in employment success were found by Age Group, whichever group was considered, there was an averaging effect when partitioned with other variables. Grades Completed were strong and consistent indicators of the dependent variable. Only the Prior Employed category of Prior Labor Force Status was shown to be a stronger indicator of post-training Labor Force Status.

Those intervening categories maintaining consistently high rates across all categories of each independent variable were then examined together within each category of the dependent variable Labor Force Status. High Employed rates were most consistently represented by 13 or More Grades Completed, Marital Status of Other (divorced or widowed), 3-9 Years Previous Employment and Prior Labor Force Status of Employed. The variants best indicating high Unemployed rates across all categories of the independent variables were 0-8 Grades Completed, 40-49 Age, Public Assistance Recipients and 10 or More Years of Employment. In all cases, Females were less affected than Males. Labor force dropout (Not in Labor Force) was associated with Reentrants to the labor force, Under 2 Years of Employment, 17-

19 Age and Single Marital Status.

Deviations existed within some of the categorizations, however, the resultant groupings were speculatively shown to posses common within-group traits. These commonalities were discussed in terms of opportunity structures, labor force marginality and interaction effects.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The Human Resources Paradox

In the United States there is an annoyingly persistent unemployment problem, yet there are segments of the economy that exhibit labor scarcities.[1] Manpower needs and resources involve the two-way channeling of supply and demand. In this case, one way involves the demand for skills by employers in the market place and the other way, the supply, necessitates matching available trained individuals to fill the variety of specific demand situations.

This alone is a herculean task, but the special problem to be considered here is the critical imbalance that exists in the qualitative characteristics of these two major factors. The imbalance results from requirements of employers on the demand side and the level of qualifications or skill level of workers on the supply side.

There is a gap between the supply and demand for skilled labor and available evidence indicates that the gap is not closing, either in quantitative or qualitative terms.[2] The much discussed technological revolution, or evolution if one prefers, will undoubtedly keep increasing pressure on many workers to increase or adapt skills even in an era of improved training and educational

---

[1]U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Report of the President and A Report on Manpower Requirements, Resources, Utilization and Training (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 3.

[2]Ibid.

opportunities at the entry levels.

Certain segments of the population are known to be substantially less prepared to compete for available jobs, or even to train for them, for a variety of reasons. Heavier concentration of training needs seem to exist, for instance, among the categories of educationally deficient, handicapped, long term unemployed, certain ethnic minority groups, poverty striken families and impoverished youth.

Federal Legislation

The first of the new programs designed to deal specifically with this problem was the Area Redevelopment Act (A.R.A.) of 1961. Its several provisions included one for job training. Unfortunately, its provisions limited training to geographic areas classified as economically depressed, thereby eliminating service to the many unemployed workers in areas with relatively high employment rates.

The program was used as inducement to bring new industries to those areas by training workers for particular employers. Choice and appropriateness for an individual worker would obviously be limited in such a situation, especially for those people difficult to employ. Those with the most potential would be taken first, leaving the more serious unemployment problems unattended even in areas where the A.R.A. was operationalized. However, the A.R.A. experience did help to clarify the nature of these and related problems.

The A.R.A. was followed by the Manpower Development and

Training Act (M.D.T.A.) of 1962. It was revised in 1965 and 1966. One of the changes was the incorporation of the job training provision of the A.R.A. This became section 241 of the M.D.T.A. and continues to serve essentially the same function as previously.

A number of programs have followed. Of particular note are the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the various sections of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, including the Job Corps, Work Training and Work Study, Adult Education, the Migrant Labor and Work Experience sections of the act and V.I.S.T.A. Each of the statutes was enacted to do a particular job and apply to a specific segment of the society. None was intended to replace the others. The Economic Opportunity Act (Public Law 88-452), for example, is specifically designed to apply to the poor people of America; to the poverty pockets in communities; and to the creation of sheltered employment opportunities by Federal-community action and funding.

The broad objectives of the original M.D.T.A. were: 1. To determine the skill requirements of the economy. 2. To promote and encourage the development of broad and diversified training programs. 3. To qualify for employment the many persons who could not reasonably be expected to secure full time employment without such training. 4. To equip the nation's workers with the new and improved skills which are or will be required.

The 1965 ammendments to the M.D.T.A. primarily affected the nature of funding relationships between the states and the Federal government, training allowance expansion, refresher courses for professionals and, as previously mentioned, the incorporation of the

training portion of the A.R.A. In 1966, however, formal recognition was given to the problem of: "The emergence of selected skill shortages that accompany declining unemployment and the residual pockets of hard-core unemployment levels."[3] The general trend in legislation, then, has been an expansion of responsibility for manpower training.

> In effect, an emergency recession measure designed to provide technologically displaced, experienced, family heads with subsistence while they acquired new skills through either state operated vocational schools or private on-the-job training in order to fill existing job vacancies has become a permanent, wide ranging, primarily federally financed and directed program, though with less clearly defined objectives than the original bill. Currently, the emphasis is on assisting those with a wide variety of disadvantages to become effective competitors in the labor market. However, the professional refresher and part-time upgrading components and the rhetoric of alleviating labor shortages indicate a trend toward a general-purpose, remedial, out-of-school training program.[4] (Emphasis added)

At the national level the M.D.T.A. is the joint responsibility of the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (H.E.W.). The division of responsibilities is reflected, organizationally, at the regional, state and local levels. At the state level the corresponding agencies are the Departments of Employment (or Employment Security) and of Education. Locally, the Employment Service offices and the training agency are the final links in the hierarchical chain. At all levels there are Manpower Advisory Committees with membership representing labor,

---

[3]U.S., Congress, House, Committee on Education and Labor, Select Subcommittee on Labor, M.D.T.A. Amendments of 1966, Hearings on H.R. 14690, 89 Cong., 2nd Sess., 1966, p. 61.

[4]Garth L. Mangum, MDTA: Foundation of Federal Manpower Policy, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1968), p. 39.

employers, education, government and the public-at-large.

The Department of Labor has responsibility for determining training needs in the labor market, identification of elgible trainees, payment of allowances, supervision of on-the-job training, research and data gathering, guidance services (sometimes additional guidance services are provided by the training institution) and placement service for trainees after completion of training. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare is authorized to contract for training with educational institutions and approves curriculum. Although general policy is set at the federal level, specific operationalization is initiated at the state level with federal approval of state proposals, although states are now autonomous with programs costing under $10,000 and for individual trainees referred to established non-M.D.T.A. initiated programs.

Funding is authorized by Congress and is distributed to the states on a population basis with preferential bias for states with particularly large proportions of disadvantaged or minority groups. Areas with high unemployment rates obtain additional help through the Rural Area Redevelopment provision (the original A.R.A.).

There are two basic types of training available under the M.D.T.A., institutional (classroom) and on-the-job (O.J.T.). Cumulative national enrollment for fiscal years 1963 through 1968 was 713,400 and 321,000 respectively for a total of 1,034,400 with a total budget of approximately $1.3 billion.[5] Over 600,000 of those

---

[5]U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Education and Training, 1969, v. 7, Tables A-2 (p. 69), B-2 (p. 71), and B-10 (p. 81).

enrolled completed training.[6] The ratio of enrollees, however, is not indicative of more recent policy. In fiscal year 1968, for instance, there were 140,000 institutional and 125,000 O.J.T. enrollees reflecting a proportionately increasing interest in the latter type of training.

Until 1967, O.J.T. was co-ordinated by the Bureau of Apprenticeship Training, a division of the Department of Labor. Since then it has been controlled by the Bureau of Work Training Programs. In both cases the effect has been to lessen state level influence in that type of training program. Institutional training, however, is coordinated by state level agencies. Approximately 40% of the O.J.T. projects are coupled programs where the two types of training are combined.[7]

Trainees may be referred to M.D.T.A. training from a variety of sources, including agencies other than the Employment Services such as Welfare, Economic Opportunity Centers and other on-going training programs. Commonly, however, the local Employment Service office identifies potential trainees from their own files and, increasingly, through community recruitment included in such programs as Neighborhood Service Centers, Special Impact, Concentrated Employment and Concerted Services Programs, Youth Opportunity Centers and the Human Resources Development Program. All of these attempt to reach into disadvantaged areas and distribute information and services

---

[6] Ibid., p. 1.

[7] Ibid.

concerning employment and training opportunities along with whatever other responsibilities that might be involved. One effect has been to shift the emphasis in the Employment Services from an employer-oriented screening agency to an applicant-oriented organization developing the potential of individuals. In this framework, testing and counseling continue to be important functions.

Testing is designed to identify occupational interest and levels of attainment and aptitude in the basic skills. Once eligibility for training has been determined, it must be decided whether or not education in basic skills will be required to bring the referral up to a level to be able to function in, and benefit from, a regular training program. Usually a potential skill training program is identified as appropriate but that is no longer an absolute requirement. Basic education is recognized as a valuable end in its own right in helping a person become more employable. If basic education is determined as unnecessary for the identified skill training program, the referral is placed directly in training. If labor market demand is not sufficient to warrant a class size program, the individual may be referred to a continuing program in a public institution such as a community college or to a private training school. Private schools are also sometimes contracted to do training for class size M.D.T.A. groups if their equipment and curriculum are adequate and if their costs are competitive with public institutions.

Throughout the process, counseling services are provided. This service may range from formal information dissemination to personal problems and from initial contact through post-training job seeking.

Nationally, training covers an extraordinarily wide range of occupations, including some in all of the nine major categories of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles.

> In 1968, three of the nine major occupational groups each accounted for about one-fifth of the trainees - clerical and sales (20 percent), machine occupations (22 percent), and structural occupations (18 percent). Most of the remaining trainees were prepared for professional, technical, and managerial work or for the service occupations...[8]

Individual occupational titles would probably number into the hundreds although distribution of types of training would vary from one area to another depending on such factors as urban concentration, industrial base and economic growth.

The Concept of Labor Force Status

Labor force status is now a rather commonly used term but its implications and meaning are certainly of uncommon importance.

> For the individual his (or her) labor force status is one of the major influences on his entire way of life. And it is not just economic well-being that is involved. The importance of a job to a person's status and sense of personal identity has been stressed by many people writing about many different kinds of societies.[9]

Labor force status is a derived concept that depends upon the definitions given to the categories of employed and unemployed and the residual category of not-in-the-labor-force. Specific definitions will be given later, but it should be emphasized that these categories

---

[8] Ibid.

[9] William G. Bowen and T. Aldrich Finegan, The Economics of Labor Force Participation (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969), p. 3.

are not always clear cut. For instance, is a person working without pay in the labor force?, is a person working less than a certain number of hours a week unemployed?, is a person who wants a job but not actively seeking one in the labor force and unemployed or not in the labor force at all?, should the labor force concept be limited to the market sector of the economy?, etc.[10] The list could be expanded almost indefinately.

How solidly one is attached to the labor force has consequences relating to one's income, amount of leisure and its use, availability of fringe benefits such as employment security, potential retirement income and health care not to mention mental health and attitude towards, and selection of, one's reference groups and society as a whole. Each of these factors, and others, may vary in their intensity for different groups within each category of labor force status. Whatever classification or demographic schemes and breakdowns used, labor force status seems to be an important point of focus in a man's everyday life as well as being a correlate of many structural elements in society that are beyond the individual's ability to effectively control.

The Literature on Manpower and Education

There are a number of organizations involved in manpower research, including the educational aspects. Among them are the Office

---

[10]A. J. Jaffe and Charles D. Stewart, "The Rationale of Current Labor Force Measurement," in Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Morris Rosenberg, The Language of Social Research (New York: The Free Press, 1955).

of Manpower Administration; Office of Manpower, Automation and Training; Bureau of Labor Statistics; and the Office of Manpower Policy, Education and Research - all divisions of the United States Department of Labor. The Bureau of the Census of the United States Department of Commerce and the Office of Education of the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, especially the Division of Vocational and Technical Education, are sources of statistics and monographs as is the National Manpower Council. The United Nation's Education, Social and Cultural Organization's International Institute for Educational Planning is also very active in the field.

Many universities have various types of institutes and research projects involved in educational planning and manpower needs. The base for these operations range from Colleges of Education and Schools of Business Administration to special institutes and projects funded almost entirely by the federal govenment.

Levels of interest range from local to international and include such topics as labor supply, employment trends, automation and its effects, economic growth, manpower needs, population and demographic research, guidelines for specific occupational training and broad educational planning. Much investigation has been directed at certain occupational categories such as military manpower policy, health services, clerical, technical and professional as well as more general inquiries such as education for social and economic development.

There is, then, certainly no lack of statistics and basic

information on the general subject of manpower and education. Although some journals, especially scholarly ones, have a relatively high proportion of historical materials, most current research centers on cost-benefit analysis and surveys of labor market areas, especially at the local level.[11] There is an amazing lack of sociological analysis even though the basic research data are available. Consider this rather typical qualifying statement: "No studies by sociologists or psychologists are included, although the abundance of statistics should be very useful..."[12]

Possibly one of the reasons for the prevalence of descriptive statistics and the lack of explanatory paradigms is the nature of the data available. Tables already composed do not lend themselves to manipulation of categories that would be necessary to go beyond simple description to investigation of interesting variations in the data. The Department of Labor recognizes this situation. "...it has become apparent that there is growing need for more practitioners and research specialists in the manpower field...Knowledge and insights far beyond those yet provided by manpower research are required for effective action..."[13] The release of basic data in a useable research form by government agencies, as is the case in this study, is a much

---

[11]See, for instance, U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Manpower Research Projects (Through June 30, 1968).

[12]U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Equal Employment Opportunity, Report No. 1, 1966, p. 7.

[13]U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Report of the President and A Report on Manpower Requirements, Resources, Utilization and Training, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, v. 7, 1966), p. 7.

needed service.

Much current social research uses standard methods of a single discipline, for instance, economics. A particular method of investigation often places a limitation on types of problems chosen for study and the specific questions to be answered. Consequently, the variables used in such research tend to represent a narrow spectrum of the data available.

This is not necessarily detrimental in the short run. Such specialized investigation has confirmed a number of correlates that have been relied upon by researchers to a great extent and thereby used as basis for more complex analysis and for guidance in program operation. For instance, it seems well established that there is correlation between such variables as race and years of schooling with employment success.

The techniques of regression and factor analysis will yield this sort of information. What is not gained by such powerful statistical techniques is insight into how such situations are possibly vitiated by other variables and how exceptional cases can be theoretically integrated with verified correlates. Methodology cannot be separated from discussion of the type of knowledge yielded. This study is the first on manpower programs to use the total complex of methods discussed in Chapter II.

Educational Implications

One of the problems of evaluating public school programs is the lack of agreed upon criteria variables. Education for citizenship is mentioned but, except for negative connotations such as crime

rates, it is probably not possible to quantify. Any sociologist or professional educator knows that degree of academic success does not necessarily correlate significantly with later vocational or professional success. The result is confusion about both ends and means of general education programs. Undoubtedly, part of the problem is the heterogeneity of the clientele served. With rather standarized curriculum and methods it is unlikely that all will be served equally well by whatever criteria chosen.

Another situation is also quite clear. A large portion of the school population do not perceive of school as being in their best interest and drop out. Many others, who do complete public schooling, are not prepared for work. Those who are prepared, or believe themselves to be prepared, sometimes find their skills antiquated within a few years. The problem, then, is not limited to any single age group or level of work skill. The extent and persistency of the unemployment problem, especially as it relates to specific sub-groups in society, indicates a need for a readjustment mechanism that is more effective than those now available. This does not necessarily imply that the schools, overall, are failures or that the traditional agencies of transition from school to work such as the military and labor unions do not still serve useful functions. It is implied that they are no longer adequate alone.

The various manpower programs have been designed to fill the gaps by providing needed services to those not able, for various reasons, to benefit from previously existing programs. The current manpower programs do, indeed, "indicate a trend toward a general-

purpose, remedial, out-of-school training program."[14] It is potentially a new, strong educational force for America.

Data: Source and Description

The data used in this study were collected and coded by the Research and Statistics Division and the Oregon State Employment Service, both of which are divisions of the Oregon State Department of Employment, as part of the regular, on-going operation of the M.D.T.A. program. The format of the data collection instruments are standardized by the U.S. Department of Labor and the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. They are used for all M.D.T.A. programs nationally. Data were provided the investigator in such form that individual trainees were not identifiable. This is in conformance with Federal and state regulations. The forms referred to below are shown in the appendix.

Form MT-101, Characteristics of Trainees, is prepared when eligibility for training has been determined. The individual may or may not accept actual referral and if referral is accepted he may not, for various personal reasons, enroll in a program.

Form MT-102, Individual Trainee Termination Report, is prepared at the end of all training. If a trainee is first enrolled in basic education and then is referred to a regular training program, the form is completed at the last stage of training. This is done whether or not the program is completed by the trainee.

---

[14]Mangum, op. cit.

Form MT-103, Post Training Report, is filed only for those who complete training or achieve the objectives of the course prior to formal completion of the program in which enrolled. There are three Post Training Reports, three months, six months and twelve months after completion of training. Information is current as of the reference week, that is, the week in which the data are collected. Since the information is cumulative, only the twelve month follow-up reports are used in the analysis.

The data were obtained for this study in January 1969 and includes those projects for which all post training reports had been received at that time. Projects for one full fiscal year were desired. Since training may last for over a year and another year is required for the final follow-up report, 1966 is the full fiscal year included. Also included are those 1967 fiscal year projects that were completed in time for final reports to be submitted by the date the data were received.

The population studied here includes only those who completed institutional training. Those who do not complete training are not followed up. Institutional training was chosen for two major reasons. First, on-the-job training has such different characteristics from institutional training that it would require a complete analysis of its own. A comparison of the two types of training with the methods used in this study could be efficiently done only after they are analyzed individually. Second, major program responsibility for O.J.T. is now with the Bureau of Work Training Programs, a federal agency. Communication between it and the State Employment Service

seems to be such that records and reports are delayed in arriving at their destination. Consequently, the data for 1966 and 1967 fiscal year O.J.T. projects were woefully incomplete at the time of receipt of the data decks.

For institutional trainees who completed training for fiscal year 1966 and partial fiscal year 1967, N=1197. Forms MT 101, 102 and 103 were submitted for the total N, however, the MT-103, which shows labor force status one year after completion of training, has complete data for 919. The difference represents the number of completers who could not be located. Most of the data tables, therefore, reflect the lower figure. On occasion, slight variations exist. These minor inconsistencies could be due to lack of data on an individual for a particular variable or error in data transfer.

Summary Statement of the Problem Investigated

Manpower training programs are increasingly becoming an educational, remedial and training force for the social readjustment of large numbers of people. In this study, data that are available and considered pertinent in a variety of previous research have been used to study relationships between the several indices. Labor Force Status is the major criteria variable used to measure effectiveness of training programs among comparison groups internal to those programs. The training program is treated as a constant, the assumption being that testing for aptitude and interest prior to individual trainee referral, as related to the study's sample size, has an averaging effect on the criteria variable. This assumption is explicitly

controlled to the extent that only those who completed training are included.

Special attention is given to those categories of trainees who exhibited comparatively greater or lesser success as indicated by labor force status one year after completion of an institutional type training program operated under the auspices of the Manpower Development and Training Act. This program was chosen because it is the largest, in cost and number of trainees, the oldest and most established program of its type. The relationship of individual variables with the criteria variable are first examined. The most fruitful ones are chosen for multivariate elaboration. They are held constant in order to study the effects of additional variables, especially in terms of mitigating or aggravating the observed deviance from mean rates of the overall sample. Clusters of variables so treated, core categories, are then integrated by examining underlying consistencies and inconsistencies in order to create a paradigm useful for program guidance as well as for obtaining a proportioned view of a variety of evidence on a type of social behavior. Detailed explanation of methodological techniques are in the next chapter.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

Introductory Remarks

Paradigms for explaining observations of the social world are often characterized as belonging to one side or the other of a theoretical-empirical dichotomy. Theory appears to be most often a set of logical-deductive postulates from which hypotheses are generated and then tested, by various methods, for validity. Often, it is asserted, the verification, if attempted at all, is data forced to the theoretical mold and therefore not likely to be of much value to the applied areas of social science and education.

Empirical investigation, conversely, seems to have a reputation for dealing with trivial and rather obvious social facts for which no guidelines exist for assessing the importance of one observation against another nor for generalized significance of the observations in the substantive area investigated.[1] It is an assumption of the present study that this is a false dichotomy which exists because of confusion concerning the relationship of theory and methodology and because of the traditional methods of dividing the social-scientific enterprise into portions that are convenient for research purposes. Since they are not separate concerns, brief comments on

---

[1]For a well known extended discussion of these topics, see Robert K. Merton, Chapter II, "The Bearing of Sociological Theory on Empirical Research," and Chapter III, "The Bearing of Empirical Research on Sociological Theory," in Social Theory and Social Structure (New York: The Free Press, 1957).

these two points are warranted.

Theory Generation

In order to test hypotheses, one must first identify them. They are usually obtained from the theoretical model. But, where does the researcher obtain the paradigm in the first place? Usually a pre-existing theory, or combination of theories, is identified and then elaborated upon to create the needed hypotheses. This could take the form, for instance, of shifting an existing theory to a different substantive area of inquiry. The theory is subsequently partially validated or modified according to the results of the verificational process through testing of the hypotheses.

The task of originally creating the theory could take several forms including, most likely, the previously implied logical construct approach or, less likely, through the accumulation of empirical evidence. In any case, the argument here is that a continuum of activity exists in the research process with theory standing in the middle. On the one side it is approached, but seldom reached, through logic-deductive constructs and on the other side it is taken as it exists and is then used as the foundation for verificational research activity. One way to overcome the problem of theory usefulness and relevancy would be to approach data with the express purpose of creating or generating theory or explanatory paradigms. This should be considered a continuing process, since the investigator will not always be able to tell in advance the amount of data needed to adequately close enough gaps in the construct.

Initial Decisions and Theoretical Sampling

Approaching an explanatory construct without reliance on previous existing paradigms involves many practical problems, not the least of which is justification of initial decisions. Essentially, it is the "...operation of selecting out from the seamless web of social reality that which is theoretically significant and socially meaningful for research and for relationships to other researchable variables."[2]

Whether it is called "sociological imagination" after C. Wright Mills, the "sympathetic introspection" of Charles H. Cooley or "theoretical sampling" as by Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss, a central problem is that of data selection, especially in the early stages of the research. We will use the term "theoretical sampling" because it more directly implies the relationships between comparative analysis of variables as controlled by emerging theory and contrasts with the assumptions of statistical sampling used in the verificational processes.

Lazarsfeld and Barton state the problem in the following way. "...the researcher will be faced by an array of raw data for which theoretical categories will not exist. He must formulate categories before he can do anything else. Probably the best way to start is with fairly concrete categories - the sort of categories which experienced policy makers or participants in the situation use, worked

---

[2]Arnold M. Rose, "Varieties of Sociological Imagination," American Sociological Review, V. 34, No. 5, October, 1969, p. 623.

out in as clear and logical form as possible."[3] Glaser and Strauss concur. "The initial decisions for theoretical collection of data are based only on a general sociological perspective and on a general subject or problem area..."[4]

In this study, manpower training has been selected as the subject area with Labor Force Status as the major criteria component. The research effort is directed towards identifying those elements, at various levels of conceptualization, that contribute to labor force status persistency or lack of persistency. Using a rather extensive range of variables, they are each cross-tabulated with post-training Labor Force Status. The consistencies and relationships that emerge from each two-way comparison is adequate to begin the process of selecting out and further comparing theoretically relevant categories in order to identify more complex core indicies. Glaser and Strauss, who explicated the technique of theoretical sampling as applied to comparative analysis, state the purpose in the following manner: "Theoretical sampling is done in order to discover categories and their properties, and to suggest the interrelationships into a theory."[5] They go on to say, "Statistical sampling is done to obtain accurate evidence on distributions of people among categories to be

---

[3]Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Allen H. Barton, "Some Principles of Questionnaire Classification," The Language of Social Research, eds. Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Morris Rosenberg (New York: The Free Press, 1955), p. 84.

[4]Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss, The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967), p. 45.

[5]Ibid., p. 62.

used in descriptions or verifications...the researcher who generates theory need not combine random sampling and theoretical sampling when setting forth relationships among categories and properties."[6]

Relaxation of Rules of Verification

This last statement is deserving of some elaboration. Theoretical sampling differs from statistical sampling in several fundamental ways. As previously implied, concepts and hypotheses are developed from the data. "...one generates conceptual categories or their properties from evidence; then the evidence from which the category emerged is used to illustrate the concept."[7] In statistical verification, the hypotheses must exist prior to the investigation. The purpose of theory generation is to create constructs in the form of conceptual categories and their properties. Hypotheses and generalized relations are worked out concomitantly.

Representativeness of the sample is not a central concern in this type of study. Direction of relationships, not the strength of relationships, is of primary importance. "...the direction of a relationship used to suggest a hypothesis is assumed to exist until disproved, in both biased and unbiased populations."[8] Largely for the same reason, the regulations concerning accuracy of evidence in verificational studies can be relaxed. It is the conceptual category

---

[6] Ibid., pp. 62-63.

[7] Ibid., p. 23.

[8] Ibid., p. 189.

and not specific facts which generated it that are of concern. It follows, then that the number of cases (sample size) required is not so pertinent. "A single case can indicate a general conceptual category or property; a few more cases can confirm the indication."[9] We are attempting to develop concepts as indicated by data that can stand apart from the data that generated it.

The purpose of relaxing otherwise commonly accepted strictures on data analysis is to expand the possibilities for identifying theoretically significant relationships. These may then be relevant to social scientists and practitioners in a variety of circumstances whether or not specific descriptions eventually become inaccurate for a research population.

Comparative Method

The general historical, statistical and experimental methods all use the logic of comparison to develop data. Our use of comparison as method involves the constant comparison of categories in order to develop emerging theory and to further aid in selection of groups for continued comparison as it is needed to saturate core categories and give them adequate depth. There is no clear cut rule to stop this process of continuing elaboration. Essentially, one must judge that further elaboration does not add significantly more relevance or insight.

In making comparisons, groups are often obtained from various

---

[9] Ibid., p. 30.

types of situations such as cross-cultural or cross-organizational. However, one can also create groups for purposes of comparison. Glaser and Strauss comment: "...only a handfull of survey researchers have used their skill to create multiple comparison sub-groups for discovering theory. This would be a very worthwhile endeavor."[10] Grouping has been done in this study by analyzing and comparing different categories of each cross-tabulated variable and by elaborating upon them with additional variables and their categories. Those categories exhibiting unexpected or inconsistent traits were given particular attention. Elaboration analysis and deviant case analysis, then, are two additional techniques (with theoretical sampling) used within the framework of the general comparative method.

Elaboration Analysis

Elaboration analysis allows the researcher to consider the effect of further variables. For instance, if variables x and y are subjected to cross-break analysis (partitioning) and variable t is introduced, one can ascertain whether or not the relationship xy is similiar to or different from xt or ty. In effect, the categories of variable t are held constant to discover if there is an intervening effect on xy.[11] If differences are minimal, we can determine the conditions under which a category exists and if differences are

---

[10] Ibid., p. 53.

[11] For a more extended discussion of this concept see, Paul Lazarsfeld, "Interpretation of Statistical Relations as a Research Operation," The Language of Social Research, op. cit.

maximized we can note how the categories and their properties are varied by diverse conditions.

Deviant Case Analysis

"...through deviant case analysis the researcher is able to uncover relevant additional factors which had not previously been considered."[12] Because of the complexity of human behavior, it is not possible to use all existing factors in creating an explanatory paradigm. In fact, it would be ludicrous to include all available data. The basic purpose of theory is to explain phenomena in as simple terms as reasonable, otherwise the complexity approaches that of the social world itself and little is gained in terms of explanatory efficiency.

Deviant case analysis can help identify those factors that deserve special attention in order for the model to realistically conform to actual observation of the data. In this way those cases not conforming to the expected pattern as indicated by emerging concepts will become a help in refining those concepts rather than being an embarrassing hinderence as is so often the case in verificational studies. The explanation of deviant cases can also help us judge the adequacy of the depth or break-down of the identified core categories.

---

[12]Patricia L. Kendall and Katherine M. Wolf, "The Two Purposes of Deviant Case Analysis," The Language of Social Research, op. cit., p. 167.

Secondary Analysis

Some readers may have doubts about the suitability of the use of previously collected data for sociological and educational research. Actually, existing data is an important and acceptable source of potential research data. Bureaucratic organizations have the time, manpower and resources for data collection that generally is not available to the individual researcher. The use of such data is called secondary analysis, that is, the research use is not the same as was originally intended for the data.[13] Certainly, for verificational studies in general, the use of such data should properly be questioned and for experimental studies in particular, by current definitions, it could not be used.[14] However, for generating purposes, several advantages accrue, including; shifting attention from collection to analysis and theory generation, less dependence on previously conceived hypotheses and more variety and larger quantities of data than might otherwise be possible.

The influence of *a priori* conceptualization, so often overlooked in behavioral research, is at least partially avoided because most hypotheses and concepts are derived from the data itself. "Theory based on data cannot usually be completely refuted by more data or

---

[13]As will be discussed, the data used in this study were, in fact, originally created for research purposes, however, it has not previously been analyzed with the combination of methods used here.

[14]However, theoretically, it would be possible to combine sampling and randomness required for the use of more powerful inferential statistics with *ex post facto* situations. It would be useful to pursue this possibility within the framework of the comparative method advocated in this study.

replaced by another theory. Since it is too intimately linked to data, it is destined to last despite its inevitable modification and reformulation."[15]

Another writer has succinctly summarized the basic questions involved:

> The task of selecting variables relevant to important aspects of social life is a task of recognition, to which the social scientist must be sensitized. He is not likely to be sensitized to this task by learning statistical techniques, no matter how sophisticated...The main problem is the selection of proper objects of study, those that are at the same time socially significant, traceable and theoretically pregnant...Preconceived notions (be they Utopian or pragmatic) are rooted in antiquated social philosophies and pervaded with parochial values generated by those philosophies and by the accidents of particular historical experience. Preoccupation with change must be coupled with an emancipation from preconceived notions.[16]

It might be argued that the prior existence of data prejudices the researcher. That is always a possibility in any social research but, here, the methodology does not add to this momentum and the data are broadly conceived and recognized as being socially significant by scientists and practitioners. The constructed model can point to necessary new directions.

Computer Assistance

The computer program used in developing the data is one in the library of programs developed and compiled by the Health Services

---

[15]Glaser and Strauss, op. cit., p. 4.

[16]Anatol Rapoport, "Methodology in the Physical, Biological and Social Sciences," Yearbook of the Society for Systems Research, V. XIV, 1969, p. 185.

Computing Facility, University of California at Los Angeles. The specific program used was BMD 08D, Cross-tabulation with Variable Stacking. The basic data were transferred from standard I.B.M. card format to tape prior to operationalizing the program at the University of New Mexico Computing Center facility where the I.B.M. 390/40 was used. The major portions of the following description are from the BMD Biomedical Computer Program Manual.

BMD 08D computes two-way frequency tables of data input. Frequency tables are computed from specified ranges of the original variables, variables after transgeneration, stacked variables or combinations of these. The output includes: 1) Frequency tables of all combinations of the variables or only those specified by the user. 2) Chi-square values and degree of freedom for each table. 3) Means, standard deviations and correlation coefficients for each pair of variables.

The second and third types of output, although obtained, were of limited value in analyzing the data in this study. Much of the data are scaled nominally, therefore, parametric measures of dispersion and association such as means, standard deviations and correlation coefficients became meaningless for most of the tables. After obtaining the frequency tables based on the categories of the variables used in the original data collection, it was necessary to combine categories for reasons of practical application and of theoretical development, therefore, degrees of freedom and, consequently, chi-square values as computed were no longer applicable. As discussed elsewhere, this did not hinder the development of data and it was not

deemed necessary to recompute those values.

However, one feature of the program was particularly useful. This was the variable stacking ability which allows stacking a nested classification of several variables into a single variable, that is, breaking down a category within categories of another variable. In effect, this transgeneration feature allows transformations of input variables and creation of new variables prior to performance of the computations.

This feature allowed us to proceed to the elaboration analysis of third variable effects, that is, of examining the effects of holding chosen third variables constant on the two-way frequency tables previously developed.

CHAPTER III

DESCRIPTION

Accuracy of Data

The data in this analysis are not directly comparable to that published by government agencies or other independent investigators because a partial fiscal year is included. However, Tables 1 and 2 give some evidence of its congruence. It should be noted that Table 1 reports Labor Force Status for persons completing institutional training in the 1966 fiscal year. This includes carry over programs from the previous fiscal year funding and excludes 1966 fiscal year funded projects that may still have been in operation past June, 1967. Also, it is not indicated which follow-up report was used. Considering the dates involved, it was probably the first, or three month, post-training report. Probably, these methods were used by the Department of Labor as an administrative convenience for data gathering purposes. Our data, it will be recalled, is by fiscal year of funding and used 12 month post-training reports.

Nevertheless, the similarity to this study's data, broken down by fiscal year in Table 2, for 1966 is striking. For Oregon, both tables show 70 percent employed. The slight differences in the Unemployed and Not in Labor Force categories could be partially due, additionally to the reasons above, to differences in rounding. Note that the federal figures total more than 100 percent. The Department of Labor figures show, for Oregon, 91 percent of all 1966 fiscal year graduates having had some employment since training. Our data for

both 1966 and partial 1967 is 92 percent.[1] Nationally, for the 1967 fiscal year, "Follow-up during the year after training shows that 90 percent of the institutional trainees obtained employment, most of it training related, and that 72 percent were employed when contacted."[2] Table number 3 shows the figure 73 percent employed a year after training for our sample. This latter figure for both fiscal years is closer to the U.S. employed figure for 1966 than is the Oregon figure for 1966 alone in both Tables 1 and 2.

Although it is not essential for the purposes of this study to test the generalizability of the data, it appears, in overall dimensions, that it corresponds closely to that which is published by the government agencies for Oregon specifically and the U.S. in general. The inclusion of the 1967 data has the effect of adjusting Oregon 1966 data towards the parameters of the national experience while still being directly applicable to the state experience. This can be said only for the overall Labor Force Status reports. Demographic differences between Oregon and the U.S. would be likely to void the comparability of some specific variables if statistical tests of significance requiring large N's were to be applied in follow-up verificational studies using a national sample.

---

[1]Table not reproduced in the study.

[2]U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Report of the President and A Report on Manpower Requirements, Resources, Utilization and Training (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968), v. 8, p. 205.

TABLE 1

PERCENTAGE OF "GRADUATES" THROUGH JUNE 1967 HAVING HAD SOME EMPLOYMENT SINCE TRAINING AND THE LABOR FORCE STATUS REPORTED BY PERSONS COMPLETING INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING DURING FISCAL YEAR 1966

	All Graduates- Some Employment Since Training	1966 Graduates - Status in Week of Latest Canvas		
		Employed	Unemployed	Not In Labor Force
Oregon	91%	70	16	15
U.S.	90%	76	15	9

Adapted from U.S. Department of H.E.W., Education and Training, v. 6, 1967, Table E-2, p. 79.

TABLE 2

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS BY FISCAL YEAR

Labor Force Status	Employed	Unemployed	Not In Labor Force		
Fiscal Year				(N)	(%N)
1967 Partial	.80	.11	.09	(279)	(30)
1966	.70	.14	.16	(640)	(70)
Combined	.73	.13	.14	(919)	(100)

Labor Force Status Categories

Gainful employment is any employment for pay, self-employment for profit or employment in a family enterprise for which no salary is received. Family farming would probably be the modal occupational category for which no salary is given.

Unemployed persons are those civilians (no age limit) who have no employment and are available for work and had engaged in specific job seeking activity within the past four weeks. Principal activities include; registering at a public or private employment office, meeting with prospective employers, checking with friends or relatives, placing or answering advertisements, writing letters of application or being on a union or professional register.

An unemployed person could also be one waiting to be called back to a job from which they had been laid off or one waiting to report to a new wage or salaried job scheduled to start within the following 30 days, depending upon the suitability of the job or conditions of return.

Not in the Labor Force is a collapsed category including those not fitting in the two previous categories who were keeping house, in school, ill and "other."

For purposes of discussion, the three categories of the criteria variable Labor Force Status are combined in various ways. The following terminology is used. "In the Labor Force" includes the categories Employed and Unemployed and is used to differentiate them from Not in the Labor Force. The term "Not Working" combines the categories Unemployed (but in the labor force) and Not in the

Labor Force to contrast with those holding a job.

Selection of Variables

Selection of variables for elaboration analysis was based on the calculation of extreme high and low deviance from the mean percent employed of the total sample. Initially, two limitations were placed on selection. First, only those were considered that included the total N in the study. The purpose was to forego not including those subjects in the sample that are not a part of more limited categories. For instance, only youth were considered in some of the original analysis. If they contribute differentially to employment success, this can be brought out in the Age Group variable which is an all-inclusive one.

Second, if the category of a variable resulting in a low or high rate of deviance included less than 10 percent of the total N, it was not further considered. The reasons here are two-fold. By breaking down a category through elaboration, the N in the cells quickly become very small so we wish to keep the original N in a category at a reasonably high level. As previously discussed, there is no theoretical reason for insisting on a large N. The consideration is a pragmatic one that leads to the other argument for a larger initial N than existed in some of the categories. If policy recommendations affect only an extremely small portion of program participants, they are not likely to elicit much enthusiasm from program administrators, especially if rather complex or expensive means are identified to alleviate an identified problem.

Within these guidelines, the variables with categories showing substantial deviation below the mean in the zero-order cross-tabulations were Public Assistance Status and Grades Completed. Variables with deviance above the mean were Marital Status and Age Groups. Prior Labor Force Status and, to a lesser extent, Years of Employment exhibited deviances both above and below the mean.

In addition, because of its recognized overall importance within the M.D.T.A. program and in general sociological and demographic literature and because of the exhibited variation between categories in Unemployed and Not in Labor Force status, Sex is included in the final elaboration analysis. Sex, age and education are treated as independent variables against which other variables are intervened.

Description of Sample Population by Two-Variable Cross-Tabulation

Proportion in Each Labor Force Status by Sex (Table 3): By Sex, the total sample is represented by 56 percent Females and 44 percent Males. The Female and Male categories do not contribute differentially to the proportion Employed. Since they are mutually exclusive and, together, all inclusive categories they reflect the total sample in the cross-tabulated category Employed. However, Females represent twice the proportion over Males in Not in Labor Force - the reverse being true for Unemployed.

Proportion in Each Labor Force Status by Age Groups (Table 4): Except for the teenage group, the proportion of the total N decreases with each Age Group from 36 percent in the 20-29 Age Group to 10 percent in the 50-65 age range. Teenagers represent 13 percent of the total.

TABLE 3

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
BY SEX

Labor Force Status	Employed	Unemployed	Not In Labor Force		
Sex				(N)	(%N)
Female	.73	.09	.18	(516)	(56)
Male	.73	.18	.09	(403)	(44)
				(919)	(100)

TABLE 4

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
BY AGE GROUPS

Labor Force Status	Employed	Unemployed	Not In Labor Force		
Age Groups				(N)	(%N)
50-65	.74	.14	.12	(92)	(10)
40-49	.70	.19	.11	(172)	(19)
30-39	.79	.12	.09	(202)	(22)
20-29	.72	.12	.16	(332)	(36)
17-19	.70	.07	.23	(121)	(13)
				(919)	(100)

The 30-39 Age Group, with the highest rate Employed (79 percent) and the lowest rate Not in Labor Force (9 percent), has the highest rate of retention in the labor force. Although those over 45 are considered disadvantaged by M.D.T.A. definition, the oldest group, 50-65, held their own very well with other groups at 74 percent Employed. They were, in fact, the second highest by Age Group category.

Teenagers tied for lowest rate of Employed (70 percent) but also had the lowest rate of Unemployed at 7 percent and, consequently, by far the largest proportion Not in Labor Force. The Not in Labor Force show a curvilinear function, starting high at the lower Age Group, minimizing at the middle and then rising slightly at the older Age Groups.

Proportion in Each Labor Force Status by Grades Completed (Table 5): the percentages of the total sample above grade 12 and below grade 9 are comparatively small, 7 and 9 percent respectively. Some high school represents 24 percent of the sample and high school graduation or its equivalency (G.E.D.) has 60 percent. The G.E.D. is categorized with high school graduation in the original coding, therefore it is not possible to differentiate between them.

Not surprisingly, the higher the Grade Completed prior to training the higher the Employed rate and the lower the Unemployed rate. There is a dramatic consistency in the Employed rate through the 11th grade. The Unemployed rate, however, is higher for the 0-8 grade group. There is a consistent 5-6 percent drop for Unemployed between each of the categories from low to high.

TABLE 5

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
BY GRADES COMPLETED

Labor Force Status / Grades Completed	Employed	Unemployed	Labor Force	(N)	(%N)
13 or more	.82	.05	.13	(60)	(7)
12 or G.E.D.	.75	.11	.14	(554)	(60)
9-11	.67	.16	.17	(224)	(24)
0-8	.67	.22	.11	(81)	(9)
				(919)	(100)

Proportion in Each Labor Force Status by Marital Status (Table 6): Half of the sample are married. The remaining half are evenly split between Single and Other. The category Other includes divorced and widowed. Single means never married and Married includes those who might be separated.

Single and Married have about the same proportion Employed but Single has a lower Unemployed rate and a higher Not in Labor Force percentage. Other, as a category, has the highest Employed rate, tied with Single for lowest Unemployed rate and has the highest retention in the labor force.

Proportion in Each Labor Force Status by Prior Labor Force Status (Table 7): The Unemployed prior to training composed 77 percent of the population studied. The remainder were about evenly split between previously Employed and Reentrants.

A trainee was classified Reentrant if he had not been either actively seeking work (other than for the reason he felt no work was available) or had not been employed immediately preceding contact with the selection and referral agency for training. Definition for Unemployed is the same for Prior Labor Force Status as for post-training Labor Force Status. Prior Employed status includes underemployed, that is, those working less than 40 hours per week, under their skill level or had been notified of a pending technological layoff. A farm worker was determined Unemployed if he was a member of a farm family with an annual net income of less than $1,200 per year. The before and after categories are, then, quite comparable.

The persistency of prior status to post-training status,

TABLE 6

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
BY MARITAL STATUS

Labor Force Status	Employed	Unemployed	Not In Labor Force		
Marital Status				(N)	(%N)
Other	.80	.10	.10	(230)	(25)
Married	.71	.16	.13	(461)	(50)
Single	.70	.10	.20	(228)	(25)
				(919)	(100)

TABLE 7

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
BY PRIOR LABOR FORCE STATUS

Labor Force Status	Employed	Unemployed	Not In Labor Force		
Prior Labor Force Status				(N)	(%N)
Employed	.84	.08	.09	(104)	(11)
Unemployed	.73	.14	.13	(709)	(77)
Reentrant	.65	.11	.24	(106)	(12)
				(919)	(100)

with the training program being a constant, is a phenomenan that should be understood in greater depth, particularly since training programs and guidance services are supposedly designed to equalize opportunities for trainees. It is obvious from the table that this is not being accomplished. This is a comparative and not an absolute value judgment. Those who were previously Unemployed were 73 percent Employed in the follow-up reference week, the same proportion as for the sample as a whole. The point is, those must be compared to the 84 percent who were previously Employed and the Reentrant rate of 65 percent Employed. Studying the demographic characteristics of these exceptional cases may help explain this situation of persistency.

Proportion in Each Labor Force Status by Years of Employment (Table 8): The population studied is weighted more heavily in the 3-9 Years of Employment category (39 percent) but the other categories are quite evenly distributed with between 19 and 22 percent each.

The only consistent trend is for Not in Labor Force which decreases for each increment of Years of Employment. One might suspect that the low rate of Employed for those with 10 or more years of previous employment would be due to an age factor. However, as shown in Table 4, the oldest Age Group fares quite well and no Age Group in Table 4 has as low a rate Employed as does 10 or More Years of Employment in Table 8. The Unemployed rate, overall, tends to decrease as Years of Employment decreases.

Proportion in Each Labor Force Status by Public Assistance Status (Table 9): If, at the time training was offered, the referral was receiving financial aid from a federal, state or local public

TABLE 8

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
BY YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT

Labor Force Status	Employed	Unemployed	Not In Labor Force		
Years of Employment				(N)	(%N)
10 or more	.68	.22	.10	(202)	(22)
3-9	.78	.11	.11	(356)	(39)
2	.71	.12	.17	(181)	(20)
Under 2	.70	.09	.21	(180)	(19)
				(919)	(100)

TABLE 9

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
BY PUBLIC ASSISTANCE STATUS

Labor Force Status	Employed	Unemployed	Not In Labor Force		
Public Assistance Status				(N)	(%N)
Non-Recipient	.75	.11	.14	(776)	(85)
Recipient	.63	.23	.15	(140)	(15)
				(916)	(100)

assistance program he was classified as a Recipient. This would include aid-to-dependent children, old age assistance or general assistance but not if receiving only surplus food, food stamps, assistance from a voluntary welfare agency such as the Salvation Army, pensions or Old Age Insurance benefits.

Recipients accounted for 15 percent of the total sample and Non-recipients 85 percent. Recipients had a substantially smaller proportion Employed and a larger proportion Unemployed but the labor force drop-out rate was about equal for both groups.

CHAPTER IV

SEX AS AN INDEPENDENT VARIABLE

Introduction

Sex is recognized in nearly all demographic and evaluative studies as a basic variable for investigation. The zero-order table Sex and Labor Force Status shows no proportional difference between Employed Males and Employed Females. The figures for Unemployed and Not in Labor Force are reversed for the two Sex categories. The wisdom of using Sex as an independent variable, however, is confirmed by the variation between the categories Male and Female when elaboration in the form of intervening variables is applied.

There are nearly limitless possibilities for generalizing about conditions that could lead to explanation of differences in labor market experience between the sexes. We will only assume that among those not working - whether because they are Unemployed or Not in Labor Force - are reasons that can also effect a difference in Employed rate when additional variables as interjected. Rather than attempting to create a rationale based on other research, the conclusions will be based on a step by step examination of variables selected for this analysis.

Sex will be followed by Age Groups and Grades Completed as independent variables in succeeding chapters. An assumption made is that the variants are experienced by individuals in that order. For instance, Sex and many important experiences of being one sex or another are somewhat independent of when born or educational level.

Age level provides an extended set of influences, such as educational expectations, increasing over time. Education level is the one independent variable over which the individual may have some control although there are restraining influences.

This temporal ordering is important for us only to the extent that the complexity of the interpretation of specific combinations of variables are influenced. Data presented later in the study will be partially interpreted in relation to that previously presented.

The first variable intervening between Sex and Labor Force Status presented is Age Group.

Analysis

Labor Force Status by Sex by Age Group (Tables 10A and 10B)[1]

Male and Female Employed vary together by Age Group with the single exception of the 20-29 year olds where the Female Employed rate drops 17 percent below the Male rate. Over one-quarter (26 percent) of 20-29 year old Females dropped out of the labor force. This proportion is nearly matched by the 17-19 Age Group, however, it applies to both Males and Females indicating no differential on categories of Sex by 17-19 age.

---

[1]The A series Tables represent the proportion Employed, Unemployed, and Not in Labor Force (categories of the dependent variable Labor Force Status) in each category of the independent variable by categories of intervening variables. The B series of Tables represent the proportion of N in the intervening variable in each category of the independent variable across all categories of the dependent variable.

TABLE 10A

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
SEPARATELY BY EACH SEX CATEGORY AND BY AGE GROUPS

Labor Force Status	Employed		Unemployed		Not In Labor Force	
Sex	M	F	M	F	M	F
Age Groups						
50-65	.72	.75	.19	.12	.09	.13
40-49	.68	.71	.22	.17	.10	.12
30-39	.82	.78	.13	.11	.05	.11
20-29	.80	.63	.13	.11	.07	.26
17-19	.68	.71	.10	.05	.22	.24

TABLE 10B

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
BY SEX AND BY AGE GROUPS

Labor Force Status	Employed		Unemployed		Not In Labor Force		
Sex	M	F	M	F	M	F	
Age Groups							(N)
50-65	.23	.51	.06	.08	.03	.09	(92)
40-49	.21	.49	.07	.12	.03	.08	(172)
30-39	.31	.48	.05	.07	.02	.07	(202)
20-29	.43	.29	.07	.05	.04	.12	(332)
17-19	.28	.42	.04	.03	.09	.14	(121)
							(919)

The comparatively low rate of labor force retention for the two lowest Age Groups would probably include such reasons as military service for teen-age Males, marriage and/or pregnancy and helping at home for Females and further additional schooling for both categories.

Although the sexes tend to vary together by Age Group in each Labor Force Status, there is no identifiable trend by Age Group and Sex. The ups and downs of Labor Force Status rates seem rather random. Data presented later in the study will help explain fluctuation by specific Age Group.

Labor Force Status by Sex by Grades Completed
(Tables 11A and 11B)

Educational attainment has a very definite influence on the men. Quite simply, for Males, as Grades Completed goes down so does the Employed rate. Concomitantly, among men the Unemployed and Not in Labor Force rates rise at each reduction of educational level.

Among Females, no such clear pattern is indicated. It's interesting to note, however, that the highest Employed rate for Females is at the lowest educational level. The same is true for the Female Unemployed. Consequently, the labor force dropout rate for the least educated Female is the lowest of all the Females Not in Labor Force combination of categories.

Table 16A shows, among Age Groups, the highest rate 0-8 Grades Completed Employed is for 20-29 year olds. Young age, the probability of dependent children and low socio-economic status would produce tendencies to remain in the labor force. The high Employed rate

TABLE 11A

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
SEPARATELY BY EACH SEX CATEGORY AND BY GRADES COMPLETED

Labor Force Status	Employed		Unemployed		Not In Labor Force	
Sex	M	F	M	F	M	F
Grades Completed						
13 or more	.92	.76	.08	.03	.00	.21
12 or G.E.D.	.80	.74	.14	.09	.06	.17
9-11	.67	.67	.21	.00	.12	.24
0-8	.61	.79	.26	.14	.13	.07

TABLE 11B

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
BY SEX AND BY GRADES COMPLETED

Labor Force Status	Employed		Unemployed		Not In Labor Force		
Sex	M	F	M	F	M	F	
Grades Completed							(N)
13 or more	.34	.48	.03	.02	.00	.13	(60)
12 or G.E.D.	.28	.48	.05	.06	.02	.11	(554)
9-11	.39	.28	.12	.04	.07	.10	(224)
0-8	.44	.22	.19	.04	.09	.02	(81)
							(919)

could be a combination of desire produced by necessity and placement in low skill requirement training programs for which there is a demand in the labor market. Why this should be especially so for this low educational level is not determinable from these variables.

Labor Force Status by Sex by Marital Status (Tables 12A and 12B)

Marital Status as an intervening variable has categories of Other, Married, and Single. Although these are nominal scale data, it appears that we might be able to imply ordinal characteristics when they are placed in the order shown.

Other (divorced and widowed) has the highest rate of Employed and Unemployed and the lowest labor force dropout rate for both Male and Female. Married and Single follow in that order. Males have higher Employed and Unemployed rates and Females higher Not in Labor Force rates for each Marital Status, although in some cells the differences are rather minor.

The proportion for Male and Female in each Labor Force Status category is differentiated when Marital Status intervenes. For Married, the ratios are about the same as for the zero-order table Sex by Labor Force Status. However, Other and Single (together, about one-half the total N) produce an interesting range except for Female Unemployed which remains rather constant for each Marital Status.

About 92 percent of Single are in the 17-19 or 20-29 Age Groups. Approximately 72 percent of Others are in the 30-65 age ranges (Table 17B). Although this raises the possibility of Marital

TABLE 12A

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
SEPARATELY BY EACH SEX CATEGORY AND BY MARITAL STATUS

Labor Force Status	Employed		Unemployed		Not In Labor Force	
Sex	M	F	M	F	M	F
Marital Status						
Other	.80	.79	.20	.10	.00	.11
Married	.73	.71	.20	.09	.07	.20
Single	.74	.65	.11	.09	.15	.26

TABLE 12B

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
BY SEX AND BY MARITAL STATUS

Labor Force Status	Employed		Unemployed		Not In Labor Force		
Sex	M	F	M	F	M	F	
Marital Status							(N)
Other	.08	.71	.02	.09	.00	.10	(230)
Married	.41	.31	.11	.04	.04	.09	(461)
Single	.40	.30	.06	.04	.08	.12	(228)
							(919)

Status being merely an age related factor, its possible use as a heuristic device is not thereby destroyed.

Labor Force Status by Sex by Prior Labor Force Status (Tables 13A and 13B)

Among Males, there is a distinct persistency of status before and after training. Of those Males Employed prior to training, 89 percent were Employed after. Unemployed prior to training are shown to be 21 percent Unemployed after training and Reentrant Males dropped out of the labor force at the rate of 27 percent. In each case, these are the highest proportions (among Males or Females) in each Labor Force Status.

Females are not nearly so affected by Prior Labor Force Status as Males. However, Reentrants did have a lower Employed rate (65 percent) and higher labor force dropout rate (24 percent) than they did in the other two Prior Labor Force Status categories. Among Reentrants, the experience for Males and Females is strikingly similar in each Labor Force Status category.

Labor Force Status by Sex by Years of Employment (Tables 14A and 14B)

Among Males, the Unemployed rate increases with Years of Employment. Also for Males, the Employed rate decreases with increases in Years of Employment except for the Under 2 category. There, the Employed rate for Males drops and the Not in Labor Force rate more than doubles (from 9 percent to 20 percent) over the 2 years category.

TABLE 13A

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
SEPARATELY BY EACH SEX CATEGORY AND BY PRIOR LABOR FORCE STATUS

Labor Force Status	Employed		Unemployed		Not In Labor Force	
Sex	M	F	M	F	M	F
Prior Labor Force Status						
Employed	.89	.75	.07	.09	.04	.16
Unemployed	.70	.74	.21	.09	.09	.17
Reentrant	.64	.65	.09	.11	.27	.24

TABLE 13B

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
BY SEX AND BY PRIOR LABOR FORCE STATUS

Labor Force Status	Employed		Unemployed		Not In Labor Force		
Sex	M	F	M	F	M	F	
Prior Labor Force Status							(N)
Employed	.51	.32	.04	.04	.02	.07	(104)
Unemployed	.33	.39	.10	.05	.04	.09	(709)
Reentrant	.07	.58	.01	.10	.03	.21	(106)
							(919)

TABLE 14A

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
SEPARATELY BY EACH SEX CATEGORY AND BY YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT

Labor Force Status	Employed		Unemployed		Not In Labor Force	
Sex	M	F	M	F	M	F
Years of Employment						
10 or more	.68	.69	.25	.14	.07	.17
3-9	.77	.79	.16	.07	.07	.14
2	.79	.68	.12	.11	.09	.21
Under 2	.72	.70	.08	.09	.20	.21

TABLE 14B

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
BY SEX AND BY YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT

Labor Force Status	Employed		Unemployed		Not In Labor Force		
Sex	M	F	M	F	M	F	
Years of Employment							(N)
10 or more	.48	.20	.18	.04	.05	.05	(202)
3-9	.33	.45	.07	.04	.03	.08	(356)
2	.27	.45	.04	.07	.03	.14	(181)
Under 2	.18	.52	.02	.07	.05	.16	(180)
							(919)

Male and Female experience is quite similar in each Labor Force Status for Under 2 Years of Employment. For 2 or More Years of Employment, Male Employed rate decreases and Unemployed rate increases. Considering the similarity of Male and Female experience for Under 2 and Male pattern for Over 2, it appears that habituation of work patterns may take their toll since Females, in all probability, have a sporadic work experience.

If that is the case, job training alone would not appear to overcome established work patterns and the longer one has worked the more difficult it would be to overcome them. Although there are work orientation programs to inculcate successful work attitudes in youth programs, it seems necessary to promote a two pronged program for older workers. First, to overcome unsuccessful work habits and, secondly, to train for new ones.

Labor Force Status by Sex by Public Assistance Status (Tables 15A and 15B)

Whether Females are Public Assistance Recipients or Non-Recipients makes no difference in any Labor Force Status. The same is true for the Male labor force dropout rate. However, Male Recipients show a substantially lower Employed rate (50 percent) and higher Unemployed rate (41 percent) than their Female counterparts.

Although information concerning type of public assistance is not part of this data, it is likely that Aid for Dependent Children is represented heavily for Females. This would not necessarily reflect adversely on their work ability but only on being free for work and to train for a job. Males, however, generally gain public assistance

TABLE 15A

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
SEPARATELY BY EACH SEX CATEGORY AND BY PUBLIC ASSISTANCE STATUS

Labor Force Status	Employed		Unemployed		Not In Labor Force	
Sex	M	F	M	F	M	F
Public Assistance Status						
Non-Recipient	.77	.73	.14	.09	.09	.18
Recipient	.50	.73	.41	.09	.09	.18

TABLE 15B

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
BY SEX AND BY PUBLIC ASSISTANCE STATUS

Labor Force Status	Employed		Unemployed		Not In Labor Force		
Sex	M	F	M	F	M	F	
Public Assistance Status							(N)
Non-Recipient	.34	.41	.06	.05	.04	.10	(776)
Recipient	.22	.41	.18	.05	.04	.10	(140)
							(916)

for reasons of health or disablement. This, of course, would carry over as a handicap after training. Many Males, in fact, are referred to M.D.T.A. training by rehabilitation agencies for therapeutic purposes as part of a total program. Females are also referred from public assistance agencies, but there is much more of a likelihood that training is more of a final step to self sufficiency for them. A co-ordinated program with the welfare agencies within the total M.D.T.A. program seems a necessary step, especially for Male trainees.

Summary of Chapter IV

Males are generally much more affected by the social variables investigated than are Females. This is particularly evident with Grades Completed, Prior Labor Force Status, and Public Assistance Status. This may be partly explained by the larger proportion of Females leaving the labor force. Rather than seeking work when it is difficult to obtain, Females are evidently freer to opt out. This would be particularly possible if the woman was not head of household and her income was only supplemental. Females would also more likely than Males to be eligible for public assistance, such as aid to dependent children, which might be more desirable than a low paying job or a job requiring commuting long distances to work. Of course, marriage could also deflect them from the active labor force. The residual Female element exhibits much greater homogeniety of employment experience than Males whatever the variable measured.

Similarity of Male and Female experience is shown for Reentrants to the labor force, those with under two years of Employment

experience and the 40-49 Age Group. Reentrants and 40-49 Age probably include a large proportion of the same individuals of the total sample. Table 10B shows over twice as many Females or Males in that Age Group. Table 13B indicates about eight times as many Female Reentrants. It is not unreasonable to assume many women would reenter the labor force after their children had matured and 40-49 would be a likely age. Those with under two years of employment have not yet formed a strong attachment to the labor market. This is reflected, for Males and Females, in the high Not in Labor Force rates. These might include 40-49 year old Females as well as youngsters of both sexes who might leave the labor force for reasons mentioned in the Age Group discussion.

The data indicate particular attention ought to be given to Males who remain in the labor force and Females who drop out in terms of program effectiveness. High Male Employed rates can be typified by the characteristics of 12 or more Grades Completed, 20-40 Age, Marital Status of Other and Previously Employed. If one is familiar with relevant literature on the subject, these are not surprising characteristics except, perhaps, Marital Status. They seem to identify the prime employment potential.

High risk males are 40-49 years old, have 11 or fewer Grades Completed, were previously Unemployed, have 10 or more years work experience and are Public Assistance Recipients. Those who were previously Unemployed do not have a particularly low Employed rate but do have a comparatively high Unemployed rate. The oldest Age Group (50-65) have more successful experience than the 40-49 year

olds. One possible explanation is that the oldest group may be rather successful on the job but are forced to retrain because of technological lay-off and the like, whereas, the 40-49 year olds have lost the competative edge on the job market for more personalized reasons.

There is a rather sharp distinction between high school graduates and non-graduates. The difference is greater, for instance, than between grade school graduates and non-graduates. High school graduation, or more, is now the accepted societal norm. Those who do not or cannot meet the educational norm also seem at a disadvantage on the job market. This information supports those who emphasize the importance of completing public schooling. Many able people do not attend college, often for reasons, such as financial, beyond their control. However, for those that do, an advantage is manifested in the Employed rate for 13 or more years of schooling.

Female labor force dropouts may be characterized as under 30 years of age, a Reentrant to the labor force, Single, 9-11 Grades Completed and 2 or fewer Years of Employment. A single woman 17-29 is at the usual marrying age and many undoubtedly leave the labor force for this reason. Why those with 0-8 Grades Completed leave the labor force at less than one-third the rate of the next higher group is not readily apparent from the data in this chapter. Speculation on that will be left to the chapter using Grades Completed as the independent variable.

Those who are Reentrants or with 2 or fewer years work experience have not yet developed a strong labor force attachment.

This concept is reinforced by the fact that Males in these categories also have relatively high rates of Not in Labor Force. The possible reasons, then, are not likely to be generally sex linked although subsequent data may show specific differential reasons.

In the following two chapters, further elaboration will take place. The above generalization should help form a basis for more complete explanation.

CHAPTER V

AGE GROUP AS AN INDEPENDENT VARIABLE

Introduction

Age is a particularly important consideration in manpower planning. Younger workers and older workers have their special problems in the labor market. The former because of lesser developed work skills, especially if they are school dropouts. New Federal minimum wage laws hit the young harder than other age groups because employers seek the maximum of experience for the higher wages required. In periods of economic stagnation the young are often the first to go because of lack of seniority. Sometimes they simply do not know how to go about seeking a job effectively.

Older workers are hard hit by technological displacement. They learned skills long enough ago so that they hold jobs more likely to be antiquated. It is expensive for an employer to train a new worker and the older the worker the less time left to gain a return on him. Less physical ability is sometimes a factor and the older the person the more the chance that he has a lesser education than those younger against whom he is competing in the job market.

Sex by Age Group was examined in the previous chapter. We will begin here with educational level.

Analysis

Labor Force Status by Age Group by Grades Completed (Tables 16A and 16B)

The general observations concerning educational levels in the introduction to this chapter hold for this particular data also. Table 16B shows that older Age Groups are less likely to have attained more schooling than lower Age Groups (with the exception of 50-65 year olds with 13 or more Grades Completed).

Those with more education tend to be more successful on the job market. The higher the Grades Completed the higher the Employed rate for all Age Groups. The minor exceptions are in the 0-8 Grades Completed category of the 20-29 and 50-65 Age Groups where the Employed rate is higher than for the next higher educational level.

There are over twice as many Females as Males in the 50-65 Age Group (Table 10B) and they have a relatively high proportion Employed. Males are considerably over-represented in the 20-29 Age Group (Table 10B) and they have a high rate of 80% Employed (Table 10A). Thus, a Sex related factor may be involved in these deviations from the identified trend. It was established in the last chapter that the 20-29 year old Males are included in the prime age range for employment. Females in the highest age group may, as the 40-49 Age Group, seek employment after children leave home or be widowed and without further support and therefore forced on the labor market. If so, they may have high Employed rates because the normal reasons for low rates affecting disadvantaged do not exist for them. Some credence for the widowed argument exists in Table 17B where the

TABLE 16A

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
SEPARATELY BY EACH AGE GROUP CATEGORY AND BY GRADES COMPLETED

Labor Force Status	Employed					Unemployed					Not In Labor Force				
Age Groups	17-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-65	17-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-65	17-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-65
Grades Completed															
13 or more	1.00	.77	.89	.76	.84	.00	.07	.00	.12	.00	.00	.16	.11	.12	.16
12 or G.E.D.	.72	.73	.82	.73	.75	.06	.11	.09	.20	.12	.22	.16	.09	.07	.13
9-11	.56	.69	.75	.68	.60	.11	.18	.12	.16	.20	.33	.13	.13	.16	.20
0-8	-	.79	.59	.67	.67	-	.11	.33	.23	.22	-	.10	.08	.10	.11

TABLE 16B

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
BY AGE GROUPS AND BY GRADES COMPLETED

Labor Force Status	Employed					Unemployed					Not In Labor Force					
Age Groups	17-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-65	17-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-65	17-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-65	
Grades Completed																(N)
13 or more	.02	.33	.17	.13	.16	.00	.03	.00	.42	.00	.00	.07	.02	.02	.03	(60)
12 or G.E.D.	.13	.27	.18	.11	.16	.01	.04	.02	.03	.01	.04	.06	.02	.01	.01	(554)
9-11	.05	.26	.18	.13	.06	.01	.07	.03	.03	.02	.03	.05	.03	.03	.02	(224)
0-8	-	.15	.14	.26	.12	-	.02	.08	.09	.04	-	.02	.02	.04	.02	(81)
																(919)

Other Marital Status for 50-65 year olds show a higher proportion than for the other Marital Statuses. As stated above, subjects are over twice as likely to be Females in this Age Group.

The highest labor force dropout rates are in the 9-11 Grades Completed categories for all Age Groups except the 20-29 year olds. Generally, Unemployed rates increase at this lower educational level, although the pattern is not entirely consistent. The cause here evidently is over representation of Males in this Age Group. They tend to remain in the labor force, even if Unemployed.

Labor Force Status by Age Group by Marital Status (Tables 17A and 17B)

Marital Status as an intervening variable between Labor Force Status and Age Group indicates some differential effects. The category Other shows highest rates of Employed and lowest rates of Unemployed for each Age Group. Married and Single follow in that order for Employed rates, with minor exceptions. Not in Labor Force rates seem randomly distributed.

About 90 percent of the total Other category are Female (Table 12B). Proportion of Other Employed decreases with increase in Age except for the 20-29 year old Other which has too low a figure (78 percent) to fit the trend. This Age Group has a preponderance of prime employment age Males which should contribute to maintenance of a high rate. However, the 78 percent figure is only slightly below the 80 percent for all 20-29 Age Group Males. Female Employed rate for this Age Group is only 63 percent (Table 10A) which is low enough for even a small proportion of Females to bring the combined rate

TABLE 17A

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
SEPARATELY BY EACH AGE GROUP CATEGORY AND BY MARITAL STATUS

Labor Force Status	Employed					Unemployed					Not In Labor Force				
Age Groups	17-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-65	17-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-65	17-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-65
Marital Status															
Other	1.00	.78	.86	.78	.76	.00	.07	.07	.15	.12	.00	.15	.07	.07	.12
Married	.67	.72	.76	.64	.78	.00	.14	.14	.23	.18	.33	.14	.10	.13	.09
Single	.70	.69	.50	.75	.50	.07	.12	.50	.25	.00	.23	.19	.00	.00	.50

TABLE 17B

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
BY AGE GROUPS AND BY MARITAL STATUS

Labor Force Status	Employed					Unemployed					Not In Labor Force					
Age Groups	17-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-65	17-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-65	17-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-65	
Marital Status																(N)
Other	.01	.21	.24	.21	.13	.00	.02	.02	.04	.02	.00	.04	.02	.02	.02	(230)
Married	.02	.25	.22	.14	.08	.00	.05	.04	.05	.02	.01	.05	.03	.03	.01	(461)
Single	.31	.33	.01	.03	.01	.03	.06	.01	.01	.00	.10	.09	.00	.00	.01	(228)
																(919)

for Males and Females down slightly.

Labor Force Status by Age Group by Prior Labor Force Status (Tables 18A and 18B)

Prior Labor Force Status, when cross-tabulated with Age within each Labor Force Status, does not show obviously distinctive patterns as when cross-tabulated with Sex. The Age Group 30-39 does maintain the highest Employed rate in each Prior Labor Force Status. The Unemployed rates for Prior Unemployed increases at each step of the age range.

The high labor force dropout rate for Reentrants is not surprising considering the high overall figure (24 percent) in the zero-order table. The rate decrease, however, with increases in the age of the subject group, as it does for Prior Unemployed.

The 20-29 Age Group is particularly sensitive to Prior Labor Force Status. This is the only Age Group with proportionately more Males. Distribution of Sex by Prior Status is shown in Table 13B. It is evident that the general tendency for Prior Status to persist is reinforced, in this Age Group, by distribution of Sex, that is, Males have a higher Employed rate (Table 10A) and there are fewer Males in the lower Employed rate categories of Prior Status.

Labor Force Status by Age Group by Years Employed (Tables 19A and 19B)

For those under 30, the Employed rate increases with years of previous employment. Over age 30, the opposite trend is evident. The Employed rate increases with decrease in Years Employed. The

TABLE 18A

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
SEPARATELY BY EACH AGE GROUP CATEGORY AND BY PRIOR LABOR FORCE STATUS

Labor Force Status	Employed					Unemployed					Not In Labor Force				
Age Groups	17-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-65	17-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-65	17-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-65
Prior Labor Force Status															
Employed	.71	.83	.83	.73	1.00	.00	.10	.13	.07	.00	.29	.07	.04	.20	.00
Unemployed	.69	.11	.81	.75	.67	.06	.13	.14	.19	.22	.25	.16	.05	.06	.11
Reentrant	.67	.56	.70	.58	.77	.33	.09	.04	.21	.08	.00	.35	.26	.21	.15

TABLE 18B

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
BY AGE GROUPS AND BY PRIOR LABOR FORCE STATUS

Labor Force Status	Employed					Unemployed					Not In Labor Force					
Age Groups	17-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-65	17-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-65	17-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-65	
Prior Labor Force Status																(N)
Employed	,05	.35	.19	.11	.13	.00	.04	.03	.01	.00	.02	.03	.01	.03	.00	(104)
Unemployed	.11	.27	.17	.12	.06	.01	.05	.03	.03	.02	.04	.06	.01	.01	.01	(709)
Reentrant	.02	.13	.19	.20	.10	.01	.02	.01	.07	.01	.00	.08	.07	.07	.02	(106)
																(919)

TABLE 19A

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
SEPARATELY BY EACH AGE GROUP CATEGORY AND BY YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT

Labor Force Status	Employed					Unemployed					Not In Labor Force				
Age Groups	17-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-65	17-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-65	17-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-65
Years of Employment															
10 or more	-	1.00	.76	.58	.68	-	.00	.17	.32	.18	-	.00	.07	.10	.14
3-9	.75	.78	.78	.81	.75	.25	.11	.11	.06	.13	.00	.11	.11	.13	.12
2	.68	.65	.79	.83	1.00	.11	.14	.07	.17	.00	.21	.21	.14	.00	.00
Under 2	.71	.63	1.00	.67	1.00	.02	.16	.00	.00	.00	.27	.21	.00	.33	.00

TABLE 19B

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
BY AGE GROUPS AND BY YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT

Labor Force Status	Employed					Unemployed					Not In Labor Force					
Age Groups	17-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-65	17-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-65	17-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-65	
Years of Employment																(N)
10 or more	.00	.04	.23	.22	.19	.00	.00	.05	.12	.05	.00	.00	.02	.04	.04	(202)
3-9	.03	.35	.21	.13	.06	.01	.05	.03	.01	.01	.00	.05	.03	.02	.01	(356)
2	.13	.34	.11	.10	.03	.02	.07	.01	.02	.00	.04	.11	.02	.00	.00	(181)
Under 2	.29	.24	.09	.06	.03	.01	.06	.00	.00	.00	.11	.08	.00	.03	.00	(180)
																(919)

exception to the latter statement are those 40-49 years of age with less than two years previous work experience.

A group that old with so few years experience would indicate sex linked factors. Table 10B shows more than twice the proportion of Employed Females than Males in the 40-49 Age Group. Table 14B exhibits nearly three times as many Employed Females as Males in the less than Two Years Employed category. This, combined with data in Table 13B indicating over eight times as many Female Reentrants as Male suggests a low level of labor force attachment for this particular group. There are no Unemployed 40-49 year olds with less than two years experience but the dropout rate is a very high 33 percent. Overall, the Female dropout rate for this Age Group is only 12 percent. Reentry, then, is a particularly hazardous variant.

In the zero-order tables, high employment was located in the middle categories of Years Employed (3-9) and Age (30-39). This was still generally true with Sex held constant (Tables 10A and 14A). But now, with Age held constant and Years of Employment varying, high rates are associated with older Age and fewer Years Employed. This appears to be a very complex relationship. Tables 10B and 14B may be of help. There are proportionately fewer Males in all Age Groups above 30. Also, the fewer the years of Employment the proportionately fewer Males. This appears to further support the conclusions of the previous chapter. Thus, it will be recalled, low Male employment was associated with higher Age and longer Years of Employment. But in number, Males lose influence in higher Age brackets. Overall, high

Employed rates moved away from the direction of Male influence when the variants Age and Years Employed were combined.

Labor Force Status by Age Group by Public Assistance Status (Tables 20A and 20B)

The pattern of Labor Force Status for each Age Group of Public Assistance categories is quite consistent. Non-recipients in each Age Group have higher rates of Employed and labor force drop-outs and lesser rates of Unemployed. The one exception is 40-49 year olds Not in Labor Force, but it is slight.

As with several other variables analyzed in this chapter, the 30-39 Age Group has the highest rate Employed for both categories of the intervening variable. The rate decreases for older and younger groups but the oldest group does very well, almost equaling the prime 30-39 Age Group.

The dropout rate for both categories generally decreases with age. This is consistent with the general trend with the other variants in this chapter and with the zero-order table for Age Group.

Summary of Chapter V

Age Groups as an independent variable reacts in rather a complex fashion when other variants are injected. Among Males and Females, Age and Labor Force Status are differentially related. With Age Groups the interaction process precludes a statement on consistent effects. In no case does Age Group maintain reasonably consistent Employed rates of its categories across the intervening variables.

TABLE 20A

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
SEPARATELY BY EACH AGE GROUP CATEGORY AND BY PUBLIC ASSISTANCE STATUS

Labor Force Status	Employed					Unemployed					Not In Labor Force				
Age Groups	17-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-65	17-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-65	17-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-65
Public Assistance Status															
Non-Recipient	.69	.74	.81	.72	.80	.06	.12	.10	.17	.10	.25	.14	.09	.11	.10
Recipient	.50	.57	.78	.61	.72	.00	.21	.15	.35	.14	.50	.22	.12	.04	.14

TABLE 20B

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
BY AGE GROUPS AND BY PUBLIC ASSISTANCE STATUS

Labor Force Status	Employed					Unemployed					Not In Labor Force					
Age Groups	17-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-65	17-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-65	17-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-65	
Public Assistance Status																(N)
Non-Recipient	.11	.26	.17	.13	.08	.01	.04	.02	.03	.01	.04	.05	.02	.02	.01	(776)
Recipient	.01	.24	.19	.14	.05	.00	.09	.04	.08	.01	.01	.09	.03	.01	.01	(140)
																(916)

In one case, Marital Status, the intervening variable tends to maintain its rates within categories across the dependent variable. This would indicate Marital Status as being the stronger influence. Life style, level of responsibility and psychological variants are among the many possible reasons. Whatever the reasons, the influence seems to cross age categories.

The remainder of the intervening variants exhibit interaction characteristics with Age Groups. Relations between categories remain whether viewed from the independent or intervening variable. The highest rate of Employed in the zero-order table was 13 or More Grades Completed. This holds across Age Group. The highest rate Age Group was 30-39 in the zero-order table. This characteristic tends to remain across Grades Completed. Prior Labor Force Status, Years of Employment and Public Assistance Status are similarly characterized. Some exceptions have been noted.

The oldest Age Group has provided the largest number of exceptions. Their relatively high rate Employed is particularly noticeable in categories of lowest expectation, for instance, with 0-8 Grades Completed and Reentrants. Evidently this Age Group is not plagued with such strong constraints on employability as some of the other Age Groups. Comparatively, low educational levels are more common among them so either they have learned to overcome this disadvantage or their motivation is strong enough that they have benefited greatly from the M.D.T.A. training program.

CHAPTER VI

GRADES COMPLETED AS AN INDEPENDENT VARIABLE

Introduction

There is a general trend of prolongation of the school experience in the United States. Nevertheless, there has not been a concurrent development of processes to effect the transition from school to work. Assistance in crossing this bridge has usually been, by default, the job of agencies other than those primarily educational in nature, i.e., the military, labor unions and, to a lesser extent, public and private employment agencies.

Much expenditure has been made to improve school programs but often this has resulted in new curricula for the college bound. This is not the case in many European countries where early placement directly in the trades for long periods of training is the rule rather than the exception. Very seldom do our public secondary schools provide training which is adequate for direct employability in skilled work. Youth are dumped on the market rather than placed.

For other than those leaving public schooling the problem is even more diffuse. Older persons reentering the work force, those who must change jobs because of technological displacement and those who work only intermittently have virtually no stabilized setting to which they can turn for help. The system is a haphazard one of public and private institutional arrangements. Public employment agencies are handicapped in developing a comprehensive system of job placement and skill development because of strenuous objection from the private

sector. Yet, the private sector is not well enough coordinated across industries, geographical location and special interest groups to even begin the task on a meaningful scale.

The M.D.T.A. programs are designed to remedy this situation to a limited extent. Individuals are tested and matched to appropriate skill training programs for which a labor shortage has been recently identified. Whether or not the program is effective in equalizing opportunity for those of differing educational levels is a major question to be investigated in this chapter.

Analysis

Labor Force Status by Grades Completed by Marital Status (Tables 21A and 21B)

Grades completed is a predictive factor of employment success whatever the Marital Status. As Grades Completed goes down, so does the post-training employment rate. Exceptions are in the 0-8 Grades Completed category for Other and Single. Deviation from trends, it will be recalled, have been noted on several occasions with this low educational level category.

Others are 90 percent Female and are concentrated in the upper age ranges (30 and over). However, only 28 percent of Females are at the 0-8 educational level. The resulting total in the 0-8, Other category is a rather small N but resulted in 100 percent Employed. This interesting phenomenon is not adequately explained by the available data. Speculation would indicate a responsible and consistant work pattern and strong motivation to remain in the work force. Older women supporting a family and having been trained in a job where

TABLE 21A

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
SEPARATELY BY EACH GRADES COMPLETED CATEGORY AND BY MARITAL STATUS

Labor Force Status	Employed				Unemployed				Not In Labor Force			
Grades Completed	0-8	9-11	12	13	0-8	9-11	12	13	0-8	9-11	12	13
Marital Status												
Other	1.00	.71	.79	.88	.00	.10	.12	.00	.00	.19	.09	.12
Married	.64	.69	.74	.83	.22	.17	.14	.00	.14	.14	.12	.17
Single	.67	.58	.71	1.00	.33	.16	.08	.00	.00	.26	.21	.00

TABLE 21B

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
BY GRADES COMPLETED AND BY MARITAL STATUS

Labor Force Status	Employed				Unemployed				Not In Labor Force				
Grades Completed	0-8	9-11	12	13	0-8	9-11	12	13	0-8	9-11	12	13	
Marital Status													(N)
Other	.04	.15	.53	.88	.00	.02	.08	.00	.00	.04	.06	.01	(230)
Married	.09	.20	.38	.83	.03	.05	.07	.00	.14	.04	.06	.01	(461)
Single	.02	.11	.52	1.00	.01	.03	.06	.00	.00	.05	.15	.00	(228)
													(919)

previous low education would not be a handicap might be a reasonable starting point.

Labor force dropout rates are more identifiable with Marital Status than with educational level. Marital Status would certainly be a strong factor in need to work. It would seem that Singles would have to work to support themselves but over 90 percent are in the two lowest Age Groups and we have discussed alternatives to work for them.

Labor Force Status by Grades Completed by Prior Labor Force Status (Tables 22A and 22B)

The Employed rates for those previously Unemployed follows, almost exactly, the zero-order Employed rates for categories of Grades Completed. Those previously Employed maintain consistently high rates across educational level. Reentrant rates drop at each step of educational level except for the lowest (0-8). This interaction effect between these two variants is quite systematic.

Females comprise 89 percent of Reentrants (Table 13B) but their rate Employed is only 65 percent (Males are 64 percent). Only 28 percent of 0-8 Grades Completed are Female but they have a relatively high 79 percent Employed (Table 11B). The oldest Reentrants are the most successful of all, by Age Group, and they are predominately Female. Older Age, Female and low educational level combine to produce a high Employed rate. This is rather curious since each of these variants by themselves, for the total population, would not be expected to produce better than average employment success.

TABLE 22A

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
SEPARATELY BY EACH GRADES COMPLETED CATEGORY AND BY PRIOR LABOR FORCE STATUS

Labor Force Status	Employed				Unemployed				Not In Labor Force			
Grades Completed	0-8	9-11	12	13	0-8	9-11	12	13	0-8	9-11	12	13
Prior Labor Force Status												
Employed	.83	.86	.83	.83	.17	.07	.07	.09	.00	.07	.10	.08
Unemployed	.67	.67	.75	.83	.22	.17	.12	.00	.11	.16	.13	.17
Reentrant	.80	.59	.64	.78	.00	.12	.17	.00	.20	.29	.19	.22

TABLE 22B

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
BY GRADES COMPLETED AND BY PRIOR LABOR FORCE STATUS

Labor Force Status	Employed				Unemployed				Not In Labor Force				
Grades Completed	0-8	9-11	12	13	0-8	9-11	12	13	0-8	9-11	12	13	
Prior Labor Force Status													(N)
Employed	.05	.02	.56	.10	.01	.01	.05	.01	.00	.01	.07	.01	(104)
Unemployed	.06	.16	.46	.05	.02	.04	.07	.00	.01	.04	.08	.01	(709)
Reentrant	.08	.20	.30	.07	.00	.04	.08	.00	.02	.10	.09	.02	(106)
													(919)

The labor force dropout rate is related to Prior Labor Force Status within each of the educational level categories. Prior Employed, Unemployed and Reentrants have increasingly large dropout rates, in that order, whatever the educational level. It would appear, then, that strength of attachment to the labor force after training is more dependent on previous labor force status than on educational level. Dropout rate is more sensitive to Age (Tables 18A and 18B) and Sex (Tables 13A and 13B) than to educational level.

Labor Force Status by Grades Completed by Years Employed (Tables 23A and 23B)

Whatever the previous Years Employed, the Employed rate is strikingly similar within each educational level. It seems that educational level is a better prediction of employment potential than years of experience.

The 3-9 Years Employed category does provide a rather consistent deviation, however. For this category, the Employed rate is somewhat higher for each educational level, especially the lower ones. The largest proportion of 3-9 Years Employed are 20-29 years of age (Table 19B) and have a higher proportion of Females than Males (Table 14B). By both Sex and Age Group, the 3-9 Years Employed have a more consistent Employed performance than the other work experience categories.

Although Employed rates are related to educational level, the labor force dropout rate is more closely tied to Years Employed. The more the work experience, the less the tendency to dropout. The common sense conclusion that years of experience is an indication

TABLE 23A

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
SEPARATELY BY EACH GRADES COMPLETED CATEGORY AND BY YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT

Labor Force Status	Employed				Unemployed				Not In Labor Force			
Grades Completed	0-8	9-11	12	13	0-8	9-11	12	13	0-8	9-11	12	13
Years of Employment												
10 or more	.60	.63	.70	.80	.30	.22	.21	.10	.10	.15	.09	.10
3-9	.72	.72	.81	.83	.14	.14	.09	.00	.14	.14	.10	.17
2	.60	.64	.73	.80	.20	.18	.09	.00	.20	.18	.18	.20
Under 2	.60	.65	.71	.80	.20	.05	.10	.00	.20	.30	.19	.20

TABLE 23B

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
BY GRADES COMPLETED AND BY YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT

Labor Force Status	Employed				Unemployed				Not In Labor Force				
Grades Completed	0-8	9-11	12	13	0-8	9-11	12	13	0-8	9-11	12	13	
Years of Employment													(N)
10 or more	.12	.17	.30	.08	.06	.06	.09	.01	.02	.04	.04	.01	(202)
3-9	.05	.20	.48	.05	.01	.04	.05	.00	.01	.04	.06	.01	(356)
2	.03	.11	.53	.04	.01	.03	.07	.00	.01	.03	.13	.01	(181)
Under 2	.03	.13	.50	.04	.01	.01	.07	.00	.01	.06	.13	.01	(180)
													(919)

of labor force attachment seems confirmed.

The highest number of Years Employed has the highest Unemployed rates in each of the educational levels. The Unemployed rates are also interrelated with educational level. The lower educational levels have higher Unemployed rates and these are accentuated by more years of experience. The interaction of low educational level and Years of Employment has a cumulative effect on job market success.

Labor Force Status by Grades Completed by Public Assistance Status (Tables 24A and 24B)

The success of Public Assistance Recipients shows a very defined relationship with educational level. As educational level decreases, so does the Employed rate and, at the same time, the Unemployed rate increases. High school graduate Recipients hold their own with Non-Recipients. Below that educational level a sharp step by step differential is exhibited.

Recipients do not dropout of the labor force at a greater rate than Non-recipients, therefore, contrary to detractors of public assistance programs, their attachment to the labor force is as great.

The poor performance of Recipients is also associated with Males and the lower Age Groups. Yet, overall, these categories do generally as well as their complimentary categories of the same variable. In fact, Male 20-29 year olds have a high rate Employed. In other words, the lowest performance Recipients are identified with categories of other varients that, by themselves, result in comparatively good performance. The data seem to center on the idea that welfare status indicates disadvantage in the job market in inverse relation to those

TABLE 24A

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
SEPARATELY BY EACH GRADES COMPLETED CATEGORY AND BY PUBLIC ASSISTANCE STATUS

Grades Completed	0-8	9-11	12	13	0-8	9-11	12	13	0-8	9-11	12	13
Public Assistance Status												
Non-Recipient	.75	.70	.76	.86	.13	.13	.11	.00	.12	.17	.13	.14
Recipient	.47	.53	.72	1.00	.47	.27	.15	.00	.06	.20	.13	.00

TABLE 24B

PROPORTION IN EACH LABOR FORCE STATUS
BY GRADES COMPLETED AND BY PUBLIC ASSISTANCE STATUS

Labor Force Status	Employed				Unemployed				Not In Labor Force				
Grades Completed	0-8	9-11	12	13	0-8	9-11	12	13	0-8	9-11	12	13	
Public Assistance Status													(N)
Non-Recipient	.06	.16	.47	.06	.01	.03	.07	.00	.01	.04	.08	.01	(776)
Recipient	.07	.16	.39	.01	.07	.08	.08	.00	.01	.06	.07	.00	(140)
													(916)

variants that, by themselves, would nurture success potential. Males and prime employment age groups would probably not be accepted for public assistance unless their problems are of an extreme nature. These difficulties are not ameliorated by training programs as reflected in employment rates.

Summary of Chapter VI

Grades Completed is a strong indicator of post-training employment success. Those who completed 13 or more years of schooling have consistently high rates Employed whichever the variable used in this chapter for subject categorization. Years of Employment, in particular, is sensitive to educational level and, therefore, does not add to predictability.

The one category noticeably stronger than educational level is Prior Employed. It holds a constant high Employed rate across Grades Completed. These high rates are due largely to Male influence (Table 13A). Males alone do vary considerably by educational level (Table 11A). In fact, the rate of Employed for both sexes drops to 67 percent for 9-11 Grades Completed (Table 11A). Yet Employed Grades 9-11 is a high 86 percent (Table 22A). We may conclude, then, that Prior Employed Status adds considerable reliability, for purposes of prediction of post training employment, over both Sex and Grades Completed.

The other categories of Prior Labor Force Status, however, are sensitive to educational level as are the categories of the other variants. A particularly sensitive category is Public Assistance

Recipients where the rates are accentuated above and below the Grade 12 level. Overall, Unemployed rates are residually complimentary to the Employed rates. When Employed rates are high, Unemployed rates are low and visa versa. If that seems an obvious deduction, it should be recalled that labor force dropouts have, in instances, altered that relationship.

Labor force dropout rates for Marital Status, Prior Labor Force Status and Years Employed are more sensitive to the categories of those variables than to levels of Grades Completed. The interesting exception is Public Assistance Status. Dropout rates for Recipients and Non-Recipients are not greatly differentiated.

Single trainees, Reentrants and those with 2 or fewer Years of Employment have the highest dropout rates. Each of these categories could indicate weak attachment to the labor force. Most of the Single are in the 17-19 and 20-29 Age Groups (Table 17B) and may not yet have made the transition to full-time employment.

CHAPTER VII

SYNTHESIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

By combining the processes of constant comparison, deviant cases and elaboration, an attempt has been made to identify the characteristics of M.D.T.A. trainees in each of the categories of the criteria (dependent) variable Labor Force Status. The primary technique has been that of cross-tabulation, or partitioning, in order to specify those categories having the most consistent effects across categories of the maximum number of other variants.

The investigation has proceeded through three stages so far. The first stage was one of sifting over 50 original variables and choosing those with greatest variation between categories within the variable manipulated. This was preliminary research and only the results are discussed in this study. The variables retained were Sex, Age, Grades Completed, Marital Status, Prior Labor Force Status, Years Employed and Public Assistance Status.

In step two, these selected variables were then used to describe the population and their effects on Labor Force Statuses were briefly discussed in Chapter III. The categories of Labor Force Status are Employed, Unemployed, and Not in Labor Force. The Labor Force Status of individual trainees was determined at a point in time; one year after completion of M.D.T.A. institutional vocational training.

Step three involved the selection of the three independent variables Age, Sex, and Grades Completed. Interaction effects between

independent, intervening and the dependent variable are discussed in Chapters IV, V, and VI with an independent variant the center of focus in each of those chapters.

Each of these steps could be considered analagous to X-raying a phenomenon from different directions or positions. Steps 1 and 2 viewed categories of variables across the categories of the dependent variable. Step 3 did the same thing in a more complex fashion by looking deeper into the phenomenon; it is sort of two-dimensional view to see whether or not the selected variables held their effects with the introduction of complicating factors in the form of intervening variables.

The subject of this final chapter is step 4. Here we will view the selected data from each of the categories of the dependent variables across the categories of the independent and intervening variables. This fourth view will tell us which characteristics of the previously discussed variables we can put together to describe the most successful members of each Labor Force Status category. Successful, here, means only a high rate in the category with no other valuation attached. Obviously, an M.D.T.A. administrator will not consider a high rate of Unemployed a successful venture. Hopefully, the identification of these categories will provide a reliable and valid base on which to eventually construct more specific scales and measures of predictability for program effectiveness and point to needed changes and areas of concentrated effort in order to gain operational goals of which the basic one is to successfully train men and women and have them placed in jobs.

Factors Contributing to High Employed Rates

Within the Labor Force Status Employed there are four categories of variables that exhibit consistently high employment rates across all categories of the three dependent variables Age, Sex, and Grades. "High" in this sense is comparative to other categories of variables used. Heuristically, high indicates at or above the mean rate within each category of the dependent variable. If the third, or intervening, variable category rate remains high across the several categories of each dependent variable there is reason to conjecture that the intervening category has a strong and consistent influence whichever the dependent variable used. The four categories that meet the criteria of strength and consistency are 13 or More Grades Completed, Marital Status of Other, 3-9 Years Previous Employment and Prior Labor Force Status of Employed.

These categories, except Other Marital Status, indicate a rather established pattern of successful experience in the social structure. They have completed more than average schooling, have had several years of employment and held a job prior to training at greater rates than others in the sample. This does not mean that all in the Employed group had all of these characteristics but only that individuals in each of these categories are more likely to be Employed after training whichever the independent variable used to classify them.

The Marital Status of Other is composed of 90 percent Females. Having been divorced or widowed, possibly without external means of support, would create incentive for them to become self-sufficient

through employment. The fact that they have very low labor force dropout rates would tend to support this contention.

Factors Contributing to High Unemployed Rates

The variants most consistently resulting in high Unemployed rates across categories of Sex, Age, and Grades Completed are the following: 1) 0-8 Grades Completed, 2) Prior Unemployed, 3) Public Assistance Recipient, 4) 40-49 Age, and 5) 10 or More Years of Employment. Their effects are not as entirely consistent as are those categories partitioned with Employed and Not in Labor Force. In all cases, Females are less affected than Males and this is especially true for Public Assistance Recipients and Prior Unemployed where the Female portion has no higher rate than for Females overall. In cases where two of the above categories are cross matched, i.e., 10 Years Employed and 0-8 Grades or 40-49 Age, the Unemployed rates are particularly high. This gives further credence to the argument that these are especially influencial categories on high Unemployment rates because the effects are cumulative rather than mitigating.

The exceptions to the consistency of these categories of Unemployed are primarily those cells which include the high categories for Employed, indicating some reciprocity between Employed and Unemployed variants. For instance, 40-49 year olds generally have high Unemployed rates but where they also have 3-9 Years of Employment the rate drops from an overall 19 percent average Unemployed to only 6 percent. The 3-9 Years Employed group are, as discussed, a high Employed category. All exceptions are not due to reciprocal action

of Employed rates. There is also interaction with high Not in Labor Force categories, such as Reentrants, where there are no 0-8 Grades Completed Reentrants who are Unemployed. The exceptions, then, follow that pattern. It is of interest to note that these exceptional cases exist for Unemployed rather than Employed or Not in Labor Force. This indicates Unemployed categories are more susceptible to influences of employment and labor force dropout than visa versa. The imputation is that strength and direction of influence at work is towards employment or complete withdrawal from the labor force. This gives rise to optimism about the possibility of controlling high Unemployed rates which certainly would not be the case if the data indicated trend toward high Unemployed rates instead.

Overall, the high Unemployed categories indicate a rather firm entrenchment in the labor market. They are older and have had the most work experience. Age and experience, however, are not sufficient to be successful on the labor market when complicated by factors such as low educational level and high rates of welfare recipiency. The fact that most of them were previously Unemployed indicates a compounding effect of initial disadvantaged with time. With some exceptions, as already noted, these categories of high Unemployed generally have average or lower dropout rates.

Factors Contributing to High Not In Labor Force Rates

Those categories contributing to labor force dropout have in common a characteristic that might be called labor force marginality. This characteristic has previously been identified for the general

work force by one writer and has been estimated to include about 45 percent of the total work force in the United States.[1] Marginality, in the sense used here, means the existence of a situation where the choice to work or not seek work is exercised. Whether this choice is voluntary or nonvoluntary is not determinable in these data and for the purposes of the study is not particularly important since the concern is with final behavior and with speculation of possible effects on program success in relation to previously mentioned goals of the program. Of course, some of those working at the time of data collection might also eventually fall into this category of marginality but the data indicate the proportion thus identified at one point in time.

It does not necessarily follow that marginality should exist in the M.D.T.A. programs merely because it exists in the larger work force. Trainees are sought, or requested recruitment, in order to be trained for a job. It is significant that such a group exists in the program because they are dysfunctional to the program goal of employment success. Overall, 14 percent of the total sample belong to the dropout category (Table 2). Even so, this is only about one-third of the proportion in the total work force.

The categories which are high across categories of the three independent variable are Reentrants, Under 2 Years of Employment, 17-19 Age Group and Single Marital Status. Two of these categories, Reentrants and Under 2 Years of Employment are Female dominated in

---

[1]Dean Morse, The Peripheral Worker (New York: Columbia University Press, 1969), p. vii.

terms of absolute numbers. All categories, except Reentrants which are substantially represented in all 20 and older Age Groups, are heavily concentrated in the 17-19 and 20-29 Age Groups and 12 Grades Completed category. The latter could be a function of lower age since lower age groups are more likely to complete high school.

Labor force marginality, then, is primarily represented by young age and females, either separately or together. Those who are Reentrants or with less than 2 Years of Employment, at any age level, are mostly Females. Single people in this study are 92 percent 29 years of age or younger. Among Males, the high dropout rate age range is 17-19. Among Females, the high dropout rates cover the 17-19 and 20-29 Age Groups.

Recommendations for Policy Implementation

At each stage of discussion in this study, the data have been arranged in more complex fashions. Description and conclusions, however, have been limited so that the numbers of exceptional cases could be minimized. It should also be admitted that there is some hesitancy to make too broad of a leap from description to implications. More importantly, the survey results do not lend themselves to clear cut and simple answers about relationships and patterns of interaction. This, though, is in the spirit of the original intent. More concern is with trends, tendencies, and comparative direction of influences of variants than with specific but simple probability statements.

The summaries of Chapters IV, V and VI and the previous section of Chapter VII serve the function of identifying theoretically

interesting relationships. Several of the following recommendations for policy implementation apply to rather broad segments of the target population. Close inspection of the data tables will reveal some deviation from trends on which the recommendations are based. Effective policy concerning heterogeneous groupings never seems to treat all segments with equal justice.

1. Develop criteria for assessing a potential trainees determination to remain in the work force after training. Pre-training guidance sessions on alternatives to employment might be considered, particularly for the youngest age group.

2. Give job-hunt training to Reentrants and to those who have been employed in one occupation for a long period of time.

3. Continue training sessions after completion of vocational training to deal with problems of job adjustment, especially for teenagers and 40-49 year old Reentrants.

4. Work closely with welfare referral agencies to develop a total program of rehabilitation for Male Public Assistance Recipients.

5. Provide sheltered workshop situations combined with continual training for particularly hard-core unemployable. If this could not be provided on a contract basis with private business concerns, government agencies should overcome their timidity about "competing" with the private sector of the economy. This recommendation is based on a suspicion that long term, open ended programs providing the trainee with a feeling of self-sufficiency might be needed to overcome long personal histories of work failure, undeveloped skill potential and feelings of self-alienation.

6. Provide employers with financial incentive, in the form of wage payment supplements, to hire high risk trainees for a sufficient period of time for the worker to adequately establish his effectiveness on the job.

7. Establish direct lines of cooperation with other public institutions such as the secondary schools. By acting as a transitional agency, of which there are very few in the United States, early identification, of potential problems could be better made and much wasted effort of the young worker might be avoided.

There are some types of data that should be collected in order to better evaluate M.D.T.A. programs as they relate to the larger labor market economy. At the time of the data collection for this study, no information on race or ethnicity were available. This information is now being obtained. The following information, however, is still needed.

8. Follow-up those who do not complete training. We do not know if non-completers fare better or worse than those who complete training. If they do as well, perhaps some programs should be structured in such a way that there are logical breaks where a trainee could be certified at various levels of competency. If the program is a continuing one, the trainee should have the option of returning to train for a higher level position in the same occupation if a labor shortage were found to exist. This would then open up a lower level job for a less well qualified worker. This plan would also make the program more responsive to current labor market conditions.

9. Follow-up those whose application for training is rejected. Who to accept or reject can be based on issues such as trainees occupational interest, past experience, current employment status, available funds for program development and other identifiable criteria. Administrative decisions at higher levels may also be a factor. For instance, is it policy to "skim" or "cream" the already better prepared who are more easily trained and placed on a job or is it policy to recruit the hard-core unemployed who must be trained at much greater expense with less chance of later employment. At least a sample of rejectees should be surveyed to determine possible bias in the selection process.

10. The overall effect of manpower training programs on the national economy has not been determined. Are jobs being filled that without these programs would not be filled or are other workers merely being replaced thereby leaving the total supply of unemployed unaltered? Control groups and longitudinal studies would have to be initiated on a rather broad scale to make this determination.

These recommendations are meant to be corrective of identified weaknesses in the M.D.T.A. program. Guidelines for building on existing strengths are inherent in the descriptive and speculative portions of this and previous chapters.

APPENDIX

PROGRAM: MDTA — 1; ARA — 2; Other — 4

TYPE OF ACTIVITY: Instit. — 1; OJT — 2; E&D — 4; Basic Ed. — 8; Pre-Voc. — 16; Other — 32

CHARACTERISTICS OF TRAINEES

Under the MDTA and the ARA

D/L-D/HEW MT-101 (Rev. 7-64)
Form approved.
Budget Bureau No. 44-R1202.1.

A. 1. State _____ (Code) 2. L.O. _____ (No.) 3. Project No. _____ Section No. _____

4. Occupation _____ D.O.T. Code _____

5. Name _____ (Last) _____ (First) _____ (Initial) 6. SSA No. _____

7. County of residence _____ _____ (Code)

8. Date of birth: _____ (Mo. and year)

9. Sex: Male — 1; Female — 2

10. Handicapped: Yes — 1; No — 2

11. Prior military status: Veteran — 1; Peacetime service — 2; Rejectee — 3; Other nonvet — 4; Not known — 5

12. Marital status: Single — 1; Married — 2; Other — 4

13. Primary wage earner: Yes — 1 No — 2

14. Family status: Head of family or Head of household: Yes — 1 No — 2

15. Number of dependents: — 0 — 1 — 2 — 3 — 4 — 5 and over

B. 1. Highest grade completed:

Code	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Code	College:	7	8	9
Grade	0	1 2 3 4	5	6 7	8	9 10 11	12	Year		1 2 3	4	4+

2. Primary occupation _____ D.O.T. Code _____

How long worked in *(Months)* _____ When last worked in *(Month and year)* _____

C. 1. Did applicant express willingness to accept job out of area? Yes — 1 No — 2

2. Referral to training or services: Accepted — 1 Refused — 2

3. Enrolled: Yes — 1 No — 2

5. Was reason considered: For good cause — 1 Not for good cause — 2

4. Reason for refusal of referral or failure to enroll:
Obtained employment — 1; Moved from area — 2; Illness (include preg.) — 3; Not interested — 4; Poor location or hours of training — 5; Insufficient allowance for training — 6; Not available (in school, Armed Forces) — 7; No one to look after family — 9; Reason not known — 0; Other *(Specify)* _____ — 8

D. 1. At time training offered, applicant was:
a. Underemployed — 0
35–39 hours per week and less than full time — 1
Less than 35 hours per week — 2
Under skill level — 4
Impending technological layoff — 8
b. Reentrant to labor force — 64
c. Unemployed — 16
Weeks unemployed: Less than 5 — 1; 5–14 — 2; 15–26 — 3; 27–52 — 4; Over 52 — 5
d. Farm worker — 32

2. Years of gainful employment: Under 2 — 0 2 — 1 3–9 — 2 10 or more — 3

3. Unemployment insurance status: Claimant — 1 Nonclaimant — 2

4. Public assistance status: Recipient — 1 Nonrecipient — 2

5. As defined for reimbursement of training costs, applicant is: Unemployed — 1 Other — 2

6. Last regular employment:
a. Occupation _____ D.O.T. Code _____
b. Industry _____ S.I.C. _____
c. Straight-time average hourly earnings $_____

E. Eligible for allowance *(Not applicable for ARA)*:
1. Regular training: Yes — 1 Augmented — 3 No — 2
2. Youth training: Yes — 1 No — 2
3. Subsistence-transportation: Yes — 1 No — 2

F. For youth:
1. What was the most important reason for your leaving school? *(Check only one)*
Graduated from 12th grade — 0; Illness — 1; Had to support self — 2; Had to support family — 3; Preferred work to school — 4; Because of low marks in school — 5; Had to work on family farm or in family business — 6; Trouble with teachers or school authorities — 7; Marriage or pregnancy — 8; Other — 9
(Specify) _____
2. Living with parents (either own or spouse's)? Yes — 1 No — 2
3. Highest grade of regular school father ever completed?

Code	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Code	College:	7	8	9
Grade	0	1 2 3 4	5	6 7	8	9 10 11	12	Year		1 2 3	4	4+

(Data Processing Office Copy)

INDIVIDUAL TRAINEE TERMINATION
TRAINING OR SERVICES

FORM APPROVED
BUDGET BUREAU NO. 44-R1204.1

PROGRAM:	PROJECT:	TRNG. PHASE:
MDTA —1	INST.—1	OCCUPATIONAL —0
RAR —2	OJT —2	BASIC ED. —1
OTHER—3	E&D —4	PRE-VOC. —2
NYC —4		OTHER —4

A. 1. NAME - LAST, FIRST, MIDDLE INITIAL

ADDRESS - STREET, CITY, STATE

2. SOCIAL SECURITY NO. ___ ___ ___ — ___ ___

3. SEX (CHECK ONE) M F

B. 1. STATE (NAME AND CODE)

2. PROJECT NUMBER

3. SECTION NUMBER (MDTA & RAR ONLY)

4. OCCUP. GOAL OR SERVICE FURNISHED

5. FIRST DAY ATTENDED MONTH DAY YEAR

6. LAST DAY ATTENDED MONTH DAY YEAR

7. NO. DAYS ATTENDED

8. NO. DAYS ABSENT

9. CLOCK HOURS ATTENDED

C. 1. NATURE OF TERMINATION

COMPLETED FULL COURSE	—00	DID NOT COMPLETE COURSE:	
EARLY COMPLETION	—01		
ACHIEVED TRAINING OBJECTIVE PRIOR TO END OF COURSE	—02	INVOLUNTARY	—03
		VOLUNTARY	—04

C. 2. TRANSFERRED TO: (NYC ONLY)

VOCATIONAL TRAINING	—11	OTHER SCHOOL	—14
APPRENTICESHIP TRNG	—12	OTHER NYC PROJECT	—15
REGULAR SCHOOL	—13	UNKNOWN	—16

D. EXISTING CONDITIONS AT TIME OF TERMINATION

1. IF TRAINEE DID NOT COMPLETE, INDICATE CONDITION BY CHECK. IF MORE THAN ONE CONDITION PRESENT, CHECK ALL APPLICABLE CONDITIONS AND CIRCLE ONE MOST IMPORTANT CONDITION.

POOR ATTENDANCE	—30	MOVED FROM AREA	—36	TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS	—42	DISLIKED COUNSELOR	—54
LACK OF PROGRESS	—31	CARE FOR FAMILY	—37	ENTERED ARMED FORCES	—43	AGREEMENT TERM	—55
MISCONDUCT	—32	PREGNANCY OF TRNEE.	—38	COULDN'T ADJ. TO TRNG/WRK	—50	UNKNOWN	—56
ALCOHOLISM	—33	ILLNESS OF TRAINEE	—39	LOST INTEREST	—51	OTHER (SPECIFY)	—57
COMMITTED TO INST.	—34	FULL-TIME SCHOOL	—40	DIDN'T ATT. REMED'L CLASS	—52		
POOR HOURS OR LOC.	—35	INSUF. PAY OR ALLOW.	—41	DISLIKED INSTRUCTOR	—53		

2. WAS TRAINEE INTERVIEWED BEFORE THIS SECTION WAS COMPLETED? YES—1. NO—2.

E. STATUS AT TIME OF TERMINATION (COMPLETE FOR ALL TRAINEES; CHECK ONE)

WORKING OR SCHEDULED TO REPORT TO:		NOT SCHEDULED TO REPORT TO A JOB BUT:			
TRAINING RELATED JOB	—01	LOOKING FOR WORK	—03	SCHEDULED FOR FURTHER TRNG.	—05
NON-TRAINING RELATED JOB	—02	NOT LOOKING FOR WORK	—04	NOT KNOWN	—06

F. FOR THE TRAINING FACILITY (COMPLETE FOR MDTA TRAINEES ONLY; CHECK ONE)

DATE: _____

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF TERMINATION FOR THE TRAINEE TO WHOM THIS REPORT REFERS ARE:

FOR GOOD CAUSE _____ 1. NOT FOR GOOD CAUSE _____ 2.

NAME: (SIGNATURE) _____ (FACILITY NAME) _____

(TYPED OR PRINTED) _____ ADDRESS _____

TITLE _____

G. FACILITY OR DEPT. HEAD REVIEW (COMPLETE FOR NYC. FOR MDTA COMPLETE IF TERMINATION WAS NOT FOR GOOD CAUSE)

I HAVE REVIEWED THE CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING THE TERMINATION OF THE TRAINEE TO WHICH THIS REPORT REFERS AND HAVE FOUND THEM TO BE ACCURATELY DESCRIBED.

NAME: (SIGNATURE) _____ TITLE: (AGENCY HEAD) _____

(TYPED OR PRINTED) _____ AGENCY NAME _____

H. FOR USE BY SELECTION OR REFERRAL OFFICE (CHECK APPLICABLE ITEMS)

1. ALL PHASES OF TRAINING OR SERVICES TERMINATED: YES—1 NO—2

2A. IF NO, ADDITIONAL OR CONTINUING ACTIVITY SCHEDULED:

MDTA —1	INST.—1	OCCUPATIONAL —0	
RAR —2	OJT —2	BASIC ED. —1	
OTHER—3	E&D —4	PRE-VOC. —2	
NYC —4		OTHER —4	

B. PROJECT NO. _____ C. SECTION NO. _____

D. OCCUPATION _____ DOT CODE _____

E. TRAINEE ENROLLED IN ADDITIONAL ACTIVITY; YES—1 NO—2

F. IF NOT ENROLLED, ENTER COND. CODE (SEC. D.1.) _____

G. GOOD CAUSE: YES—1 NO—2

STATE NAME AND CODE _____ OFFICE OR AGREEMENT NO. _____ DATE _____

D/L-D/HEW MT-102 (REV. 8/65)

DL/HEW FORM MT-103

MDTA ..... 1 Instit. ..... 1 Basic Ed..... 8
ARA ..... 2 OJT ..... 2 Pre. Voc.....16
Other ..... 3 E and D ..... 4 Other 32

POST TRAINING REPORT

Bud. Bur. No. 44-R1246
Expires 6/30/65

State _____ (Name) _____ (Code)
Project Number _____
Section Number _____

A. IDENTIFICATION

1. Name _____ (Last) (First) (Initial) 2. S.S. No. _____
3. Date of Birth _____ (Month/Year) 4. Occupation For Which Trained _____ D.O.T. Code _____
5. Report Number _____1 _____2 _____3 For reference week ending _____ (Month/Day/Year)
6. Source of Data: Trainee or Trainee's Family ____ (1); MT-103a ____ (2); L.O. Records ____ (3); Could Not Locate Trainee ____ (4)

B. STATUS

1. Work History Since Training
   - a. Total Weeks Since Training _____
     - (1) Weeks Totally Unemployed _____
     - (2) Weeks In Which Employed _____
     - (1) and (2) should add to total
   - b. Number of Jobs Lasting 30 Days or More Since Training _____
     - (1) Training Related Jobs _____
     - (2) Non-Training Related Jobs _____
     - (3) Information Not Known _____
   - c. Number of Placements Through ES _____

If Other than Zero → During Last Month

(a) Has Individual Turned Down Offer of a Training Related Job
Yes ___1 No ___0

(b) If Yes, Check 1 or More Reasons
- Hours Undesirable ___1
- Pay Below Normal for Occupation ___2
- Couldn't Afford to Move ___4
- Unwilling to Move ___8
- Other _____ ___16
- (Explain) _____

If Other than Zero →

(a) Reason for Leaving Last Job Lasting 30 Days or More
- Did Not Leave a Job ___0
- Slack Work ___1
- Plant Shut Down ___2
- Illness ___3
- Other ___4
- Unknown ___9

2. Current Labor Force Status
   - a. Employed _____ 1
   - b. Unemployed _____ 2
   - c. Not in Labor Force:
     - Keeping House ___3 Illness ___5
     - In School ___4 Other ___6
     - (Explain other) _____

If Checked →

(a) Job Obtained Through:
- ES Office ___1
- Establishment Where Trained ___2
- School ___3
- Other ___4
- Not Known ___9

3. *If Employed In Reference Week (if B2a is Checked)*
   - a. Employer's Industry _____ SIC Code _____
   - b. Trainee's Occupation _____ D.O.T. Code _____
   - c. Hours Worked In Reference Week
     - Less than 15 ___1
     - 15-34 ___2
     - 35 or more ___3
   - d. Straight-Time Average Hourly Earnings $ _____ per hr. (Excluding Overtime)
   - e. Is Job Training Related? Yes___1 No___2
     - (1) Was Training Useful in Obtaining Job Yes___1 No___2
   - f. Job Is Expected to Last 30 Days or More Yes___1 No___2
   - g. Trainee Had to Move 50 Miles or More to Take Job Yes___1 No___2

If Checked →

(1) Is Individual Waiting to Report to a Job in the Next 30 Days
- Yes ___1
- No ___0

If Yes, Is It Training Related
- Yes ___2
- No ___3
- Not Known ___4

If Checked →

(1) Hours Worked Were
- Normal For Industry, Area or Season ___1
- Part-Time
  - Employee's Choice ___2
  - For Economic Reasons ___3
  - Other _____ (Explain) ___4
- Not Known ___9

GPO 878-361

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Backstrom, Charles H., and Gerald D. Hursh. Survey Research. Chicago: Northwestern University Press, 1963.

Bakke, E. Wight. "Concept of the Social Organization," Yearbook of the Society for General Systems Research, 1959, IV, 95-122.

Barber, Bernard. Social Stratification: A Comparative Analysis of Structure and Process. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1957.

Beker, Joseph M. (ed.). In Aid of the Unemployed. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1965.

Bennis, Warren G. "Towards a 'Truly' Scientific Management: The Concept of Organizational Health." Yearbook of the Society for General Systems Research, 1962, VII, 269-282.

_____. Changing Organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1966.

Berger, Peter L. Invitation to Sociology: A Humanistic Perspective. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1963.

_____ and Thomas Luckman. The Social Construction of Reality. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1966.

Bertalanffy, Ludwig von. General System Theory. New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1968.

Blalock, Hubert M., Jr. Causal Inferences in Nonexperimental Research. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1961.

Blau, Peter M., and Richard W. Scott. Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962.

Bowen, William G., and T. Aldrich Finegan. The Economics of Labor Force Participation. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.

Bredemeier, Harry C., and Richard M. Stephenson. The Analysis of Social Systems. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1962.

Brown, Robert. Explanation in Social Science. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1963.

Buckley, Walter. Sociology and Modern Systems Theory. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

Campbell, Donald T., and Julian C. Stanley. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963.

Caplow, Theodore. Principles of Organization. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1964.

Cooper, James G. Basic Statistical Analyses for Educational Research. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, 1966.

Cooper, William W., Harold J. Leavitt, and Maynard W. Shelly, II, (eds.). New Perspectives in Organizational Research. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.

Crozier, Michel. The Bureaucratic Phenomenon. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Davis, James A. Undergraduate Career Decisions: Correlates of Occupational Choice. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1965.

Diamond, William J., Charles F. Martin, Sr., and Richard I. Miller. Methodology for Assessing the Quality of Public Education. Bulletin of the Bureau of School Service, XLI, No. 3. Lexington: University of Kentucky, College of Education.

Dubin, Robert. Theory Building. New York: The Free Press, 1969.

Easton, David. The Political System. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1959.

Erickson, Edsel L., et al. "Differences Between Edonomically Disadvantaged Students Who Volunteer and Do Not Volunteer for Economic Opportunity Programs." Journal of Human Resources: Education, Manpower, and Welfare Policies, IV:76-83, 1969.

Etzioni, Amitai. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. New York: The Free Press, 1961.

_____. Complex Organizations: A Sociological Reader. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961.

Francis, Roy G. The Rhetoric of Science: A Methodological Discussion of the Two-by-Two Table. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press.

Gage, N. L. (ed.). Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963.

Gainsbrugh, Martin R. (ed.). Voluntary and Involuntary Unemployment. New York: The National Industrial Conference Board, 1964.

Ginzberg, Eli. Manpower Agenda for America. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1968.

_____. Manpower Strategy for the Metropolis. New York: Columbia University Press, 1968.

Glaser, Barney G., and Anselm L. Strauss. The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967.

Glock, Charles Y. (ed.). Survey Research in the Social Sciences. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1967.

Gordon, Robert Aaron (ed.). Toward a Manpower Policy. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967.

Greer, Scott. The Logic of Social Inquiry. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1969.

Hammond, Phillip E. (ed.). Sociologists at Work. Garden City: Anchor Books, 1964.

Hill, Walter A., and Douglas Egan. Readings in Organizational Theory: A Behavioral Approach. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1967.

Homans, George C. The Nature of Social Science. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1967.

Hoos, Ida R. Retraining the Work Force. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1967.

Howland, Daniel. "Approaches to the Systems Problem." Yearbook of the Society for General Systems Research, 1964, IX, 283-285.

Kalachek, Edward. The Youth Labor Market. Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, The University of Michigan, Wayne State University, and The National Manpower Policy Task Force, Washington, D.C., 1969.

Katz, Daniel, and Robert L. Kahn. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

Kendall, Patricia L., and Katherine M. Wolf. "The Two Purposes of Deviant Case Analysis." in The Language of Social Research. Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Morris Rosenberg (eds.). New York: The Free Press, 1955.

Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.

Lansing, John B., and James N. Morgan. "The Effect of Geographical Mobility on Income." Journal of Human Resources: Education, Manpower, and Welfare Policies, II:449-460, 1967.

Lawrence, J. R. (ed.). Operational Research and the Social Sciences. London: Tavistock Publications, 1966.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F. "Interpretation of Statistical Relations as a Research Operation." in The Language of Social Research. Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Morris Rosenberg (eds.). New York: The Free Press, 1955.

_____ and Allen H. Barton. "Some General Principles of Questionnaire Classffication." in The Language of Social Research. Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Morris Rosenberg (eds.). New York: The Free Press, 1955.

_____ and Morris Rosenberg (eds.). The Language of Social Research. New York: The Free Press, 1955.

Leavitt, Harold J. (ed.). The Social Science of Organizations. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.

Lebergott, Stanley (ed.). Men Without Work. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Levitan, Sar A., and Irving H. Siegel (eds.). Dimensions of Manpower Policy: Programs and Research. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1966.

Lipset, Seymour Martin, and Reinhard Bendix. Social Mobility in Industrial Society. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966.

Main, Earl D. "A Nationwide Evaluation of M.D.T.A. Institutional Job Training." Journal of Human Resources: Education, Manpower, and Welfare Policies, III:159-170, 1968.

Mangum, Garth L. The Manpower Revolution: Its Policy Consequences. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1965.

_____. M.D.T.A.: Foundations of Federal Manpower Policy. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1968.

March, J. G., and H. A. Simon. Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.

Martindale, Don. The Nature and Types of Sociological Theory. Cambridge: The Riverside Press, 1960.

_____. Institutions, Organizations and Mass Society. Boston: Houghton-Mifflen Company, 1966.

Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: The Free Press, 1957.

Michael, Donald N. Cybernation: The Silent Conquest. Santa Barbara: Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, 1962.

Miller, Delbert C. Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1964.

Mills, Theodore M. The Sociology of Small Groups. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

Monane, Joseph H. A Sociology of Human Systems. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.

Morse, Dean. The Peripheral Worker. New York: Columbia University Press, 1969.

Okun. Arthur M. (ed.). The Battle Against Unemployment. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1965.

Parsons, Talcott, and Edward Shils (eds.). Toward a General Theory of Action. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1951.

Phillips, Bernard S. Social Research: Strategy and Tactics. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966.

Piore, Michael J. "on-the-Job Training and Adjustment to Technological Change." Journal of Human Resources: Education, Manpower, and Welfare Policies, III:435-449, 1968.

Popham, W. James. Educational Statistics: Use and Interpretation. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1967.

Presthus, Robert. The Organizational Society: An Analysis and a Theory. New York: Vintage Books, 1962.

Rice, Charles E. "A Model for the Emperical Study of a Large Scale Organization." Yearbook of the Society for General Systems Research, VI:101-106, 1961.

Rose, Arnold M. "Varieties of Sociological Imagination." American Sociological Review, XXXIV, 5:623-630, 1969.

Schutz, Alfred. The Phenomenology of the Social World. Chicago: Northwestern University Press, 1967.

Shepherd, Clovis R. Small Groups: Some Sociological Perspectives. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1964.

Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.

Sinfield, Adrian. The Long Term Unemployed. Paris: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 1968.

Somers, Gerald G. "The Response of Vocational Education to Labor Market Changes." in Vocational Education: Report of a Conference sponsored by the Brookings Institution, published as a supplement to the Journal of Human Resources: Education, Manpower, and Welfare Policies, III:32-58, 1968.

_____ (ed.). Retraining the Unemployed. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1968.

Stinchcombe, Arthur L. Constructing Social Theories. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1968.

Stromsdorfer, Ernst W. "Determinants of Economic Success in Retraining the Unemployed: The West Virginia Experience." Journal of Human Resources: Education, Manpower, and Welfare Policies, III:139-158, 1968.

Suchman, Edward A. Evaluative Research: Principles and Practice in Public Service and Social Action Programs. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1967.

Thompson, James D. Organizations in Action. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1967.

Thompson, Victor A. Modern Organization: A General Theory. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1961.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Education and Training. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1967.

_____. Education and Training. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1968.

_____. Education and Training. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1969.

U.S. Department of Labor. Job Development for the Hard-to-Employ. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1968.

_____. Manpower Report of the President and a Report on Manpower Requirements, Resources, Utilization, and Training. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1967.

_____. Manpower Report of the President and a Report on Manpower Requirements, Resources, Utilization, and Training. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1968.

_____. Manpower Report of the President and a Report on Manpower Requirements, Resources, Utilization, and Training. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1969.

_____. Manpower Research Projects sponsored by the U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1968.

_____. Statistics on Manpower. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1969.

_____, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Manpower Policy Task Force, and the Woodrow Wilson School and the Industrial Relations Section. The Transition from School to Work. Princeton: Princeton University, 1968.

Viet, Jean. Les Methodes Structuralistes Dans Les Sciences Sociales. Paris: Mouton and Company, 1967.

Wallace, Walter E. (ed.). Sociological Theory. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1969.

Webb, Eugene J., Donald T. Campbell, Richard D. Schwartz, and Lee Sechrest. Unobtrusive Measures: Nonreactive Research in the Social Sciences. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1966.

Wert, James E., et al. Statistical Methods in Educational and Psychological Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954.

Williams, Frederick. Reasoning with Statistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.

Williams, Robin M., Jr. American Society: A Sociological Interpretation. New York: Alfred Knopf, Inc., 1960.

Woodward, Joan. Organization: Theory and Practice. London: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Young, Oran R. Systems of Political Science. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.

Zetterberg, Hans L. On Theory and Verification in Sociology. Totowa, N.J.: The Bedminster Press, 1965.