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ABSTRACT

AN ADMINISTRATIVE PERSPECTIVE OF THE
JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT IN
SELECTED COUNTIES IN TENNESSEE

by

Ellis H. Winkler

The problem of this study was to determine if, in selected counties in Tennessee, differences in the noncompletion rate, the positive termination rate, and the job retention rate existed in categories of participants in the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA).

This study followed the ex-post-facto design. A personal data form was developed for the purpose of gathering data relative to the personal characteristics of participants enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program between July 1, 1984 and June 30, 1985. The findings reflect data gathered on all 1,005 participants in the program.

The chi-square test was applied to all 27 of the hypotheses. The statistical analysis was intended to determine significant differences in the participants categorized by sex, age, education, public assistance, unemployment compensation, hours trained, and type of training, in Service Delivery Area 2 in Tennessee.

The differences showing significance in the study warranted the following conclusions:

1. The age of the participants significantly affected the positive termination rate of participants in selected age categories, and it was determined that the 18-21 age category had more positive termination participants than expected.

2. A comparison of the positive termination rate and the job retention rate by age indicated a difference existed in that there were significantly more job retention rate participants than positive termination rate participants in all four age categories.
3. A significant difference was found in the job retention rate of participants enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program. There were significantly more job retention participants who received unemployment compensation than expected and significantly fewer participants who did not receive unemployment compensation than expected.

4. The type of training received does significantly affect the positive termination rate of participants in selected training categories. The manufacturing/factory assembly line category had significantly fewer participants than were expected. However, the sales/service category had significantly more participants observed than were expected.
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CHAPTER 1
Introduction

The Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) is a national program for training and placing eligible participants in unsubsidized jobs. Each state is provided federal funds to operate the JTPA and has organized a delivery system to provide services authorized in the Act. In Tennessee, these funds are channeled through the Tennessee Department of Labor to 14 Service Delivery Areas or Districts.

According to data prepared by the Tennessee Department of Employment Security (Spring, 1984), Service Delivery Area 2 encompasses an area of 3,696 square miles and includes the counties of Claiborne, Cocke, Grainger, Greene, Hamblen, Hancock, Hawkins, Jefferson, Sevier, and Union. This region is located in the northeastern portion of the state and is bordered by the states of Kentucky and Virginia. Among the kinds of products manufactured in the region are furniture, textiles, chemicals, apparel, fabricated metal products, paper products, and electrical components.

The population of Service Delivery Area 2 was expected to increase from 308,907 in 1980 to 334,460 in 1984, an 8.3% change. Males were expected to number 163,152 and females 171,308. The black population was expected to total 6,927 with other minorities amounting to 1,887 in 1984. Minorities were expected to account for 2.6% of the
Many of the counties in the region have shown an increase in population and an expanding labor force while maintaining an unemployment rate within a few points of the state rate. Service Delivery Area 2 has contracted with the Tennessee Department of Employment Security to certify eligible participants for Title II-A of the JTPA. Persons being eligible to participate in job training programs under Title II-A must be economically disadvantaged.

The JTPA administrators should be aware of the personal profile of the JTPA on-the-job training participants in order to enable the administrators to make sound decisions regarding the relative merits of local programs. The JTPA administration is responsible not only to the participants and the financial supporters of the program for conducting an ongoing assessment of the program, but according to Brauchle (1984) the JTPA evaluation criteria and methodology should be "customized" for each local agency—for its special circumstances and characteristics—so that the evaluation system is significant and useful. At the same time, it will have to satisfy the major evaluation components of the law. Thus, a local administrative proposal to deliver training services will be evaluated in terms of how well the proposed objectives correspond with those identified in the law, and the program output will be measured in terms of the degree to which those objectives have been achieved.
The Problem

Statement of the Problem

The problem of the study was to determine if, in selected counties in Tennessee, differences in the noncompletion rate, the positive termination rate and the job retention rate existed in categories of participants in the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA).

Subproblems

The following subproblems were developed to:

1. Determine if a difference existed between males and females in the noncompletion rate, the positive termination rate, and the job retention rate of JTPA participants.

2. Determine if a difference existed between selected age groups in the noncompletion rate, the positive termination rate, and the job retention rate of JTPA participants.

3. Determine if a difference existed between selected educational levels and the noncompletion rate, the positive termination rate, and the job retention rate of JTPA participants.

4. Determine if a difference existed between selected categories of public assistance and the noncompletion rate, the positive termination rate, and the job retention rate of JTPA participants.

5. Determine if a difference existed between selected categories of unemployment compensation and the noncompletion
rate, the positive termination rate, and the job retention rate of JTPA participants.

6. Determine if a difference existed between selected categories of hours of training and the noncompletion rate, the positive termination rate, and the job retention rate of JTPA participants.

7. Determine if a difference existed between selected categories of training and the noncompletion rate, the positive termination rate, and the job retention rate of JTPA participants.

Significance of the Study

The need for evaluation of manpower programs was indicated by Patton in 1971. He stated:

For both institutional and on-the-job training there have been studies made which suggest that sizeable proportions of trainees drop out before completing training. For both types of programs it appears that those who completed on-the-job training remained with their contracting employers. However, these generalizations are very shaky because the studies are quite inadequate. (Patton, 1971, p. 648)

According to Jakubauskas and Palomba:

If manpower programs are to be improved and become more efficient and more effective, then evaluation of these programs is essential. An underlying premise of the evaluation of programs is its importance in providing evidence about the relative merits of manpower programs so that administrators of these programs can make rational decisions. From the viewpoints of the trained (the target population), the government, and society, we are obligated to evaluate and improve manpower programs. (Jakubauskas & Palomba, 1973, p. 225)
The lack of data regarding manpower training was mentioned by Perry:

There is ample and highly diverse evaluative literature on the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) sponsored and MDTA related training programs, as would be expected given the longevity and breadth of the MDTA training effort. Unfortunately, however, much of this literature is not directly relevant to an assessment of the basic impact of MDTA on the labor force or the labor market: even within the relevant, there is a surprising paucity of hard data on the impact of MDTA programs. (Perry, 1976, p. 154)

The research contrasted the noncompletion rate, the positive termination rate, and the job retention rate by sex, age, educational level, public assistance recipients, unemployment compensation recipients, the amount of training provided to the participants, and the type of training provided to on-the-job participants in the JTPA program.

Specifically, the study is significant in that it provides information on the effectiveness of JTPA on-the-job training and furnishes information for future planning by JTPA administrators, governmental officials, and society.

Limitations
1. The study was limited to the eastern Tennessee counties of Claiborne, Cocke, Grainger, Greene, Hamblen, Hancock, Hawkins, Jefferson, Sevier, and Union.
2. The study was limited to participants who left the JTPA on-the-job training program.
3. The ages of the participants were limited to 18-55.
4. The 13-week follow-up was limited to individuals who had been positively terminated from the JTPA on-the-job program between July 1, 1984 and June 30, 1985.

5. All participants were involved in Title II of the JTPA.

**Assumptions**

1. It was assumed that there was a need for a study of this nature.

2. It was assumed that data obtained from the Job Training Partnership Act and the Tennessee Department of Labor offices were correct.

3. It was assumed that training was intended to have a positive influence on job placement.

**Procedures**

1. A review of current literature was conducted in Sherrod Library at East Tennessee State University.

2. District 2 of the Tennessee Department of Labor was selected as the service delivery area to be studied.

3. The office of the service delivery area in District 2 of the Tennessee Department of Labor was contacted for a roster of participants who were terminated between July 1, 1984 and June 30, 1985.

4. Job Training Partnership Act records of the selected participants were obtained from the District 2 and Nashville offices of the Tennessee Department of Labor.
5. The data were analyzed using the chi-square test with a .05 level of significance.

6. The results were reported and summarized.

Definitions of Terms

**Administrative Entity**

An administrative entity is the entity designated to administer a job training plan (Public Law 97-300, 1982, p. 1325).

**Economically Disadvantaged**

The economically disadvantaged individual: (a) receives or is a member of a family which receives cash welfare payments under a federal, state, or local welfare program; (b) has, or is a member of a family which has received a total family income for the 6-month period prior to application for the program involved (exclusive of unemployment compensation, child support payments, and welfare payments) which, in relation to family size, was not in excess of the higher of (1) the poverty level determined in accordance with criteria established by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, or (2) 70% of the lower living standard income level; (c) is receiving food stamps pursuant to the Food Stamp Act of 1977; (d) is a foster child on behalf of whom state or local government payments are made; or (e) in cases permitted by regulations
of the secretary, is an adult handicapped individual whose own income meets the requirements of clause (a) or (b), but is a member of a family whose income does not meet such requirements (Public Law 97-300, 1982, p. 1325).

**Handicapped Individual**

Any individual who has a physical or mental disability which for such individual constitutes or results in a substantial handicap to employment (General Accounting Office, 1985, p. 56).

**High School Graduate, or Equivalent, and Above (JTPA Only)**

An individual who has received a high school diploma or GED Certificate, or who has attended any post-secondary, vocational, technical, or academic school (General Accounting Office, 1985, p. 56).

**Job Retention Rate**

Participants who have been placed in unsubsidized employment and retained to perform work which provides job knowledge and skills (Public Law 97-300, 1982, p. 1333).

**Noncompletion Rate**

Participants who enrolled in on-the-job training, but left the program prior to completing the training (Public Law 97-300, 1982, p. 1333).
On-the-job Training

Training provided to a participant who has been hired by an employer to perform work which provides job knowledge and skills (Public Law 97-300, 1982, p. 1361).

Positive Termination

Participants who have been placed in unsubsidized employment (Public Law 97-300, 1982, p. 1333).

Private Sector

Persons who are owners, chief executives, or chief operating officers of private for-profit employers and major non-governmental employers, such as health and educational institutions or other executives of such employers who have substantial management or policy responsibility (Public Law 97-300, 1982, p. 1326).

Public Assistance

A participant in Title II-A who is a welfare recipient or whose family is receiving cash payment under AFDC (SSA Title IV), General Assistance (State or local government), or the Refugee Assistance Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-212) at the time of JTPA eligibility determination (General Accounting Office, 1985, p. 55).

School Dropout

An individual who is not attending any school and has not received a high school diploma or a GED Certificate (General Accounting Office, 1985, p. 55).
Service Delivery Area

Grant Recipient

The entity that receives JTPA funds for a Service Delivery Area directly from the governor (Public Law 97-300, 1982, p. 1333).

Unemployment Compensation Claimant

Any individual who has filed a claim and has been determined monetarily eligible for benefit payments under one or more State or Federal unemployment compensation programs, and who has not exhausted benefit rights or whose benefit year has not ended (General Accounting Office, 1985, p. 56).

Unemployed Individual

An individual who did not work during the 7 consecutive days prior to application to a JTPA program, who made specific efforts to find a job within the past 4 weeks prior to application, and who was available for work during the 7 consecutive days prior to application (General Accounting Office, 1985, p. 56).

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses, stated in the declarative format, were developed for this study:

$H_1$ There will be a significant difference in the noncompletion rate of males and females enrolled in the JTPA
on-the-job training program.

$H_2$ There will be a significant difference in the positive termination rate of males and females enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program.

$H_3$ There will be a significant difference in the job retention rate of males and females enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program.

$H_4$ There will be a significant difference in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of males enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program.

$H_5$ There will be a significant difference in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of females enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program.

$H_6$ There will be a significant difference in the noncompletion rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program whose ages are 18-21, 22-30, 31-40, and 41-55.

$H_7$ There will be a significant difference in the positive termination rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program whose ages are 18-21, 22-30, 31-40, and 41-55.

$H_8$ There will be a significant difference in the job retention rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program whose ages are 18-21, 22-30, 31-40, and 41-55.
$H_9$ There will be a significant difference in the positive termination rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program whose ages are 18-21, 22-30, 31-40, and 41-55.

$H_{10}$ There will be a significant difference in the noncompletion rate of individuals in selected educational levels: high school dropouts, high school graduate/equivalents, and post high school participants enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program.

$H_{11}$ There will be a significant difference in the positive termination rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program in selected educational levels: high school dropouts, high school graduate/equivalents, and post high school enrollees.

$H_{12}$ There will be a significant difference in the job retention rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program in selected educational levels: high school dropouts, high school graduate/equivalents, and post high school enrollees.

$H_{13}$ There will be a significant difference in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of high school dropouts, high school graduate/equivalents, and post high school participants enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program.

$H_{14}$ There will be a significant difference in the noncompletion rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA
on-the-job training program who received public assistance and individuals who did not receive public assistance.

$H_{15}$ There will be a significant difference in the positive termination rate of individuals enrolled in the on-the-job training program who received public assistance and individuals who did not receive public assistance.

$H_{16}$ There will be a significant difference in the job retention rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program who received public assistance and individuals who did not receive public assistance.

$H_{17}$ There will be a significant difference in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program who received public assistance.

$H_{18}$ There will be a significant difference in the noncompletion rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program who received unemployment compensation and individuals who did not receive unemployment compensation.

$H_{19}$ There will be a significant difference in the positive termination rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program who received unemployment compensation and individuals who did not receive unemployment compensation.

$H_{20}$ There will be a significant difference in the job retention rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job
training program who received unemployment compensation and individuals who did not receive unemployment compensation.

$H_{21}$ There will be a significant difference in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program who received unemployment compensation.

$H_{22}$ There will be a significant difference in the positive termination rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program and trained for a period of 160 hours, 480 hours, 760 hours, and 1,040 hours.

$H_{23}$ There will be a significant difference in the job retention rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program and trained for a period of 160 hours, 480 hours, 760 hours, and 1,040 hours.

$H_{24}$ There will be a significant difference in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program and trained for a period of 160 hours, 480 hours, 760 hours, and 1,040 hours.

$H_{25}$ There will be a significant difference in the positive termination rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program and trained to be manufacturing/factory assembly line employees, clerk/typist employees, and sales/service employees.

$H_{26}$ There will be a significant difference in the job retention rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job
training program and trained to be manufacturing/factory assembly line employees, clerk/typist employees, and sales/service employees.

\( H_{27} \) There will be a significant difference in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program and trained to be manufacturing/factory assembly line employees, clerk/typist employees, and sales/service employees.

**Organization of the Study**

This study was organized and presented in five chapters. Chapter 1 contains the introduction of the study, the statement of the problem, its purpose and significance, the limitations, and assumptions, definitions of terms, a listing of the hypotheses, and a description of the procedures and organization of the study.

Chapter 2 includes a review of the related literature. Chapter 3 describes the procedures and methodology of the study. Chapter 4 contains an analysis of the data and presentation of the results. Chapter 5 includes the summary of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations.
CHAPTER 2
Review of Related Literature

Introduction
The late Senator Robert F. Kennedy concluded: "This nation faces many problems . . . but of all of our problems, none is more immediate--none is more pressing--none is more omnipresent--than the crisis of unemployment" (Gordon, 1972, p. vii).

Studies pertinent to this investigation were reviewed in this chapter. References to related literature were compiled in this chapter relative to the increasing concern regarding federal intervention in the area of unemployment. They were further selected to provide specific information about the historical intervention of the federal government into employment and training programs, unemployment programs and benefit distribution.

An Historical Overview of Job Training Programs
Baumer and Van Horn (1985) noted that the federal government had made a direct and continuous effort of support for the unemployed since the 1930s. Due to a 25% unemployment rate, the election of President Roosevelt, and a Congress which supported strong government action, Roosevelt's emergency relief measures passed Congress and put in place temporary jobs programs, short-term financial
assistance, and other humanitarian aid for the indigent and unemployed.

Although temporary jobs programs come and go with the whims of public opinion and political support, and remain a highly debatable subject, the nationwide insurance system remained virtually uninterrupted during the past half century. The American welfare state and unemployment insurance, such as social security pensions and health care benefits for the elderly, have become deeply ingrained in the American way of life and have become one of a group of government entitlements that politicians are unlikely to change, except to continue benefits and make them more liberal.

Scott (1982) suggested that government expenditures on manpower programs made an investment in individuals which was intended to increase their income-producing ability. The basic thinking was that some people would not be able to attain basic job skills if the government did not provide these job skills through government intervention in the form of grants and subsistence. This line of thinking insinuated that individuals who received job training would have better job opportunities than those individuals who did not participate in job training through manpower programs.

According to Harrison, Sheppard, and Spring (1972), the 1935 Works Project Administration (WPA) started with small projects and expanded $1.4 million per year until 1943 when
the program was eliminated. During 1935 the Institute of Public Opinion polled a sample of the American people. One of the questions asked for "the greatest accomplishment" of the Roosevelt administration, as well as the "worst thing" the Roosevelt administration had done. The Works Project Administration won in both categories.

Greenspan, Mirengoff, Rindler, and Seabloom (1980) noted the Neighborhood Youth Corps, Operation Mainstream, and the Public Service Careers Program were job training programs which tried to improve the employability of participants during the 1960s. The Neighborhood Youth Corps was structured to prepare disadvantaged youth for employment by providing some job experience, a bit of orientation to the workplace, and some discipline by working directly under a supervisor. Operation Mainstream provided low-income older workers with the opportunity to participate in useful community improvement activities, especially in rural areas. Minorities and other disadvantaged persons were provided opportunities in public employment through a small-scale Public Service Careers Program.

Strong (1975) found that with the passage in 1961 of the Area Redevelopment Act the Federal Manpower Policy changed directions. The federal government conceded that specific areas would probably remain in a depressed condition without governmental intervention, which would include a slight contribution to the upgrading of specific skills. The
The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 was action in response to the loss of jobs due to the effects of automation.

The United States officially declared "war on poverty" in 1964, when the Economic Opportunity Act was passed. The opportunities of those individuals at the lower end of the income level were increased by providing them with second-chance opportunities for adult education and skill training. In 1967, Congress gave economic benefits to public assistance recipients who found employment. The recipients were allowed to keep the first $80 of their monthly earnings. In 1970, Congress increased the financial incentives to enter employment, and insisted that certain recipients register for employment and accept the job offered or chance being removed from the public assistance rolls (Strong, 1975).

According to Mirengoff and Rindler (1980), there was recognition in the 1960s that, even in times of economic growth, there are individuals who, because of a lack of education and skills, have a particularly difficult time competing in the labor market. As a result, emphasis was on the equal opportunity for minorities and other individuals who faced special barriers to employment, the development of human resources, and the elimination of poverty.

Brauche (1984) reported that in an effort to train disadvantaged youth and adults for productive employment, a great deal of public monies have been spent. The two most
noteworthy were the 1962 Manpower Development and Training Act, also known as MDTA, and the 1973 Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, known as CETA. A great number of individuals participated in these and federally supported human resource development programs with such large amounts of money and personnel involved, evaluation has been a major concern.

According to Hallman (1980), CETA was charged with expending public service employment funds, and brought together various manpower programs under local and state prime sponsors, as well as provided for several other programs (such as Indians, migrants, youth, older workers, offenders, and persons of limited English-speaking ability). Prime sponsors were created out of cities with a population greater than 100,000, counties with at least 100,000 people outside those cities, and a combination of eligible cities and counties, and state governments for the balance.

The Committee for Economic Development (1973) reported that decentralization and decategorization were two of the objectives of the CETA program. There were more than 20 existing categorical manpower programs that had been under the administration of numerous separate and oftentimes competing bureaucracies. As a result of this action, the major responsibility for planning and delivering manpower services was moved from the Federal Government to state and
local governments, although they remained subject to federal review. However, the major thrust of CETA continued to be on preparing the hard-to-employ for jobs, and it was expected that the consolidation would make it possible to align those services more closely to the local labor markets.

According to Mirengoff and Rindler (1978) transformation of the manpower system appealed to pragmatic administrators seeking a more rational way to conduct employment and training activities, as well as the administrators attracted by the features of grass root participation and to administrators who were committed to a reduction of the federal role.

Baumer and Van Horn (1985) described CETA as being the focus of American policy for the unemployed from 1973-83. Its programs were the only unemployment measures that sought to help the chronically unemployed obtain steady jobs. CETA's public service employment components were the major federal job measures in existence at the time and the only ones focused on helping the long-term unemployed. Changing funding levels reflected Congress's shifting objectives. CETA was formally amended on several occasions: Public service employment programs were added in 1974 and 1977, altered in 1978, and discontinued in 1981; major programs for youth, veterans, migrant workers, and senior citizens were implemented and the entire law was reformed in 1978 and 1982. Originally, CETA's main objective was to
train the chronically unemployed for private sector jobs. Within months after being passed into law, however, Congress added "emergency" job components onto CETA to balance the recession of 1974-75. Within a few years, CETA increased from providing approximately 100,000 jobs to more than 725,000 jobs in 1978-79.

An Overview of JTPA

According to Riffel (1984), Congress specified its view that job training is an "investment in human capital and not an expense." It decreed that the results of the investment be evaluated to determine if it was worthwhile. Two specific criteria were to be used: increased employment and earnings of participants, and a reduction in welfare dependency. This emphasis on performance standards was another key component of JTPA and could prove to be the law's most dramatic change. It should no longer be possible for federal employment and training dollars to be used for political patronage, as critics charged they were under CETA. Organizations that received JTPA dollars would have to prove their ability to meet the state's performance standards.

According to the National Alliance of Business (1982), the Job Training Partnership Act of 1982 promoted a longstanding federal commitment to help prepare people with serious employment barriers to be productive members of the labor force. Like the 1973 Comprehensive Employment and
Training Act—which it replaced—the new legislation worked primarily through a locally based program delivery system to provide remedial education, training, and employment assistance to low income and long-term unemployed youth and adults.

An important departure from the structure of former training programs under CETA involved the focus of JTPA upon training and skill development rather than monetary payments to the participants. Income maintenance and stipends provided under JTPA were almost nonexistent (Leconte & Kochhar, 1983).

Rogers (1985) noted that the typical JTPA participant many times was poorly educated, had few or no marketable skills, had been chronically unemployed and underemployed, had poor work habits, and often did not have adequate transportation. Additionally, some were divorced with young children, which in turn created very serious problems with day care.

A survey by Leach and Barnard (1983) indicated that in job training programs employed adults had the greatest numbers of options for training; youth had the fewest options. The major barriers were inadequate communication, confusing rules, planning problems, competition among employment training providers, training efficiency, and evaluation. The approach to training that was promoted through JTPA activities focused upon practical learning experiences and
active performance of the individuals within the actual work environment.

Helwig (1984) wrote that only economically disadvantaged persons were eligible for JTPA with the exception that up to 10% did not have to be economically disadvantaged if they had experienced barriers to employment. Such individuals included those who had limited English proficiency, displaced homemakers, school dropouts, Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) recipients, addicts, or alcoholics, offenders, veterans, handicapped, teenage parents, and older workers.

Another component of the new training legislation was the extent to which it allowed the local public and private partners to make basic decisions on how federal funds would be administered and programs managed at the local level. Like other federal laws incorporating a "block grant" element (but a great deal unlike CETA), the Act allowed locals a great deal of flexibility in deciding the kinds of program assistance to be provided with federal funds. But it also left totally open the questions of what agency or entity would be the local grant recipient and what entity would administer or manage the local program—questions to be decided jointly by the private industry council (PIC) and chief local elected officials (National Alliance of Business, 1982).

**Title I** deals with the state and local service delivery system and general program and administrative issues. It describes:

1. Authorities and requirements for Governors, state job training coordinating councils, local private industry councils, and chief local elected officials.

2. Processes for designating local service delivery areas (SDAs), preparing local plans and selecting local service providers.

3. Policies and procedures to guide the Labor Department in developing and implementing performance standards for state and local programs funded under the act.

4. Administrative provisions related to fiscal controls, monitoring and record-keeping.

5. Procedures and deadlines governing the transition during FY 1983 from CETA to the new delivery system and program policies.

**Title II** authorizes funding and sets out requirements for training services to be provided at the local level for disadvantaged youth and adults. It specifies:

1. How federal funds for training services are to be allocated to the states, and then from the states to the local service delivery areas.
2. What population groups are eligible for training and employment aid paid for out of Title II funds.

3. The great variety of programs and services that can be provided with Title II funds (with allowable activities not limited to those mentioned in the Act).

4. Limitations on the amount of local funds that must be used for training, administrative expenses, wages and supportive services, and the method for obtaining state waivers to these limitations.

5. Separate funding and program requirements for summer youth training and jobs programs.

**Title III** provides for a separate, state-administered training and employment aid program for dislocated workers which requires state consultation with local private industry councils at key points of decision-making.

**Title IV** establishes funding and requirements for federally administered activities including:

1. Programs for Native Americans, migrant workers and veterans.

2. Job Corps.

3. Research, demonstration, evaluation, training and technical assistance.

4. Labor market information systems.

5. Functions of the National Commission for Employment Policy.
Title V contains miscellaneous provisions and training-related changes to other federal laws, including:

1. Amendments to the Wagner-Peyser Act altering funding to state employment service agencies and requiring joint planning between the job training and employment service delivery systems.

2. Amendments to the Social Security Act affecting coordination between the job training delivery system and the Work Incentive program carried out by state and local welfare agencies (National Alliance of Business, 1982, pp. 11-12).

Brady (1984) pointed out that many provisions in the legislation indicated the philosophy that job training programs must be effectively connected with other human resource programs. She reported that JTPA was concerned with advancing a cost-effective, integrated, and coordinated approach to meeting the needs of long-term unemployed individuals. Examples of such provisions included the stipulation that geographic boundaries of other state and local agency service programs be taken into consideration when determining the boundaries of a service delivery area (SDA); the requirement that private industry council (PIC) membership included representatives of other agencies and organizations; and the decision that JTPA funds not be used to duplicate other state and local facilities and services available in the area unless a more effective option can be
demonstrated (Brady, 1984). The JTPA emphasized the necessity of the business community in identifying local job opportunities and in creating training programs that would respond to local economic needs (Strumpf, 1984). The JTPA changed the responsibility for major policy planning and management from the federal government to the states for employment and training. The partnership in JTPA was concerned with the shared authority of the Private Industry Councils and Local Elected Officials (Stocksdale, 1985).

Each JTPA service delivery area must have a private industry council whose membership included representatives of educational agencies (representative of all educational agencies in the service delivery area), organized labor, rehabilitation agencies, community-based organizations, economic development agencies, and the public employment service. Educational representatives were to be selected among individuals nominated by local educational agencies and vocational schools within the SDA. The only other group on the PIC for which a nomination process was mentioned in the law was the private sector. The law also stipulated that representatives of the business community make up a majority of the membership in the PIC (Brady, 1984). The local Private Industry Council was more than just a resource for training funds. It could be a forum for understanding and commitment for a local economic development program (Lauer, 1984).
The JTPA legislation placed the private employers in the partnership as far as the local community is concerned and placed with them major responsibility for the success or failure of the training program. Some individuals in the private sector had complained in the past that they were only asked for advice which was not followed. They also complained that they were called in on training situations after the fact and that training was designed without their involvement, and not according to their employment needs (Griffin, 1983).

Smith (1985) conducted a study of JTPA and found that good economic conditions did not necessarily translate into a successful employment jobs project, employers tended to rely on informal procedures for filling job vacancies and seemed unlikely to change their approach without strong incentive, many employers were still unaware of JTPA, and a great number of employers had an overall distrust of federal jobs programs, their opinion being that the costs outweigh the benefits.

Brady (1984) found that educational institutions, both public and private, were much more likely to serve as training providers than as administrators. Consequently, the public school system provided most of the skills training. Out of the 583 SDAs on which data were collected, 551 SDAs used public educational institutions as training providers, and more than half (326) relied on private schools for that
function.

One of the strengths of the Job Training Partnership Act was its emphasis on a partnership. The partnership was created so that public and private community leaders and institutions could contribute their special expertise to ensure a cost-effective approach to meeting the needs of the long-term unemployed individual. When JTPA is evaluated, the involvement and contribution of the education, public assistance, and economic development committees as well as the public employment service will be an important measure of the law's success (Brady, 1984).

Escutia (1983) reported that JTPA is considerably different from CETA in its elimination of public service employment jobs and the near elimination of funds for training stipends. JTPA's developers believed that these changes would lead to an emphasis on training rather than income maintenance (Escutia, 1983).

Danzberger (1985) found that persons who turned to the employment and training system were generally persons for whom traditional educational experiences, or possibly prior employment, were not translated into successful entry into the work force. The average JTPA client was isolated from the mainstream by his/her economic and educational disadvantage. Frequently, this was compounded by racial, ethnic, or language isolation, as well as dropout youth and adults who had not completed high school and faced many
obstacles to employment.

Bradrick's study (1985) found that successful program activities and results had not been well documented or well publicized. In fact, very few studies on programs' effects have been undertaken to study the results of their effect over time.

Sumner and Wilson (1983) stated that

Adult retraining is an important area for educators to understand because there appear to be some changes developing in the delivery of education and training. One change relates to the entry of private enterprise into the training field. Other changes concern the population to be educated. This population tends to be more mobile than ever before, and older. These characteristics mean that many adults will be coming and going in training programs (having an effect on the types of programs that can be successful), and that adjustments in teaching strategies will have to be made to compensate for adults' slower reaction times and possible health problems. Other changes in the adult population that will affect retraining include the possibility of job layoff (which may potentially make learners hostile or fearful), increasingly stressful ways of life, and smaller families. The explosion of knowledge as technology advances also makes the task of teaching adults even more overwhelming; the amount of information students must know constantly increases. (p. 82)

Along with the legislative desire for an effective return on the investment, JTPA was concerned with performance standards, and stipulated a focus on increased employment and earnings, as well as a reduction of public assistance recipients. The emphasis on performance was underscored by incentive funding for successful programs. While the benefits of such accountability were obvious, the danger of performance standards based on positive placements was that
it might encourage "creaming"--the tendency to select as clients individuals who were least disadvantaged and easiest to place. These individuals were considered a less risky investment than other more disadvantaged individuals. Hispanics and other individuals with serious employment barriers might find themselves rejected from participation in training programs due to the tendency to "cream" on the part of program operators. Furthermore, the language barrier in JTPA could contribute to the exclusion of minorities in employment and training programs (Escutia, 1983). The basic criteria for the success of JTPA was client entry into private sector employment, whether that was immediately after training for adults or into part-time or full-time work for youth (Danzberger, 1985). According to Rist (1983), the JTPA program would be judged a success if adult trainees landed permanent jobs in the private sector, if they increased their earnings, and if they got off welfare or unemployment.

Escutia (1983) found that in the past, the federal government gave directions at great length and detail about how training programs were to be conducted, emphasizing the means rather than the end. JTPA's emphasis on results was a major legislative shift in social policy. Performance standards, more than any other part of JTPA, were critical to the outcomes-based system. Their importance was emphasized by the fact that 6% of the funds allocated to the
states could be used to reward high performers, and the sanctions must be applied to consistently poor performers. JTPA stipulated that the basic measure of performance for adult training programs under Title II was the increase in employment and earnings and the reductions in welfare dependency resulting from participation in the program. JTPA ordered the Secretary of Labor to prescribe performance standards on the basis of appropriate factors which could include (a) placement in unsubsidized employment, (b) retention in unsubsidized employment, (c) the increase in earnings, including hourly wages, and (d) reduction in the number of individuals and families receiving cash welfare payments.

**Participant Characteristics**

Westat found that virtually all JTPA participants were economically disadvantaged. Youth comprised almost 40% of JTPA participants, compared to 20% of the eligible population. Relative to CETA, there was a slightly higher proportion of high school graduates and a slightly lower proportion of public assistance recipients in JTPA. First, 87% of the SDAs in the sample had centralized intake systems and only 1/4 were doing any form of outreach. Second, in many cases, the eligibility verification and assessment process represented a screening procedure of its own. Third, the classroom training and on-the-job training had become
the largest parts of the JTPA program. In terms of service mix during the 1983 transition year, 40% of the participants were engaged in classroom training; 22% were in on-the-job training; 21% were in job search assistance; only 7% were in work experience; while 10% were in a miscellaneous or other category. Nationally, 69% of adults and 57% of youths entered employment upon termination at wages of $4.77 and $4.06 respectively, $4.53 averaged across both groups (Oversight Hearing, U.S. House of Representatives, 1985).

A comparison of the characteristics of the Title II-A eligible population with the characteristics of JTPA participants from the Job Training Longitudinal Survey (JTLS) Quick Turnaround data indicated that males and blacks were overrepresented in the participant population, while whites and older individuals were underrepresented. Youth (14-21 years old) were substantially overrepresented in the participant population (39.8%) compared to the eligible population (19.4%). Public assistance recipients were almost proportionally represented in the participants and eligible populations, while AFDC recipients were relatively overrepresented among participants. At the same time, the proportion of high school graduates was higher for participants than for eligibles. Virtually all JTPA participants were economically disadvantaged and very little use was made of the 10% "window" for serving nondisadvantaged individuals (Oversight Hearing, 1985).
An analysis by Catholic University of America (1985) indicated that women in poverty, such as displaced homemakers and AFDC mothers, might be having some difficulty being incorporated into the JTPA program. There was some question about how effectively JTPA had reached and served women who faced difficult barriers to employment and self-sufficiency.

According to the Full Employment Action Council (1985), the U.S. Department of Labor had gathered data which indicated that slightly more than half of JTPA participants were women. However, high performance standards acted to discourage JTPA programs from enrolling "hard to place" applicants—in some cases, women with little previous job experience and low educational levels. Also, there was no requirement that local programs set aside money for support services such as transportation and child care for program participants. Due to the fact that many programs did not set aside money for support services, women with young children were oftentimes not able to participate in JTPA's training opportunities.

A study of the JTPA program in Illinois by Orfield at the University of Chicago found that women, even when accepted into training programs, were more likely than men to be placed in classroom training for low-wage clerical jobs while men were twice as likely to receive on-the-job training which produced immediate income and long-term employment prospects. The study also found that female JTPA
participants in Illinois fared less well than men once training had been completed: For example, women who received AFDC benefits made up 25% of all enrollees, but made up only 19% of those individuals placed in private sector jobs (Full Employment Action Council, 1985).

A comparison was also done between the characteristics of JTPA transition year participants and those of fiscal year 1981 CETA participants. Both JTPA and CETA participants were more disadvantaged than eligible nonparticipants, as measured by family income and unemployment experience. The proportion of long-term unemployed participants was higher under JTPA than under CETA. However, the proportion with no unemployment (not in the labor force) prior to program entry was substantially higher under CETA. The proportion of public assistance recipients was higher and the proportion of high school graduates lower among CETA participants.

Beyond self-selection, the mix of participants had also been affected by several institutional factors. First, most SDAs had centralized their intake activities. Only five SDAs in the sample allowed the actual service providers to handle intake. Further, only 1/4 of the SDAs indicated that they were doing any outreach. These efforts added to administrative costs, which were limited, but did not contribute to placements. Second, the eligibility verification and assessment used by the SDAs represented a screening process for indefinite characteristics such as
motivation. Third, the service mix also affected participant selection and screening. On-the-job and classroom training had become the largest parts of the JTPA program and, consequently, the related selection procedures applied to a large part of the participant population. The apparent rise in the proportion of participants with a high school degree was probably related to the increased importance of on-the-job and classroom training in the JTPA service mix (Oversight Hearing, 1985).

Increased emphasis on OJT had resulted from the need of SDAs to establish high placement rates, develop closer ties with private business, and provide participants with support in the face of stipend restrictions. Program data from JTLS indicated that over 20% of 1984 enrollees entered OJT programs. This compared to 9% in CETA’s first fiscal year, and 11% in 1977 through 1979. These proportions were slightly higher if public service employment and work experience were excluded from the CETA figures (Oversight Hearing, 1985).

On-the-job training was shorter under JTPA. Findings from the JTLS indicated the median length of stay of 11.8 weeks for participants in OJT. JTLS data estimated a median length of training that was 3 weeks less than the median length of stay under CETA in 1980 as measured by the Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey. Both data groups
eliminated those with less than 8 days of program participation (Oversight Hearing, 1985).

**Geographical Data**

A survey completed by Brady (1984) indicated that the number of local jurisdictions responsible for administering federally funded employment and training programs increased by 26%, from approximately 470 under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act to 596 under the Job Training Partnership Act. Much in the increase can be attributed to the breakup of large CETA balance-of-state areas. In about 1/2 the SDAs, the geographical boundary of the JTPA service delivery areas remained the same as that of its CETA predecessor. The geographical boundaries of 61% of the SDAs coincided with at least one labor market area; slightly more than 2/3 of these local areas had boundaries which were identical to one or more entire labor market areas. Twenty-five percent of the SDAs had fewer than the 200,000 persons necessary for automatic designation. More than 1/2 represented areas with a population under 300,000. Slightly more than 2/3 of the SDAs included more than one chief local elected official. The majority of the remaining SDAs were a single county, with only 7% of all the SDAs representing a single city service delivery area (Brady, 1984).
Organizational Data

Brady (1984) wrote that the legislative objective that business groups be involved in the selection of the business representatives on private industry councils was achieved in the overwhelming majority of cases (91%). The average PIC consisted of 25 members, although individual PIC board size ranged from a low of 9 members to a high of 134. Almost 11,000 business volunteers were serving on PICs. Nearly 3/4 of the interviewees reported an active role for the PIC in planning and evaluating local programs. Specifically, responses showed that 80% of the PICs intended to participate actively in determining the types of training programs, 75% in determining occupations, 77% in determining training providers, and 89% in establishing criteria for training programs.

Programmatic Data

Brady (1984) found that high school dropouts and welfare recipients were the two groups most frequently identified by interviewees as target populations for JTPA programs and services (80% and 75%, respectively). In-school youth, minorities, and handicapped people were each provided targeted service by over 2/3 of the private industry councils. Local service providers utilized a host of entities to provide skill training with a marked increase from CETA in the use of small business. The most widely
used was the public school system (used by over 90% of the private industry councils). The second major training agent was private employers, particularly small businesses, which provided training in almost 80% of the SDAs, often in combination with on-the-job training programs. Private secondary and postsecondary schools, community-based organizations, and large businesses were all involved in providing training in somewhat more than 1/2 of the SDAs.

**Summary**

The federal government became directly involved in the job programs in the 1930s and after 40 years continued to provide services to disadvantaged youth and adults.

In the 1960s, America declared "war on poverty" and provided resources to minority groups in order to provide equal opportunity with other groups in the society. Special recognition and consideration was given to individuals who were handicapped by the lack of education and skills to compete in the labor market.

Two of the most noteworthy job programs were the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) and the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA). Due to the large expenditures of federal dollars, questions began to be raised regarding the evaluation of the job programs.

The CETA program was instrumental in shifting manpower services from the federal government to state and local
governments, thereby decentralizing and decategorizing the job programs. A unique feature of CETA was the public service employment component that sought to assist the chronically unemployed.

The Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) replaced CETA in 1983 with an added emphasis on increased employment and earnings of participants, and a reduction of welfare dependency. Additionally, the JTPA legislation allowed the local public and private partners to make decisions on how federal funds would be administered and programs managed at the local level.

The Private Industrial Councils had provided an opportunity for members of the local community to participate in the planning, decision making, and evaluation of local programs.

JTPA placed an emphasis on training rather than public service employment and training stipends. JTPA also emphasized performance standards based on positive placements which had caused concern that the standards might lead to "creaming" the clientele who were the least disadvantaged and easiest to place and retain in unsubsidized employment.

Studies had shown that youth, males, and blacks were overrepresented in the JTPA participant population. On-the-job training had increased substantially under JTPA and the proportion of participants with a high school diploma had also increased.
The JTPA data collection requirements were minimal. States were not required to maintain profiles on participants in the program, income levels before and after participation in JTPA, or records of job experience. There, the Act had created a situation which made assessment of the program somewhat difficult, and, as a result, supported an extensive public concern that the most unskilled, and the most difficult to employ, had not been included in the JTPA training (Full Employment Action Council, 1985).
CHAPTER 3  
Research Methodology and Instruments 

Introduction 

This chapter contains a description of the research design, identification of the population, description of the data collection instrument, procedures used in the study, and a summary of the statistical analysis of the data. 

Research Design 

The research design followed was the ex-post-facto design of a co-relational study. Kerlinger (1973) defined ex-post-facto research as follows: 

Ex-post-facto research is systematic empirical inquiry in which the scientist does not have direct control of independent variables because their manifestations have already occurred—or because they are inherently not manipulable. Inferences about relations among variables are made without direct intervention from concomitant variation of independent and dependent variables. 

(p. 379) 

Kerlinger (1973) wrote that many social, scientific, and educational problems lend themselves to controlled inquiry of ex-post-facto research rather than experimentation. 

According to Best (1981), the behavioral sciences use ex-post-facto research frequently and appropriately. However, he cautioned that the limitations of ex-post-facto research should be mentioned. 

1. The independent variables cannot be manipulated. 
2. Subjects cannot be randomly assigned to treatment 
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groups.

3. Causes are often multiple rather than single (p. 123).

**Identification of Population**

The population from which the sample was collected consisted of all participants in the JTPA on-the-job training program in Service Delivery Area 2 in Tennessee from July 1, 1984 to June 30, 1985.

A listing of JTPA on-the-job training participants was secured from the documents on file in the JTPA office and verified by Frank Skinnell, Associate JTPA Director, on June 16, 1986. Anonymity of the participants was maintained by assigning each participant a number, beginning with 0001 and continuing until every participant had an assigned number.

**Instrument Used in the Study**

One instrument (see Appendix B) was used to obtain the data necessary for the study. The instrument, a personal data sheet, was developed for the purpose of gathering data relative to the personal characteristics of participants enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program between July 1, 1984 and June 30, 1985.

In order to manage and administer the treatment effectively, the data were categorized by sex, age, educational level, public assistance and/or unemployment compensation recipients, number of hours trained, and the
type of training provided. One personal data sheet was completed on each participant and the information transferred to computer cards for the purpose of doing the statistical analysis.

Procedures

A review of literature related to federally funded job training programs was conducted to determine the significance of the planned study and to provide the necessary background for the study. This was accomplished by conducting an ERIC computer search and using reference volumes of the Charles E. Sherrod Library, including the Dissertation Abstracts International, the Current Index to Journals in Education, the Education Index, and the card catalog at East Tennessee State University.

After receiving approval from the doctoral advisory committee and the East Tennessee State University Institutional Review Board to conduct this study, permission to carry out the study was requested from the Service Delivery Area District 2 office of the Tennessee Department of Labor. Contact was made with the Director of the Service Delivery area and the President of Walters State Community College, which is the administrative entity for District 2 (see Appendix A), both of whom gave their approval and support for the study to be conducted in District 2.
Data gathering procedures were developed in collaboration with the staff of the Service Delivery Area. These plans included determining the population, developing the data-gathering instrument, and scheduling data-gathering activities. The data were collected over a 6-week period and hand tabulated, after which proper statistical procedures were applied to the data.

**Statistical Analysis Procedures**

The hypotheses of the study were stated in the null form for the purpose of statistical treatment. The use of the null hypothesis is a succinct way to test data against chance expectation since this type of hypothesis asserts that there is no significant difference between population means and that any difference found is unimportant and incidental.

The data from the completed instruments were transferred to computer punch cards and were statistically analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSSX) at East Tennessee State University. Frequency counts were tabulated for all items on the personal data sheet and presented as descriptive data. The chi-square test with a .05 level of significance was utilized in analyzing and interpreting the data.

According to Borg and Gall (1983) "the chi-square is a nonparametric statistic that is used when the research data are in the form of frequency counts. These frequency counts
can be placed into two or more categories" (p. 599). A nonparametric statistic does not specify conditions about the parameters of the population from which the sample was drawn and does not make an assumption about normality.

**Null Hypotheses**

$H_0^1$ There will be no significant difference in the noncompletion rate of males and females enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program.

$H_0^2$ There will be no significant difference in the positive termination rate of males and females enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program.

$H_0^3$ There will be no significant difference in the job retention rate of males and females enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program.

$H_0^4$ There will be no significant difference in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of males enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program.

$H_0^5$ There will be no significant difference in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of females enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program.

$H_0^6$ There will be no significant difference in the noncompletion rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program whose ages are 18-21, 22-30, 31-40, and 41-55.
\( H_0^7 \) There will be no significant difference in the positive termination rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program whose ages are 18-21, 22-30, 31-40, and 41-55.

\( H_0^8 \) There will be no significant difference in the job retention rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program whose ages are 18-21, 22-30, 31-40, and 41-55.

\( H_0^9 \) There will be no significant difference in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program whose ages are 18-21, 22-30, 31-40, and 41-55.

\( H_0^{10} \) There will be no significant difference in the noncompletion rate of individuals in selected educational levels: high school dropouts, high school graduate/equivalents, and post high school participants enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program.

\( H_0^{11} \) There will be no significant difference in the positive termination rate of individuals in selected educational levels: high school dropouts, high school graduate/equivalents, and post high school participants enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program.

\( H_0^{12} \) There will be no significant difference in the job retention rate of individuals in selected educational levels: high school dropouts, high school graduate/equivalents, and post high school participants enrolled in
the JTPA on-the-job training program.

$H_013$ There will be no significant difference in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of high school dropouts, high school graduate/equivalents, and post high school participants enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program.

$H_014$ There will be no significant difference in the noncompletion rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program who received public assistance and individuals who did not receive public assistance.

$H_015$ There will be no significant difference in the positive termination rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program who received public assistance and individuals who did not receive public assistance.

$H_016$ There will be no significant difference in the job retention rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program who received public assistance and individuals who did not receive public assistance.

$H_017$ There will be no significant difference in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program who received public assistance.

$H_018$ There will be no significant difference in the noncompletion rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program who received unemployment
compensation and individuals who did not receive unemployment compensation.

$H_0^{19}$ There will be no significant difference in the positive termination rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program who received unemployment compensation and individuals who did not receive unemployment compensation.

$H_0^{20}$ There will be no significant difference in the job retention rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program who received unemployment compensation and individuals who did not receive unemployment compensation.

$H_0^{21}$ There will be no significant difference in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program who received unemployment compensation.

$H_0^{22}$ There will be no significant difference in the positive termination rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program and trained for a period of 160 hours, 480 hours, 760 hours, and 1,040 hours.

$H_0^{23}$ There will be no significant difference in the job retention rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program and trained for a period of 160 hours, 480 hours, 760 hours, and 1,040 hours.

$H_0^{24}$ There will be no significant difference in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of
individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program and trained for a period of 160 hours, 480 hours, 760 hours, and 1,040 hours.

$H_0^{25}$ There will be no significant difference in the positive termination rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program and trained to be manufacturing/factory assembly line employees, clerk/typist employees, and sales/service employees.

$H_0^{26}$ There will be no significant difference in the job retention rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program and trained to be manufacturing/factory assembly line employees, clerk/typist employees, and sales/service employees.

$H_0^{27}$ There will be no significant difference in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program and trained to be manufacturing/factory assembly line employees, clerk/typist employees, and sales/service employees.
CHAPTER 4
The Data and Findings

Introduction
Findings of the results from the data of this study are reported in this chapter. Data were collected and analyzed to test the hypotheses as stated in Chapter 1. These hypotheses were tested in the null form using the .05 level of significance to determine if significant differences existed.

A description of the statistical analysis of the data was presented in Chapter 3. The chi-square test was used to test for significant differences. Yates' correction for continuity was used for all $1 \times 2$ or $2 \times 2$ cell tables (instances in which there is but one degree of freedom).

Presentation of Data
Data were collected for all participants in the Job Training Partnership Act on-the-job training program from July 1, 1984 to June 30, 1985. The three status groups represented in the study included individuals who entered on-the-job training, but did not complete the program (noncompleters); participants who completed the program and were employed, but did not maintain their employment for 13 weeks (positive termination); and participants who were positively terminated and retained their employment for a
minimum of 13 weeks after positive placement (job retention). These three groups were categorized by sex, age, education, public assistance, unemployment compensation, hours trained, and type of training.

Table 1 reveals that 33.4% of the participants left the training program prior to completion of the program, and 13.7% of the participants completed the program, but did not retain their employment for a minimum of 13 weeks, as compared to 52.9% of the participants who completed the training program, were placed in employment, and retained their employment for a minimum of 13 weeks.

### Table 1

Noncompletion, Positive Termination, and Job Retention Rates of Participants in the Job Training Partnership Act

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number (N), status (S), category of participants (Cp), and percentage of all JTPA on-the-job training participants (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncompletion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive termination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null hypothesis 1 (H₀₁) stated that there will be no significant difference in the noncompletion rate of males and females enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program.
The data reported in Table 2 indicate that 335 participants were in the noncompletion category of the JTPA on-the-job training program. Sixty-four percent of the total enrollment were males and 36% were females. Therefore, the expected number of noncompletion males was 214.4 (64% of 335) and the expected number of noncompletion females was 120.6 (36% of 335). In reality, there were 201 males and 134 females in the noncompletion category. Therefore, there were 13.4 more noncompletion males in the program than were expected and 13.4 fewer noncompletion female participants than were expected. This resulted in a difference in the male and female noncompletion rate with a greater percentage of males not completing the program than females. The chi-square value of 2.3264 with one degree of freedom was not significant at the .05 level as previously determined. In fact, the level of significance was 0.1272. These results support the conclusion that there was no significant difference in the noncompletion rate of males and females enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program; therefore, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Null hypothesis 2 ($H_2O$) stated that there will be no significant difference in the positive termination rate of males and females enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program.
Table 2

A Comparison of the Noncompletion Rate of Males and Females Enrolled in the JTPA On-the-Job Training Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Fo Males</th>
<th>Fo Females</th>
<th>Fe Males</th>
<th>Fe Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>214.4</td>
<td>120.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 2.3264 \quad \text{df} = 1 \quad \text{P} > .05 \]

The data in Table 3 reveal that 138 participants were in the positive termination category of the JTPA on-the-job training program. The number of expected positive termination males was 88.3 and the expected number of females was 49.7. However, there were actually 81 males and 57 females in the positive termination category. As a result, there were 7.3 fewer positive termination males in the program than were expected and 7.3 more positive termination female participants than were expected. A difference was found in the male and female positive termination rate with a greater percentage of females being positively terminated than males. The chi-square value of 1.6757 with one degree of freedom was not significant at the .05 level as previously determined. In fact, the level of significance was 0.1955. The results sustain the conclusion.
that there was no significant difference in the positive termination rate of males and females enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program. As a result, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Table 3
A Comparison of the Positive Termination Rate of Males and Females Enrolled in the JTPA On-the-Job Training Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Fo</th>
<th>Fe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 1.6757 \quad \text{df} = 1 \quad P > .05 \]

Null hypothesis 3 \( (H_0.3) \) stated that there will be no significant difference in the job retention rate of males and females enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program.

The data in Table 4 report that 532 participants were in the job retention category of the JTPA on-the-job training program. The expected number of job retention males was 340.5 and the expected number of females was 191.5. Actually, there were 361 males and 171 females in the job retention category. Consequently, there were 20.5 more males in the job retention category than were expected and 20.5 fewer
females than were expected. This resulted in a difference in the male and female job retention rate with a greater percentage of males completing the program than females. The chi-square value of 3.4287 with one degree of freedom was not significant at the .05 level as previously determined. Actually, the level of significance was 0.0641. The results support the conclusion that there was no significant difference in the job retention rate between males and females enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program. As a result, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Table 4
A Comparison of the Job Retention Rate of Males and Females Enrolled in the JTPA On-the-Job Training Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Fo</th>
<th>Fe</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>340.5</td>
<td>191.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 3.4287 \] \hspace{1cm} \[ df = 1 \] \hspace{1cm} \[ P > 0.05 \]
Null hypothesis 4 ($H_0^4$) stated that there will be no significant difference in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of males in the JTPA on-the-job training program.

The data in Table 5 report that 442 male participants were in the positive termination and job retention categories of the JTPA on-the-job training program. The expected number of positive termination males was 88.3 and the expected number of job retention males was 340.5. In reality, there were 81 males in the positive termination category and 361 males in the job retention category. Therefore, there were 7.3 fewer positive termination males than were expected and 20.5 more job retention males in the program than were expected. This resulted in a difference in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate for males, with a greater percentage of males being in the job retention category than in the positive termination category. The chi-square value of 1.3886 with one degree of freedom was not significant at the .05 level as previously determined. In fact, the level of significance was 0.2386. The data support the conclusion that there was no significant difference in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of males in the JTPA on-the-job training program. Therefore, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.
Table 5
A Comparison of the Positive Termination Rate and the Job Retention Rate for Males Enrolled in the JTPA On-the-Job Training Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Positive termination</th>
<th>Job retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fo</td>
<td>Fe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 1.3886 \quad df = 1 \quad P > .05 \]

Null hypothesis 5 (\(H_0^5\)) stated that there will be no significant difference in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of females enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program.

The data in Table 6 report that 228 female participants were in the positive termination and job retention categories of the JTPA on-the-job training program. The expected number of positive termination females was 49.7 and the expected number of job retention females was 191.5. Actually, there were 57 females in the positive termination category and 171 females in the job retention category. As a consequence, there were 7.3 more positive termination females than were expected and 20.5 fewer job retention females in the program than were expected. As a result, there was a difference in
the positive termination rate and the job retention rate for females with a greater percentage of females being in the positive termination category than in the job retention category. The chi-square value of 2.691 with one degree of freedom was not significant at the .05 level as previously determined. Actually, the level of significance was 0.1009. It was apparent from the data that there was no significant difference in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of females in the JTPA on-the-job training program. As a result, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Table 6

A Comparison of the Positive Termination Rate and the Job Retention Rate for Females Enrolled in the JTPA On-the-Job Training Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number (N), degrees of freedom (df), frequency observed (Fo), frequency expected (Fe), chi-square ($X^2$), significance level (P)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 2.6917$  
$df = 1$  
$P > .05$
Null hypothesis 6 ($H_0$) stated there will be no significant difference in the noncompletion rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program whose ages are 18-21, 22-30, 31-40, and 41-55.

The data reported in Table 7 indicate that 335 participants were in the noncompletion category of the JTPA on-the-job training program. The percentage of the total enrollment in the 18-21 age category was 31.7%, while 38.4% were in the 22-30 age category, 18.9% were in the 31-40 age category, and 10.9% were in the 41-55 age category. Therefore, the expected number of participants in the 18-21 age category was 106.2 (31.7%), the expected rate for the 22-30 age category was 128.6 (38.4% of 335), the expected rate for the 31-40 age category was 63.3 (18.9% of 335), and the expected rate for the 41-55 age category was 36.5 (10.9% of 335).

There were actually 112 participants in the 18-21 age category, 130 participants in the 22-30 age category, 65 participants in the 31-40 age category, and 28 participants in the 41-55 age category. Consequently, there were 5.8 more participants in the 18-21 age category than were expected, 1.4 more participants in the 22-30 age category than were expected, 1.7 more participants in the 31-40 age category than were expected, and 8.5 fewer participants in the 41-55 age category than were expected. This resulted in a difference in the age categories with the 18-21 age
category having the greatest percentage of noncompletion participants and the 41-55 age category having the smallest percentage of noncompletion participants. The chi-square value of 2.3538 with one degree of freedom was not significant at the .05 level as previously determined. In fact, the level of significance was 0.5023. The results support the conclusion that there was no significant difference in the noncompletion rate between individuals whose ages are 18-21, 22-30, 31-40, and 41-55. Therefore, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Table 7
A Comparison of the Noncompletion Rate by Age Categories for Participants Enrolled in the JTPA On-the-Job Training Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18-21</th>
<th>22-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>41-55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number (N)</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106.2</td>
<td>128.6</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X²</td>
<td>2.3538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null hypothesis 7 (H₀7) stated that there will be no significant difference in the positive termination rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program whose ages are 18-21, 22-30, 31-40, and 41-55.
The data reported in Table 8 indicate that 138 participants were in the positive termination category of the JTPA on-the-job training program. The expected number of participants in the 18-21 age category was 43.8, the expected number for the 22-30 age category was 53 participants, the expected number for the 31-40 age category was 26.1 participants, and the expected number for the 41-55 age category was 15 participants. In fact, there were 57 participants in the 18-21 age category, 40 participants in the 22-30 age category, 29 participants in the 31-40 age category, and 12 participants in the 41-55 age category. There were 13.2 more participants in the 18-21 age category than were expected, 13 fewer participants in the 22-30 age category than were expected, 2.9 more participants in the 31-40 age category than were expected, and 3 fewer participants in the 41-55 age category than were expected. This resulted in a difference in the positive termination rate by age categories with a greater percentage of the 18-21 age category being positively terminated. The chi-square value of 8.0830 with three degrees of freedom was significant at the .05 level as previously determined. Actually, the level of significance was 0.0433. As a result, the null hypothesis was rejected and the research hypothesis was accepted.
Table 8
A Comparison of the Positive Termination Rate by Age Categories for Participants Enrolled in the JTPA On-the-Job Training Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>18-21</th>
<th>22-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>41-55</th>
<th>18-21</th>
<th>22-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>41-55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 8.0830 \quad df = 3 \quad P < .05$

Null hypothesis $H_0^8$ stated that there will be no significant difference in the job retention rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program whose ages are 18-21, 22-30, 31-40, and 41-55.

The data in Table 9 show that the number of participants in the job retention category was 532. The expected number of participants in the 18-21 age category was 168.6 participants, the expected number for the 22-30 age category was 204.3 participants, the expected number for the 31-40 age category was 100.5 participants, and the expected number of participants in the 41-55 age category was 58. In reality, there were 150 participants in the 18-21 age category, 216 participants in the 22-30 age category, 96 participants in the 31-40 age category, and 70 participants...
in the 41-55 age category. Consequently, there were 18.6 fewer participants in the 18-21 age category than were expected. There were 11.7 more participants in the 22-30 age category than were expected and 4.5 fewer participants in the 31-40 age category than were expected, and 12 more participants in the 41-55 age category than were expected. This resulted in a difference in the job retention rate by age categories with a greater percentage of the 41-55 age category retaining their jobs. The chi-square value of 5.3995 with three degrees of freedom was not significant at the .05 level as previously determined. In fact, the level of significance was 0.1448. As a result, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Table 9

A Comparison of the Job Retention Rate by Age Categories for Participants Enrolled in the JTPA On-the-Job Training Program

| Number (N), degrees of freedom (df), frequency observed (Fo), frequency expected (Fe), chi-square ($X^2$), and significance level (P) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Fo | Fe |
| | 18-21 | 22-30 | 31-40 | 41-55 | 18-21 | 22-30 | 31-40 | 41-55 |
| N | 532 | 150 | 216 | 96 | 70 | 168.6 | 204.3 | 100.5 | 58 |
| $X^2$ | 5.3995 | df = 3 | P > .05 |
Null hypothesis 9 (H9) stated that there will be no significant difference in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program, whose ages are 18-21, 22-30, 31-40, and 41-55.

The data in Table 10 report that the number of participants in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate was 670. The expected number of positive termination participants in the 18-21 age category was 43.7 participants, the expected number for the 22-30 age group was 53 participants, the expected number for the 31-40 age category was 26.1 participants, and the expected number of participants in the 41-55 age category was 15 participants. The expected number of job retention participants in the 18-21 age category was 168.6, the expected number for the 22-30 age category was 204.3 participants, the expected number for the 31-40 age category was 100.5 participants, and the expected number of participants in the 41-55 age category was 58. The actual number of positive termination participants in the 18-21 age category was 57, the actual number of participants in the 22-30 age category was 40, the number in the 31-40 age category was 29, and the number in the 41-55 age category was 12. The actual number of job retention participants in the 18-21 age category was 150, the number in the 22-30 age category was 216, the number in
Table 10

A Comparison of the Positive Termination Rate and the Job Retention Rate by Age Categories for Participants Enrolled in the JTPA On-the-Job Training Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive termination</th>
<th>Job retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fo</td>
<td>Fe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-30</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>168.6</td>
<td>204.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 12.2648 \]
\[ df = 3 \]
\[ p < .05 \]
the 31-40 age category was 96, and the number in the 41-55 age category was 70.

There were 13.3 more positive termination participants in the 18-21 age category than were expected, there were 13 fewer participants than expected in the 22-30 age category, the 31-40 age category had 2.9 more participants than expected, and there were 3 fewer participants in the 41-55 age category than were expected. The job retention category had 18.6 fewer participants than were expected in the 18-21 age category, the 22-30 age category contained 11.7 more participants than were expected, the 31-40 age category had 4.5 fewer participants than were expected, and the 41-55 age category contained 12 more participants than were expected. The chi-square value of 12.2648 with three degrees of freedom was significant at the .05 level as previously determined. In fact, the level of significance was 0.0065. As a result, the null hypothesis was rejected and the research hypothesis was accepted.

Null hypothesis 10 \( (H_{010}) \) stated that there will be no significant difference in the noncompletion rate of individuals in selected educational levels: high school dropouts, high school graduate/equivalents, and post high school participants enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program.

The data in Table 11 show that the number of participants in the noncompletion category of the JTPA
on-the-job training program was 335. The high school dropout category contained 39.8% of the total number of enrollees in the program. The high school graduate/equivalent category contained 51.1% of the number of enrollees, and 9.1% of the total number of participants were in the post high school category. The expected number of high school dropouts was 133.3 (39.8% of 335), the expected rate of high school graduates was 171.2 (51.1% of 335), and the expected rate of post high school enrollees was 30.5 (9.1% of 335). Actually, there were 145 participants in the high school dropout category, there were 162 participants in the high school graduate/equivalent category, and there were 28 participants in the post high school category. Therefore, there were 11.7 more participants in the high school dropout category than were expected. There were 9.2 fewer participants than were expected in the high school graduate/equivalent category. The post high school category contained 2.5 fewer participants than were expected. This resulted in a difference in the noncompletion rate between individuals in selected educational categories, with participants in the high school graduate category containing the largest percentage of participants. The chi-square value of 1.7262 with two degrees of freedom was not significant at the .05 level as previously determined. Actually, the level of significance was 0.4218. The results indicate that there was no significant difference
in the noncompletion rate between individuals in selected categories. Therefore, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Table 11

A Comparison of the Noncompletion Rate by Educational Categories for Participants Enrolled in the JTPA On-the-Job Training Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Fo</th>
<th>Fe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school dropout</td>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>Post high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>133.3</td>
<td>171.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 1.7262 \quad \text{df} = 2 \quad P > .05 \]

Null hypothesis 11 \((H_0^{11})\) stated that there will be no significant difference in the positive termination rate of individuals in selected educational levels: high school dropouts, high school graduates/equivalents, and post high school participants enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program.

The data in Table 12 report that 138 participants were in the positive termination category of the JTPA on-the-job training program. The expected number of positive termination participants in the high school dropout category
was 54.9, the expected number of positive termination participants in the high school graduate/equivalent category was 70.5, and the expected number in the post high school category was 12.6 participants. In reality, there were 47 high school dropout participants in the positive termination category, there were 76 participants in the high school graduate/equivalent category, and there were 15 participants in the post high school category. Therefore, there were 7.9 fewer participants than were expected in the high school dropout category, there were 5.5 more participants in the high school graduate/equivalent category than were expected, and the post high school category contained 2.4 more participants than were expected. This resulted in a difference in the educational categories with a greater percentage of high school graduate/equivalents being enrolled in the positive termination category. The chi-square value of 2.0230 with two degrees of freedom was not significant at the .05 level as previously determined. In fact, the level of significance was 0.3637. The results support the conclusion that there was no significant difference in the positive termination rate between individuals in selected educational levels. Therefore, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.
Table 12

A Comparison of the Positive Termination Rate by Educational Categories for Participants Enrolled in the JTPA On-the-Job Training Program

| Number (N), degrees of freedom (df), frequency observed (Fo), frequency expected (Fe), chi-square (X^2), and significance level (P) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| N | High school dropout | High school graduate | Post high school |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 138 | 47 | 76 | 15 |
| 54.9 | 70.5 | 12.6 |

\[ X^2 = 2.0230 \quad df = 2 \quad P > .05 \]

Null hypothesis 12 (H_{012}) stated that there will be no significant difference in the job retention rate of individuals in selected educational levels: high school dropouts, high school graduate/equivalents, and post high school participants enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program.

The data in Table 13 show that 532 participants were in the job retention category of the JTPA on-the-job training program. The expected number of job retention participants in the high school dropout category was 211.7, the expected number in the high school graduate/equivalent category was 271.9, and the expected number in the post high school category was 48.4. The actual number of participants in the
high school dropout category was 208, the number of participants in the high school graduate/equivalent category was 276, and the number in the post high school category was 48. There were 3.7 fewer participants in the high school dropout category than were expected, the high school graduate/equivalent category contained 4.1 more participants than were expected, and the post high school category was composed of 0.4 fewer participants than were expected. There was a difference in the educational categories with the high school graduate/equivalents having a greater percentage of participants. The chi-square value of 0.1298 with two degrees of freedom was not significant at the .05 level as previously determined. Actually, the level of significance was 0.9372. The results support the conclusion that there was no significant difference in the job retention rate between individuals in selected educational levels. Therefore, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Null hypothesis 13 ($H_0^{13}$) stated that there will be no significant difference in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of high school dropouts, high school graduate/equivalents, and post high school participants enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program.
Table 13

A Comparison of the Job Retention Rate by Educational Categories for Participants Enrolled in the JTPA On-the-Job Training Program

<p>| Number (N), degrees of freedom (df), frequency observed (Fo), frequency expected (Fe), chi-square ($X^2$), and significance level (P) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>High school dropout</th>
<th>High school graduate</th>
<th>Post high school</th>
<th>High school dropout</th>
<th>High school graduate</th>
<th>Post high school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>211.7</td>
<td>271.9</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 0.1298$  
$df = 2$  
$P > .05$

The data in Table 14 reveal that 670 participants were enrolled in the positive termination and job retention categories of the JTPA on-the-job training program. The expected number of positive termination participants in the high school dropout category was 54.9, the number of participants expected in the high school graduate/equivalent category of the positive termination rate was 70.5, and the number of participants expected in the post high school category of the positive termination rate was 12.6. The expected number of job retention participants in the high school dropout category was 211.7, the number of participants expected in the high school graduate/equivalent category of the job retention rate was 271.9, and the number expected in
Table 14

A Comparison of the Positive Termination Rate and the Job Retention Rate by Educational Categories for Participants Enrolled in the JTPA On-the-Job Training Program

| Number (N), degrees of freedom (df), frequency observed (Fo), frequency expected (Fe), chi-square ($X^2$), and significance level (P) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Positive termination rate | | Job retention rate | | | |
| | Fo | Fe | Fo | Fe | Fo | Fe | Fo | Fe |
| High school dropout | 670 | 47 | 76 | 15 | 54.9 | 70.5 | 12.6 | 208 | 276 | 48 | 211.7 | 271.9 | 48.4 |
| High school graduate | $X^2 = 1.3414$ | df = 2 | P > .05 |
the post high school category of the job retention rate was 48.4. The actual number of positive termination participants in the high school dropout category was 47, the number of participants in the high school graduate/equivalent category was 76, and the number of participants in the post high school category was 15. The actual number of job retention participants in the high school dropout category was 208. The number of participants in the high school graduate/equivalent category was 276, and the number in the post high school graduate category was 48.

There were 7.9 fewer participants in the positive termination rate of the high school dropout category than were expected, there were 5.5 more participants in the high school graduate/equivalent category of the positive termination rate than expected, while the post high school category of the positive termination rate contained 2.4 more participants than were expected. The high school dropout category of the job retention rate contained 3.7 fewer participants than were expected and there were 4.1 more participants than expected in the high school graduate category of the job retention rate, whereas there were 0.4 fewer participants than were expected in the post high school category of the job retention rate.

This resulted in a difference between the positive termination rate and the job retention rate with the job retention category having a higher percentage of participants.
The chi-square value of 1.3414 with two degrees of freedom was not significant at the .05 level as previously determined. In fact, the level of significance was 0.5113. Therefore, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Null hypothesis 14 (H₀₁₄) stated that there will be no significant difference in the noncompletion rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program who received public assistance and individuals who did not receive public assistance.

The data in Table 15 indicate that 335 participants were in the noncompletion category of the JTPA on-the-job training program. The public assistance category contained 4.7% of the total enrollment in the program, while the category that did not receive public assistance included 95.3%. Therefore, the expected number of noncompletion participants who received public assistance was 15.7 (4.7% of 335) and the expected number of noncompletion participants who did not receive public assistance was 319.3 (95.3% of 335). The number of participants who actually received public assistance was 23 and the number of participants who did not receive public assistance was 312. As a result, there were 7.3 more noncompletion participants who received public assistance than were expected and there were 7.3 fewer participants who did not receive public assistance than were expected. This resulted in a difference in the participants who received public assistance and the
participants who did not receive public assistance in the noncompletion category with a greater percentage of participants being in the "did not receive public assistance" category. The chi-square value of 3.5612 with one degree of freedom was not significant at the .05 level as previously determined. Actually, the level of significance was 0.0591. The results support the conclusion that there was no significant difference in the noncompletion rate between participants who received public assistance and participants who did not receive public assistance in the JTPA on-the-job training program. Therefore, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Table 15

A Comparison of the Noncompletion Rate by Public Assistance Categories for Participants Enrolled in the JTPA On-the-Job Training Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Received public assistance</th>
<th>Did not receive public assistance</th>
<th>Fe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 3.5612$  \hspace{1cm} df = 1  \hspace{1cm} P > .05
Null hypothesis 15 \( (H_0^{15}) \) stated that there will be no significant difference in the positive termination rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program who received public assistance and individuals who did not receive public assistance.

The data in Table 16 report that 138 participants were in the positive termination category of the JTPA on-the-job training program. The expected number of positive termination participants who received public assistance was 6.5 and the expected number of positive termination participants who did not receive public assistance was 131.5. In reality, there were 8 participants in the "received public assistance" category and 130 participants in the "did not receive public assistance" category. Consequently, there were 1.5 more positive termination participants who received public assistance than were expected and there were 1.5 fewer participants in the "did not receive public assistance" category than were expected. There was a difference in the "did not receive public assistance" category and the "received public assistance" category. The "did not receive public assistance" category had a greater percentage of participants. The chi-square value of 0.3633 with one degree of freedom was not significant at the .05 level as previously determined. In fact, the level of significance was 0.5467. The results strengthen the conclusion that there was no significant
difference in the positive termination rate between individuals who received public assistance and individuals who did not receive public assistance. Therefore, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Table 16

A Comparison of the Positive Termination Rate by Public Assistance Categories for Participants Enrolled in the JTPA On-the-Job Training Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Received public assistance</th>
<th>Did not receive public assistance</th>
<th>Received public assistance</th>
<th>Did not receive public assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fo</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 0.3633$  
$df = 1$  
$P > .05$

Null hypothesis 16 ($H_0^{16}$) stated that there will be no significant difference in the job retention rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program who received public assistance and individuals who did not receive public assistance.

The data in Table 17 reveal that 532 participants were in the job retention category of the JTPA on-the-job training program. The expected number of job retention participants
who received public assistance was 25 and the expected number of positive termination participants who did not receive public assistance was 507. Actually, there were 16 participants in the "received public assistance" category and 516 in the "did not receive public assistance" category. As a result, there were 9 fewer job retention participants who did not receive public assistance than were expected. There were 9 more participants in the "did not receive public assistance" category than were expected. There was a difference in the job retention rate of participants who received public assistance and the job retention rate of those who did not receive public assistance in that the "did not receive public assistance" category had a greater percentage of participants. The chi-square value of 3.3998 with one degree of freedom was not significant at the .05 level as previously determined. Actually, the level of significance was 0.0652. The results bear out the conclusion that there was no significant difference in the job retention rate between individuals who received public assistance. As a result, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Null hypothesis 17 (H₀₁₇) stated that there will be no significant difference in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program who received public assistance.
Table 17

A Comparison of the Job Retention Rate by Public Assistance Categories for Participants Enrolled in the JTPA On-the-Job Training Program

<p>| Number (N), degrees of freedom (df), frequency observed (Fo), frequency expected (Fe), chi-square ($X^2$), and significance level (P) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Received public assistance</th>
<th>Did not receive public assistance</th>
<th>Received public assistance</th>
<th>Did not receive public assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 3.3998$  
$df = 1$  
$P > .05$

The data in Table 18 indicate that 24 participants received public assistance and were in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of the JTPA on-the-job training program. The expected number of positive termination participants was 12 (a 50% split between public assistance recipients and nonrecipients was assumed), and the expected number of job retention participants was 12 (a 50% split between public assistance recipients and nonrecipients was assumed). The actual number of positive termination category participants was 3 and the number of participants in the job retention category was 16. This resulted in 4 fewer positive termination participants than were expected and there were 4 more job retention
participants than were expected. This resulted in a difference in the positive termination category and the job retention category, with the job retention category having a greater percentage of participants. The chi-square value of 2.6667 with one degree of freedom was not significant at the .05 level as previously determined. In fact, the level of significance was 0.1025. The results are in agreement with the conclusion that there was no significant difference between the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of individuals who received public assistance. Therefore, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Table 18
A Comparison of the Positive Termination Rate and the Job Retention Rate by Public Assistance Categories for Participants Enrolled in the JTPA On-the-Job Training Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number (N), degrees of freedom (df), frequency observed (Fo), frequency expected (Fe), chi-square ($X^2$), and significance level (P)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 2.6667$  \hspace{1cm} df = 1  \hspace{1cm} P > .05$
Null hypothesis 18 ($H_{0-18}$) stated that there will be no significant difference in the noncompletion rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program who received unemployment compensation and individuals who did not receive unemployment compensation.

The data reported in Table 19 indicate that 335 participants were in the noncompletion category of the JTPA on-the-job training program. Participants who received unemployment compensation comprised 11.6% of the total enrollment in the program. The remaining 88.4% of the population were in the "did not receive" unemployment compensation category. Therefore, the expected number of noncompletion participants who received unemployment compensation was 38.9 (11.6% of 335) and the expected number of participants who did not receive unemployment compensation was 296.1 (88.4% of 335). In reality, there were 30 participants who received unemployment compensation and 305 participants who did not receive unemployment compensation. Therefore, there were 8.9 fewer participants in the "received unemployment compensation" category than expected and 8.9 more participants in the "did not receive unemployment compensation" category than expected. This resulted in a difference in the noncompletion rate of participants who received unemployment compensation. The chi-square value of 2.3038 with one degree of freedom was not significant at the .05 level as previously determined.
Actually, the level of significance was 0.1291. From these data it was decided that there was no significant difference in the noncompletion rate between individuals who received unemployment compensation and individuals who did not receive unemployment compensation. Consequently, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Table 19

A Comparison of the Noncompletion Rate by Unemployment Compensation Categories for Participants Enrolled in the JTPA On-the-Job Training Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Received unemployment compensation</th>
<th>Did not receive unemployment compensation</th>
<th>Received unemployment compensation</th>
<th>Did not receive unemployment compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>296.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 2.30 \quad df = 1 \quad P > .05 \]

Null hypothesis 19 \((H_{0.19})\) stated that there will be no significant difference in the positive termination rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program who received unemployment compensation and individuals who did not receive unemployment compensation.
The data in Table 20 report that 138 participants were in the positive termination category of the JTPA on-the-job training program. The expected number of positive termination participants who received unemployment compensation was 16 and the expected number of participants who did not receive unemployment compensation was 122. Actually, there were 9 participants who received unemployment compensation and 129 participants who did not receive unemployment compensation in the positive termination category. This resulted in 7 fewer participants in the "received unemployment compensation" category than expected and 7 more participants in the "did not receive unemployment compensation" category than expected. This resulted in a difference in the positive termination rate of participants who received unemployment compensation and participants who did not receive unemployment compensation. The chi-square value of 3.4641 with one degree of freedom was not significant at the .05 level as previously determined. In fact, the level of significance was 0.0672. Therefore, there was no significant difference in the positive termination rate between individuals who received unemployment compensation and individuals who did not receive unemployment compensation. For this reason the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.
Table 20
A Comparison of the Positive Termination Rate of Unemployment Compensation Categories for Participants Enrolled in the JTPA On-the-Job Training Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Received unemployment compensation</th>
<th>Did not receive unemployment compensation</th>
<th>Received unemployment compensation</th>
<th>Did not receive unemployment compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X^2$</td>
<td>3.464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>$&gt;.05$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null hypothesis 20 ($H_{o,20}$) stated that there will be no significant difference in the job retention rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program who received unemployment compensation and individuals who did not receive unemployment compensation.

The data in Table 21 show that 532 participants were in the job retention category of the JTPA on-the-job training program. The expected number of job retention participants who received unemployment compensation was 61.7 and the expected number of job retention participants who did not receive unemployment compensation was 470.3. As a matter of fact, there were 78 participants who received unemployment compensation and 454 participants who did not receive
unemployment compensation in the job retention category. Consequently, there were 16.3 more participants who received unemployment compensation than were expected and 16.3 fewer participants who did not receive unemployment compensation than were expected. This resulted in a difference in the "received unemployment compensation" and "did not receive unemployment compensation" categories of the job retention rate with a greater percentage of participants in the "did not receive unemployment compensation" category. The chi-square value of 4.8711 with one degree of freedom was significant at the .05 level as previously determined. Actually, the level of significance was 0.0273. The results indicated that there was a significant difference in the job retention rate between individuals who received unemployment compensation and individuals who did not receive unemployment compensation. Consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected and the research hypothesis was accepted.

Null hypothesis 21 (Hₐ21) stated that there will be no significant difference in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program who received unemployment compensation.
Table 21
A Comparison of the Job Retention Rate by Unemployment Compensation Categories for Participants Enrolled in the JTPA On-the-Job Training Program

| Number (N), degrees of freedom (df), frequency observed (Fo), frequency expected (Fe), chi-square ($X^2$), and significance level (P) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Received unemployment compensation | Did not receive unemployment compensation | Received unemployment compensation | Did not receive unemployment compensation |
| N | 532 | 78 | 454 | 61.7 | 470.3 |

$X^2 = 4.8711$  
$df = 1$  
$P < .05$

The data in Table 22 show that 87 participants were in the positive termination category plus the job retention category of unemployment compensation recipients of the JTPA on-the-job training program. The expected number of positive termination participants who received unemployment compensation was 10.1, and the expected number of job retention participants who received unemployment compensation was 76.9. There were actually 9 positive termination participants who received unemployment compensation and there were 78 participants in the job retention category who received unemployment compensation. As a result, there were 1.1 fewer positive termination participants than expected and 1.1 more job retention participants than expected. The
chi-square value of 0.1355 with one degree of freedom was not significant at the .05 level as previously determined. In fact, the level of significance was 0.7123. The results support the conclusion that there was no significant difference between the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of individuals who received unemployment compensation. As a result, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Table 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number (N), degrees of freedom (df), frequency observed (Fo), frequency expected (Fe), chi-square ($X^2$), and significance level (P)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 0.1355$ \hspace{1cm} df = 1 \hspace{1cm} P > .05

Null hypothesis 22 ($H_0^{22}$) stated that there will be no significant difference in the positive termination rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program and trained for a period of 160 hours, 480 hours, 760 hours, and 1,040 hours.
The data in Table 23 indicate that there were 138 participants in the positive termination category of the JTPA on-the-job training program. Total enrollment by percentage in the positive termination category of hours trained was as follows: 18.8% of the participants were trained for 160 hours, while the 480 hour category contained 18.8% of the total number of participants, 27.8% of the participants were trained for 760 hours, and 34.6% of the participants were trained for 1,040 hours. Therefore, the expected number of positive termination participants who trained for 160 hours was 25.9 (18.8% of 138), the expected number of participants who trained for 480 hours was 27 (19.6% of 138), the expected number of participants who trained for 760 hours was 36.7 (26.6% of 138), and the expected number of participants who trained for 1,040 hours was 48.4 (35.1% of 138). The number of participants who actually trained for 160 hours was 26, whereas the number of participants who trained for 480 hours was 31, the number of participants who trained for 760 hours was 30, and the number of participants who trained for 1,040 hours was 51. Therefore, there were 0.1 more participants who trained for 160 hours than were expected, there were 4 more participants who trained for 480 hours than were expected, there were 6.7 fewer participants who trained for 760 hours than were expected, and there were 2.6 more participants who trained for 1,040 hours than were expected. There was a difference
in the hours trained with the 1,040-hours-trained category having a greater percentage of participants. The chi-square value of 3.2027 with three degrees of freedom was not significant at the .05 level as previously determined. The level of significance was 0.3614. The results indicated that there was no significant difference in the positive termination rate between individuals trained for a period of 160 hours, 480 hours, 760 hours, and 1,040 hours. Consequently, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Table 23
A Comparison of the Positive Termination Rate by Hours of Training Categories for Participants Enrolled in the JPTA On-the-Job Training Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>160</th>
<th>480</th>
<th>760</th>
<th>1040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fo</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 3.2027 \quad \text{df} = 3 \quad \text{P} > .05 \]

Null hypothesis 23 (H0.23) stated that there will be no significant difference in the job retention rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training and trained for a period of 160 hours, 480 hours, 760 hours, and 1,040 hours.
The data in Table 24 show that 532 participants were in the noncompletion category of the JTPA on-the-job training program. The expected number of participants in the 160-hour training category was 100, the expected rate for the 480-hour training category was 104.2, the expected rate of the 760-hour category was 141.5, and the expected rate for the 1,040-hour category was 186.7. The actual number of participants in the hourly categories included 100 in the 160-hour category, 100 in the 480-hour category, 148 in the 760-hour category, and 184 in the 1,040-hour category. As a result, there was not any difference between the expected and the actual number of participants in the 160-hour category. There were 4.2 more participants in the 480-hour category than were expected, the 760-hour category contained 6.5 more participants than were expected, and the 1,040-hour category had 2.7 fewer participants than were expected. This resulted in a difference in the hours trained category with the 1,040-hour category containing the highest percentage of participants. The chi-square value of 0.5070 with three degrees of freedom was not significant at the .05 level as previously determined. In fact, the level of significance was 0.9174. These data agree with the conclusion that there was no significant difference in the job retention rate between individuals trained in selected hourly categories. Consequently, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.
Table 24

A Comparison of the Job Retention Rate by Hours of Training Categories for Participants Enrolled in the JTPA On-the-Job Training Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Fo</th>
<th>Fe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>148</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>104.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>141.5</td>
<td>186.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 0.507 \quad \text{df} = 3 \quad P > .05 \]

Null hypothesis 24 (H\textsubscript{24}) stated that there will be no significant difference in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program and trained for a period of 160 hours, 480 hours, 760 hours, and 1,040 hours.

The data in Table 25 indicate that 670 individuals participated in the positive termination category and the job retention category of the JTPA on-the-job training program. The number of positive termination participants expected in the 160-hour category was 25.9, the expected number in the 480-hour category was 27, the number expected in the 760-hour category was 36.7, and the number expected in the 1,040-hour category was 48.4. The number of job retention participants expected in the 160-hour category was
Table 25

A Comparison of the Positive Termination Rate and the Job Retention Rate by Hours of Training Categories for Participants Enrolled in the JTPA On-the-Job Training Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Positive termination</th>
<th>Job retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fo</td>
<td>Fe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 2.4540 \quad df = 3 \quad P > .05 \]
100, the expected number in the 480-hour category was 104.2, the expected number in the 760-hour category was 141.5, and the number expected in the 1,040-hour category was 186.7.

The actual number of participants in the positive termination category who were trained for 160 hours was 26, the number trained for 480 hours was 31, the number trained for 760 hours was 30, and the number trained for 1,040 hours was 51. The actual number of participants in the job retention category included 100 in the 160-hour category, 100 in the 480-hour category, 148 in the 760-hour category, and 184 in the 1,040-hour category. The positive termination category included 1 more participants in the 160-hour category than were expected, there were 4 more participants in the 480-hour category than were expected, the 760-hour category contained 6.7 fewer participants than were expected, and there were 2.6 more participants than expected in the 1,040-hour category. The job retention category had the same number of expected and actual participants in the 160-hour category, the 480-hour category had 4.2 fewer participants than were expected, the 760-hour category contained 6.5 more participants than were expected, and there were 2.7 fewer participants in the 1,040-hour category than were expected. This resulted in a difference in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate with a greater percentage of participants in both categories being enrolled in the 1,040-hour category.
The chi-square value of 2.4540 with three degrees of freedom was not significant at the .05 level as previously determined. Actually, the level of significance was 0.4837. The results of this data support the conclusion that there was no significant difference between the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of individuals participating in selected hourly categories. Therefore, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Null hypothesis 25 (H₀25) stated that there will be no significant difference in the positive termination rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program and trained to be manufacturing/factory assembly line employees, clerk/typist employees, and sales/service employees.

The data in Table 26 show that 138 participants were in the positive termination category of the JTPA on-the-job training program. Sixty-two percent of the participants were in the manufacturing/factory assembly line category, 3% were in the clerk/typist category, and 35.4% were in the sales/service category. Therefore, the expected number of manufacturing/factory assembly line participants was 85.6 (62% of 138), the expected number of clerk/typist participants was 4.1 (3% of 138), and 48.3 (35.4% of 138) participants were expected in the sales/service category. The actual number of participants in the manufacturing/assembly line category was 72, the clerk/typist category
Table 26

A Comparison of the Positive Termination Rate by Types of Training Categories for Participants Enrolled in the JTPA On-the-Job Training Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number (N), degrees of freedom (df), frequency observed (Fo), frequency expected (Fe), chi-square ($X^2$), and significance level (P)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing/ Factory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 6.9298$  
$df = 2$  
P < .05
had 3 participants, and 63 participants were in the sales/service category. As a result, there were 13.6 fewer participants in the manufacturing/factory assembly line category than were expected, the clerk/typist category had 1.1 fewer participants than were expected, and there were 14.7 more participants in the sales/service category than were expected. This resulted in a difference in the types of training provided to participants in the positive termination category, with a greater percentage of manufacturing/factory assembly line participants being involved in the program. The chi-square value of 6.9298 with two degrees of freedom was significant at the .05 level as previously determined. In fact, the level of significance was 0.0313. Consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected and the research hypothesis was accepted.

Null hypothesis 26 ($H_0^{26}$) stated that there will be no significant difference in the job retention rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program and trained to be manufacturing/factory assembly line employees, clerk/typist employees, and sales/service employees.

The data in Table 27 indicate that 532 participants were in the job retention category of the JTPA on-the-job training program. The expected number of job retention participants in the manufacturing/factory assembly line category was 329.8, the expected number in the clerk/typist
Table 27

A Comparison of the Job Retention Rate by Types of Training Categories for Participants Enrolled in the JTPA On-the-Job Training Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number (N)</th>
<th>degrees of freedom (df)</th>
<th>frequency observed (Fo)</th>
<th>frequency expected (Fe)</th>
<th>chi-square ($X^2$)</th>
<th>significance level ($P$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fo</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing/ Factory</td>
<td>532</td>
<td></td>
<td>322</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk/ Typist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales/ Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fe</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>329.8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing/ Factory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk/ Typist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales/ Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>186.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 0.6151$  
$df = 2$  
$P > .05$
category was 16, and the expected number in the sales/service category was 186.2. In reality, there were 322 participants in the manufacturing/factory assembly line category, there were 18 participants in the clerk/typist category, and there were 192 participants in the sales/service category. Therefore, there were 7.8 fewer participants in the manufacturing/factory assembly line category than were expected, there were 7 more participants in the clerk/typist category than were expected, and there were 5.8 more participants in the sales/service category than were expected. Consequently, there was a difference in the types of training in the job retention category. The chi-square value of 0.6151 with two degrees of freedom was not significant at the .05 level as previously determined. Actually, the level of significance was 0.7352. The results support the conclusion that there was no significant difference in the job retention rate of selected types of training. Therefore, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Null hypothesis 27 (H_0,27) stated that there will be no significant difference in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program and trained to be manufacturing/factory assembly line employees, clerk/typist employees, and sales/service employees.
The data reported in Table 28 indicate that 670 participants were in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of the JTPA on-the-job training program. The expected number of positive termination participants in the manufacturing/factory assembly line category was 85.6, the expected number in the clerk/typist category was 4.1, and the expected number in the sales/service category was 48.3. The expected number of job retention participants in the manufacturing/factory assembly line category was 329.8, the expected number in the clerk/typist category was 16, and the expected number in the sales/service category was 186.2. Actually, there were 72 positive termination participants in the manufacturing/factory assembly line category, 3 participants in the clerk/typist category, and 63 participants in the sales/service category. The job retention category contained 322 participants in the manufacturing/factory assembly line category, 18 participants in the clerk/typist category, and 192 participants in the sales/service category. Consequently, there were 13.6 fewer participants in the manufacturing/factory assembly line category than were expected, the clerk/typist category had 1.1 fewer participants than were expected, and there were 14.7 more participants in the sales/service category than were expected. The job retention rate had 7.8 fewer participants in the manufacturing/factory assembly line category than were expected, there were 2 more participants in the clerk/typist
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Positive Termination Rate</th>
<th>Job Retention Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manuf./ Factory</td>
<td>Clerk/ Typist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 4.4437  

df = 2  
P > .05
category than were expected, and there were 5.8 more participants in the sales/service category than were expected. As a result, there was a difference in the positive termination and job retention categories with a greater percentage of participants in both categories being enrolled in the manufacturing/factory assembly line category.

The chi-square value of 4.4437 with two degrees of freedom was not significant at the .05 level as previously determined. In fact, the level of significance was 0.1084. The results of this data support the conclusion that there was no significant difference between the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of individuals participating in selected categories of training. Therefore, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.
Summary

The problem of this study was to determine if, in selected counties in Tennessee, differences in the noncompletion rate, the positive termination rate, and the job retention rate existed in categories of participants in the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA).

Data were collected for all JTPA participants in the Job Training Partnership Act on-the-job training program from July 1, 1984 to June 30, 1985. The three status groups represented in the study included individuals who entered on-the-job training, but did not complete the program (noncompleters): the participants who completed the program and were employed, but did not maintain their employment for 13 weeks (positive termination); and the participants who were positively terminated and retained their employment for a minimum of 13 weeks after positive placement (job retention). These three groups were categorized by sex, age, education, public assistance, unemployment compensation, hours trained, and type of training.

Findings

A majority of the findings of this study support the basic null hypotheses that the groups studied would not be
significantly different when categorized by sex, age, education, public assistance, unemployment compensation, hours trained, and types of training during the July 1, 1984 through June 30, 1985 period. There were, however, several instances in which some of the null hypotheses were rejected and the research hypotheses accepted. The findings in Table 29 summarize all instances in which the 27 hypotheses failed to be rejected (F) or were rejected (R).

An analysis of the number of statements where the null hypotheses were rejected or failed to be rejected suggests the following:

There was no significant difference in the noncompletion, the positive termination, and the job retention rates of males and females enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program. Likewise, there was no significant difference in a comparison of the positive termination rate with the job retention rate of either males or females.

There was no significant difference in the noncompletion rate of individuals in the selected age categories of 18-21, 22-30, 31-40, and 41-55. However, there was a significant difference in the positive termination rate of individuals in the selected age categories of 18-21, 22-30, 31-40, and 41-55. This finding suggests that significantly more participants than expected were in the 18-21 age category, while significantly fewer participants than expected were in the 22-30 age category. The 31-40 and 41-55 age categories
Table 29

A Summary of the Three JTPA On-the-Job Training Participant Groups Tested for Significant Differences by 27 Selected Hypotheses Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Failed to be rejected/ rejected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Noncompletion rate of males and females</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Positive termination rate of males and females</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Job retention rate of males and females</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Positive termination and job retention rate of males</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Positive termination and job retention rate of females</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Noncompletion rate by age</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Positive termination rate by age</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Job retention rate by age</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Difference in positive termination rate and job retention rate by age</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Noncompletion rate by educational level</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Positive termination rate by educational levels</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Job retention rate by educational levels</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Positive termination rate and job retention rate by educational levels</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Noncompletion rate by public assistance recipients</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 29 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Failed to be rejected/rejected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Positive termination rate by public assistance recipients</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Job retention rate by public assistance recipients</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Positive termination rate and job retention rate by public assistance recipients</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Noncompletion rate by unemployment compensation recipients</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Positive termination rate by unemployment compensation recipients</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Job retention rate by unemployment compensation recipients</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Positive termination rate and job retention rate by unemployment compensation recipients</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Positive termination rate by hours trained</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Job retention rate by hours trained</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Positive termination rate and job retention rate by hours trained</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Positive termination rate by type of training</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Job retention rate by type of training</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. Positive termination rate and job retention rate by type of training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Failed to be rejected/rejected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(F) = The null hypothesis, that there would be no significant difference, failed to be rejected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R) = The null hypothesis, that there would be no significant difference, was rejected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

were not significantly different in the observed and expected frequencies.

When age was used as a basis for comparison in the positive termination and job retention rates, a significant difference was found in that significantly more positive termination participants than expected were in the 18-21 age category, and significantly fewer positive termination participants than expected were in the 22-30 age category.

When selected education levels of participants were used as a basis for comparison in the noncompletion, the positive termination, and the job retention rates, there were no significant differences. There was also no significant difference when selected educational levels were used as a basis for comparison with the positive termination and job retention rates.
When public assistance was used as a basis of comparison in the noncompletion, the positive termination, and the job retention rates, it was found that there were no significant differences in the categories. Also, when a comparison was made with the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of JTPA participants who received public assistance, it was found that there was no significant difference.

When unemployment compensation was used as a basis of comparison in the noncompletion and the positive termination rates, it was found that there were no significant differences in the categories. However, there was a significant difference in the job retention rate of the unemployment compensation category. Also, there was no significant difference in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate of participants who received unemployment compensation. When the number of hours trained was used as a basis of comparison with the positive termination rate, as well as the job retention rate of participants, it was found that there were no significant differences.

There was a significant difference in the positive termination rate of participants in selected types of training. The difference existed in the observed and expected frequencies in manufacturing/factory assembly line employees and sales/service employees. There was, however,
no significant difference in the job retention rate when selected types of training were used as a basis of comparison. Also, there was no significant difference in the positive termination rate and the job retention rate when the selected types of training were used as a basis of comparison.

**Conclusions**

1. According to the data, the sex of the participant does not significantly affect the noncompletion, the positive termination, or the job retention rates of JTPA on-the-job training participants, when tested at the .05 level of significance, and consequently there is not a need for further analysis of the sex variable.

2. The age of the participant does not significantly affect either the noncompletion or the job retention rates of participants in selected age categories tested at the .05 level of significance. Therefore, there is not a need for further study of the situation.

3. The age of the participant significantly affected the positive termination rate of participants in selected age categories, and it was determined that the 18-21 age category had significantly more positive termination participants than were expected. By contrast, there were significantly fewer actual participants than expected in the 22-30 age category of the positive termination rate. When
the 18-21 age category was tested at the .05 level of significance, it produced more positive termination participants than either the 22-30, the 31-40, or the 41-55 age categories.

4. When a comparison of the positive termination rate and the job retention rate by age was made, the results, when tested at the .05 level of significance, indicated a difference existed in that there were significantly more job retention rate participants than positive termination rate participants in all four age categories. This indicated that significantly more participants completed their training, were employed, and maintained their employment for a 13-week period than the category of participants who were trained and were employed, but did not retain their employment for a 13-week period.

5. The educational level of the participant did not significantly affect the noncompletion, the positive termination, or the job retention rates of the on-the-job training program when tested at the .05 level of significance, in that there were no significant differences in the high school dropout, high school graduate/equivalent, or the post high school categories. This finding seems to contradict the common sense assumption that prevails among educators and the general public that the more education an individual completes the more employable that individual becomes. On the other hand, this finding could have
considerable policy/programmatic importance in that the participant selection process of the program could be studied to determine if there is a relationship between the selection process and the results of the study.

6. There were no significant differences in the noncompletion, positive termination, or job retention rates of participants who received public assistance in relation to those participants who did not receive public assistance when tested at the .05 level of significance. This finding seems to contradict the common sense assumption that public assistance recipients are not as trainable or employable as individuals who do not receive public assistance. As a consequence, this finding may have implications for the participant selection process in that follow-up could be done to determine whether there is a relationship between the selection process and the results of the study.

7. There were no significant differences in the noncompletion and positive termination rates of participants who received unemployment compensation when tested at the .05 level of significance. Consequently, there is not a need for further analysis of the unemployment compensation variable.

8. A significant difference was found in the job retention rate of individuals enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program who received unemployment compensation with individuals who did not receive unemployment compensation
when tested at the .05 level of significance. The rationale for the result could be that the job retention participants who received unemployment compensation were more motivated to retain employment due to their recent unemployment history. Additionally, the unemployment compensation recipients may have better job retention skills due to the fact that they have had recent work experience. Also, there is a possibility that the participants who did not receive unemployment compensation have never been employed or have been unemployed for an extended period of time.

9. The number of hours of training the participant received does not significantly affect the positive termination or the job retention rates of the participants in the on-the-job training program when tested at the .05 level of significance. However, this finding would appear to contradict the common sense assumption that the amount of training an individual has completed will directly impact that individual's success in finding and keeping employment. Consequently, this finding could have policy/programmatic implications in that the participant selection process of the program could affect the results of the study.

10. The type of training received does significantly affect the positive termination rate of participants in selected training categories when tested at the .05 level of significance. The manufacturing/factory assembly line category had significantly fewer participants observed than
were expected. However, the sales/service category had significantly more participants observed than were expected. Additional study should be done to determine why the significant difference existed in the training category.

11. The type of training the participant received does not significantly affect either the job retention rate or the comparison of the positive termination and job retention rates when tested at the .05 level of significance. Consequently, additional studies of these questions were not indicated.

**Recommendations**

As a result of this study, the following recommendations were made for the study of the on-the-job training component of the Job Training Partnership Act:

1. The JTPA should investigate why a significantly higher number of participants in the 18-21 age category of the positive termination rate did not retain employment for a 13 week period.

2. The JTPA should complete a profile of the noncompletion participants and study the factors involved in the noncompletion rate of participants, which resulted in 335 or 33.4% of the 1,005 participants enrolled in the JTPA on-the-job training program dropping out of the program prior to completion of training. A determination should be made as to whether the needs of this category are being met.
3. The JTPA should complete a profile of the positive termination participants and investigate the factors related to the positive termination rate, which caused 138 or 13.7% of the 1,005 JTPA participants to leave their jobs prior to completing 13 weeks of employment. A determination should be made as to whether the needs of this category are being met.

4. The JTPA should complete a profile of the job retention participants in the on-the-job training program. A comparison should be made between the noncompletion participant's profile, the positive termination participant's profile and the job retention participant's profile.

5. The JTPA should investigate the reasons why there were significantly more positive termination rate recipients than statistically expected in the 18-21 age category and significantly fewer positive termination participants in the 22-30 age category than were statistically expected.

6. A follow-up should be done by JTPA to investigate why the job retention rate of the JTPA on-the-job training program contained significantly more unemployment compensation recipients than were statistically expected.

7. The JTPA should analyze why the positive termination rate had significantly fewer participants in the manufacturing/factory assembly line category than were expected.
8. The JTPA should investigate the factors which led to the sales/service category of the positive termination rate having significantly more participants than were expected.

9. This study should be replicated in other parts of the country where the participant mix is different. This could, perhaps, increase the generalization of the results.

10. Research should be done to compare the attitude of on-the-job training participants with nonparticipants toward training, employment, and employers.

11. Further studies should be performed using self-concept inventories that measure the self-concept of participants in the JTPA on-the-job training program.

12. Additional studies should be performed to determine whether a difference exists in the self-concept of noncompleters of the program and completers of the program.

13. The JTPA should investigate whether there is a relationship between the criteria used in the participant selection process and the noncompletion rate, the positive termination rate, and the job retention rate of the on-the-job training program.

It should be noted that a number of hypotheses (1, 2, 5, 7, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 27) had significant levels slightly higher than .05 used in this study and should be reviewed by the JTPA on-the-job training program administrators for consideration of appropriate action.
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APPENDIX A

CORRESPONDENCE
Dr. Jack E. Campbell, President  
Walters State Community College  
Morristown, TN 37813-6899  

April 4, 1986

I am currently attempting to secure research data for my doctoral dissertation. The purpose of my study is to investigate the relationship between selected variables of training services for the economically disadvantaged and whether these services resulted in productive employment and job retention for the participant.

In order to gather the appropriate data, I need access to files in the Job Training Partnership Office of District Two. The names of the participants will be matched with corresponding numbers and anonymity will be maintained. May I have permission to obtain the required data in order to facilitate this study.

I would appreciate hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

Ellis H. Winkler

xc. Dr. Bill Locke
APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Retention

Contract number

Participant number

I. Age

| (1) 18-22 | ( ) |
| (2) 23-30 | ( ) |
| (3) 31-40 | ( ) |
| (4) 41-55 | ( ) |

II. Educational Level

| (1) High school drop-out | ( ) |
| (2) High school graduate/equivalent | ( ) |
| (3) Post high school | ( ) |

III. Sex

| (1) Male | ( ) |
| (2) Female | ( ) |

IV. Welfare Benefits

| (1) Receives public assistance/unemployment compensation | ( ) |
| (2) Does not receive public assistance/unemployment compensation | ( ) |

V. Number of hours trained

| (1) 160 | ( ) |
| (2) 480 | ( ) |
| (3) 760 | ( ) |
| (4) 1040 | ( ) |

VI. Type of JTPA training provided

| (1) Factory assembly line | ( ) |
| (2) Manufacturing | ( ) |
| (3) Clerk/typist | ( ) |
| (4) Sales/service | ( ) |
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