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CHAPTER I: PROBLEM AND RATIONALE

Purpose of the Study

On May 11, 1985 the Anchor Hocking Corporation closed a production plant in Lancaster, Ohio. The net result of this action was that over 500 people lost their jobs. The vast majority of these workers were blue collar, most of whom were unskilled material handlers and semi-skilled machine operatives. Most of these workers faced hard times and hard decisions. They can not be absorbed in Lancaster's economy, especially in the occupations at which they were employed at Anchor Hocking. The workers were forced to consider such options as occupational and industry changes, relocation, and retraining to obtain new employment.

Workers who find themselves unemployed face many decisions. Maintenance of food, shelter, and family structure are usually basic considerations which direct the energies of displaced workers. In most cases the perceived need to find other employment is paramount. However, obtaining employment is difficult for most displaced workers, and usually means a substantial reduction in earnings. Training would help increase their employment opportunities
and earning potential. These factors would appear to support adult education and training programs as viable means to becoming reemployed.

While training would help to increase these workers' employment opportunities and earning potential, the decision to enroll in an education or training program under these conditions can be very difficult. The unemployed worker is often forced to make decisions in an information void. They are often cut off from their usual sources of information and support.

The purpose of this study was to identify the factors affecting displaced workers' participation in adult education and training programs.

Rationale for the Study

The effects of unemployment have been studied from many perspectives, some of which are large scale economic changes, social and demographic implications, financial loss, implications for families, and psychological effects. Despite the large numbers of studies from these various perspectives, little attention has been paid to the factors influencing participation in adult education and training programs by displaced workers.

Previous studies of unemployment in general and displaced workers in particular have, for the most part, been broad brush studies. They have generally encompassed the
total unemployment experience of the subject. As a result, it is known that not very many displaced workers participate in training programs, but the reasons for nonparticipation have not been studied extensively. An in-depth analysis of selected subjects in one situation will promote better understanding of why some displaced workers do and others do not consider adult education programs as a viable means toward becoming reemployed.

Bendick (1982) stated that dislocated workers themselves were not the real problem. The real problem is an undereducated and undertrained workforce that is not prepared to meet the challenges of today's competitive labor market. He stated that the primary problem facing displaced workers is their lack of education.

They lack solid educational backgrounds (with perhaps one-third lacking high school diplomas, and even many who are high school graduates weak in basic skills); and they lack marketable job skills (having typically been semi-skilled machine operatives with little opportunity to acquire skills). (p. 3)

The lack of basic education and marketable job skills, combined with problems of age and a competitive labor market, make it difficult for displaced workers to find employment. Despite these apparent imperatives for retraining, there have not been many displaced worker programs and little response on the part of the displaced workers to the programs which have been offered.
At the national level there has not been a coordinated or comprehensive programmatic response to the needs of displaced workers (Barth & Reisner, 1981; Bendick, 1982). In a comprehensive analysis of the development of public policy related to worker retraining, Stewart (1980) reviewed the impact of programs, policy, and legislation since the Morrill Act of 1862. He cited several major pieces of legislation that provided training opportunities for the unemployed. The programs that resulted from the legislation were most often targeted for specific groups, such as the economically disadvantaged and the hard to employ. In addition, the legislation has been influenced by various philosophical differences regarding the appropriate approach to helping the economy and the unemployed. The conclusion that can be drawn from Stewart's systematic treatment of the public policy response to labor market problems is that this lack of basic agreement on goals and methods is part of the reason for the lack of a national comprehensive policy regarding unemployment. The result has been a fragmented and piecemeal public policy response which has produced programs of a reactionary nature targeted for specific populations and lacking in overall coordination.

Despite the overall lack of planning, there have been some local responses to the needs of the displaced workers. However, local program operators often do not have
sufficient information available to them to plan effective programs.

The ability of career development professionals and the education community to respond to the needs of displaced workers is hampered by a lack of knowledge about the needs of displaced workers. This condition resulted according to Gordus (1986) because "career development professionals, for the most part, were trained when involuntary unemployment and career shifts for mid-life adults were not common" (p. 317). The interdisciplinary nature of the displaced worker problem results in further difficulties for practitioners. Gordus stated, "labor economics, sociology, psychology, and public health have importance to these issues, yet no one area provides the answer. There is also a discontinuity between research in this area and the immediate and pressing needs of practitioners" (p. 317).

Displaced workers face several barriers which inhibit them from fully utilizing available services. They often lack information regarding available agencies and services (Clark & Nelson, 1983). Often they are angry and bitter over loosing their jobs (Schlossberg & Leibowitz, 1980; and Zahniser, Ashley, & Inks, 1985). Service providers wishing to help these individuals need to do more than wait for displaced workers to come to them, they need to be proactive. They must develop strategies to take their
services to displaced workers and present their services in the most positive light possible.

In order to develop effective programs, service providers need sound information regarding displaced workers. Aggregate statistics from the traditional sources such as the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Current Population Surveys are not adequate for this type of planning. More in-depth information is needed regarding displaced workers and the factors affecting their participation in adult education programs.

Definitions of Terms

Workers losing their jobs due to plant closings have been referred to as displaced or dislocated workers. There has been no general agreement in the literature on the precise definition of these terms (Haber, Ferman, & Hudson, 1963). For the purposes of this paper, the term \textit{displaced worker} will be used to indicate workers losing their jobs due to declining industries, declining occupations, foreign competition, or residing in an area with long term unemployment.

\textit{Blue-collar} workers are those employed in hourly positions as unskilled, semi-skilled, and skilled workers. \textit{White-collar} workers are those employed in salaried positions.
Adult Education is used as a comprehensive term to indicate all formal educational programs conducted by institutions for people not of traditional school age. Training and retraining are used to indicate adult education programs for the specific purpose of learning a skill to be used in a certain occupation. Training is a more general term indicating all such occupational skill preparation programs. Retraining indicates a program designed for people changing occupations usually as the result of a mid-career change. Education or educational program is used to indicate a course of study that is not designed to prepare a person for a specific occupation or skill.

The term career is used to denote a person's life time of activities devoted to work. People's careers consist of the series of working activities in which they engage throughout their working life. A mid-career change or a career change indicates a major shift in working activities. These usually involve an occupation and/or industry change.

An occupation is a group of jobs which share similar tasks and duties. They are often found in different types of industries or businesses and across many organizations. Examples of occupations are plumber, secretary, teacher, and material handler. A job is a specific position with a specific employer for a specific wage.
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter contains the review of literature relevant to retraining displaced workers. As Gordus (1986) noted, the displaced worker problem requires an interdisciplinary approach. The data reviewed for this study is drawn primarily from the fields of psychology, adult education, sociology, and economics. In the first portion of this chapter, some of the economic conditions leading to the displacement of workers is reviewed. Second, the nature and scope of the displaced worker problem is explored. Third, factors potentially affecting displaced workers' participation in adult education and training programs are reviewed. The factors are categorized into four areas: the psychological impact of involuntary job loss, career development issues, the motivational basis for participation in adult education and training programs, and the logistical factors concerning the reemployment and retraining of displaced workers. Fourth, the factors potentially affecting participation in adult education and training programs by displaced workers are summarized.

Few references were found which directly addressed the issue of participation in adult education and training
programs by displaced workers. Several studies have included the participation issue as part of a broader study. These studies have not generally focused extensively on the reasons given by displaced workers for participation or nonparticipation in adult education.

Economic Conditions Causing Worker Displacement

Many social, political, and economic factors contribute to the conditions that lead to plant closings and mass layoffs. Bendick (1982) cited four primary causes of worker displacement: changing production technology, changing import competition, changing consumer demands, and a changing industry mix. Zahniser and Ashley (1984) noted several causes of worker displacement, one of the most important is the shift to a post industrial economy. In addition, they cited changes in consumer preferences, advances in technology, and increased international competition as causing significant declines in some major American industries. Regional shifts in industries have created displaced workers in the northeast and the midwest. Labor intensive and low skill industries have tended to move to developing nations with low-wage labor forces. The result has been that displaced workers have been faced with a job market demanding a different mix of skills, offering jobs in different regions of the country, and/or offering jobs with lower wages than they were able to earn previously.
Displaced Workers:  
Nature and Scope of the Problem

Unemployment has been a persistent problem in the United States. Despite much attention in the press; many research studies; and billions of dollars spent on federal, state, local, and private sector programs, the problems of unemployment continue.

The magnitude of the problem created by displaced workers varies according to one's perspective. From a national point of view, Bendick and Devine (1981) stated that their largest estimate of displaced workers, 895,000, places the number of displaced workers at 1% of the labor force and 14% of the unemployed. Barth and Reisner (1981) noted that while the "problem appears not to be a national crisis, it is a critical issue for affected communities" (p. 6).

The Bureau of Labor Statistics (1984) defined a displaced worker as "one who had worked at least three years in a job and lost that job because of a plant closing, moving of a plant or company, slack work, or the abolishment of a position or shift" (p. 1). The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) survey indicated that about 5.1 million workers were displaced between January 1979 and January 1984. It was indicated in the survey that 60% of the 5.1 million displaced workers were reemployed at the time of the survey; 25% were unemployed; and the remainder, 15%,
had left the labor force. Of those who were reemployed, 55% reported earnings that were equal to or higher than their previous earnings while 45% reported lower earnings.

Older workers in the BLS study were less likely to be reemployed than the younger workers. At the time of the survey only 41% of those 55 to 64 years of age were reemployed while 70% of the 20 to 40 age group were reemployed. Minorities also had higher unemployment rates. Forty-one percent of the blacks and 34% of the Hispanics in the sample were unemployed while only 25% of the Whites were unemployed.

Sheingold (1982) estimated that there were between 100,000 and 150,000 displaced workers in 1983. This number is based on a conservative definition of displaced workers: those who had been out of work 26 weeks or longer and had been displaced by structural changes in the economy. Most of these workers were employed in blue-collar occupations and lived in the northeast and midwest sections of the country. Sheingold also estimated the number of displaced workers using a more liberal definition of displaced workers: all workers unemployed in geographic areas where industry is declining. This definition resulted in an estimate of 1.7 million to 2.1 million displaced workers.

Bendick and Devine (1981) used three indices of structural economic change to define and count displaced workers. They defined a displaced worker as an adult who is
able to work and has been unemployed more than 8 weeks. They specified three further criteria: a) laid off from an industry experiencing nationwide long-term decline, and/or b) laid off from an occupation experiencing nationwide long-term decline, and/or c) lived in an area with high unemployment or long term population loss. The declining industry criteria resulted in an estimate of 412,000 displaced workers. The declining occupation criteria yielded a figure of 642,000 displaced workers. The declining region criteria resulted in the number 895,000 displaced workers. All of these estimates were made for March, 1980.

Clark and Nelson (1983) used the following definition of displaced workers: "persons with considerable labor market experience who have been laid off and are unlikely to return to the same company within a period of 6 months" (p. 3). Based on Congressional Budget Office reports, they estimated the number of displaced workers at 1.8 million as of 1982 with another 760,000 workers to be displaced in 1983.

While different definitions of displaced workers are used in various studies, there are some common threads in the definitions. According to Barth and Reisner (1981), displaced workers are generally male, older, less well educated, union members, with some seniority on the job, and earning above average wages. According to Bendick and
Devine (1981), "most dislocated workers are semi-skilled machine operatives formerly employed in manufacturing industries in the nation's 'frostbelt' region" (p. 178).

These definitions and statistics give an idea of who and how many people are affected by unemployment, but not the degree of hardship experienced by displaced workers. Many studies of the unemployed have pointed out that financial hardship is the primary problem faced by the unemployed and their families (Clark & Nelson, 1983; Swineburne, 1981: and Zahniser, Ashley, & Inks, 1985). Many other problems are experienced by the unemployed as well. Ferman and Gardner (1979) developed a model that traces the effects of large scale economic changes to their ultimate effect on individuals. The model has five stages: a) aggregate economic changes which cause b) bumping and skidding labor market patterns which affect c) workers' career patterns which promote d) a degree of economic deprivation for some workers which affects e) the mental and physical health of the individuals.

The research of Brenner (1971) clearly demonstrated that individuals do suffer as the result of unemployment. He was able to show that there are significant relationships among indicators of gross economic change, such as Gross National Product, earnings, and unemployment rates, and indicators of social well-being such as inpatient hospitalization, outpatient care, mortality rates,
incidence of crime, suicide, mental hospitalization rates, domestic violence, and divorce. Increases in unemployment are followed by increases in these types of social problems.

Factors Affecting Participation in Education and Training Programs

There are many factors that could affect the potential enrollment of displaced workers in adult education and training programs. The literature reviewed is organized into four areas: the psychological impact of involuntary job loss, career development issues, the motivational basis for participation in adult education and training, and the logistical factors concerning the reemployment and retraining of displaced workers.

Psychological Impact of Involuntary Job Loss

Many studies have been conducted to isolate the psychological impacts of involuntary job loss. Important for consideration in this study is how the psychological impact of job loss affects the displaced workers' participation in adult education and training programs.

Swineburne (1981) studied a group of 20 unemployed male managers. Although the subjects were not typical of blue-collar displaced workers, the author drew several conclusions that are relevant to this study. She studied
the subjects' feelings about becoming unemployed, how they structured their time, and their job search process. The author employed a semi-structured interview approach. In general, the subjects reacted negatively to becoming unemployed. Swineburne stated that the subjects reported shock, worry, fear, and uncertainty about the future; a loss of sense of purpose, anger, bitterness, and resentment; feelings of being unwanted; shame; loss of status; and loss of self-respect. These responses are listed in order of frequency from most often reported to least often. These reactions were affected by the degree of control the subject felt he had over his circumstances: the less control an individual felt he had the more intense were his negative feelings about the experience.

It was also noted in the study that the feeling of loss experienced by a subject was greater if his occupation was more central to his self-concept. All of the subjects in Swineburne's sample recognized the need to be active, but some had greater difficulty than others in maintaining activity. Those who had greater self-direction on the job were able to structure their time better during unemployment.

Swineburne concluded that the psychological impact of involuntary job loss might be greater for white-collar workers than for blue-collar workers. Within the ranks of the blue-collar workers, she speculated that skilled
workers might feel a greater impact from job loss than semi-skilled or unskilled workers because of the varying degrees of commitment to the job and the centrality of the occupation to the person's self-image.

Hartley (1980) studied unemployed managers with a research design employing both quantitative and qualitative approaches. The author studied 87 unemployed middle- and senior-level managers and 64 employed managers. The quantitative portion of the study measured differences in self-esteem between the employed and unemployed subjects using a Q-sort questionnaire. No statistically significant differences were found in self-esteem between the two groups in either a cross-sectional or longitudinal analysis. However, several important findings were noted in the qualitative part of the study. Based on interviews the author developed four categories of subjects regarding their self-esteem. The first category consisted of those subjects who experienced low self-esteem throughout the study. The longer they were unemployed, the more reduction in self-esteem they experienced. Second, some of the subjects showed a defensively high self-esteem indicating that they were denying their difficulties. Third, some experienced intermittent periods of reduced self-esteem. These subjects generally had high self-esteem but experienced periods of difficulty and depression. Fourth, some subjects maintained moderate or high self-esteem throughout
their unemployment experience. These findings indicate that the psychological impact of unemployment, especially regarding self-esteem, is more complex than has been reported in other studies. Differences in self-esteem among the subjects indicated that people react differently to involuntary job loss. It may be that in applying the findings of this study to displaced workers that those most negatively affected would probably be the least likely to take advantage of educational or retraining programs.

It has been noted that involuntary job loss can be a severe source of stress. The degree and type of stress can affect all areas of a person's life. Brenner and Bartell (1983) studied time usage, mental health, and life satisfaction for a sample of 77 unemployed men. Using a statistical technique called Linear Structural Relations (LISREL), they attempted to determine the direction of causality among these three factors. They developed two models depicting the directional relationships among the factors. The two models are displayed in Figure 1. In Model 1 they hypothesized that subjects' perceptions of their time used actively after job loss affected their life satisfaction and both directly and indirectly through life satisfaction affected their general mental health. In Model 2 they hypothesized that mental health affected life satisfaction and both directly and indirectly through life satisfaction affected how the subjects used their time.
Figure 1: Relationships among time usage, mental health, and life satisfaction for the unemployed.

Although both models were statistically significant, Model 1 was more strongly supported by the findings of their study. The conclusion which can be drawn from Model 1 is that the ability to reorganize one's life and use time effectively during unemployment can prevent or lessen the impact of mental health problems. The conclusion which can be drawn from Model 2 is that poor psychological adjustment can prevent effective utilization of time during unemployment.

There are two implications of this study for retraining programs for displaced workers: 1) some workers will be more effective in utilizing their time during unemployment than others; and 2) proper timing of services
is critical. According to Model 1, services offered prior to or concurrent with the layoff are more likely to be effective than those offered at a later time. The sooner displaced workers can become involved in activity, the more likely they are to avoid ineffective use of their time and any resulting mental health problems. According to Model 2, those individuals who suffer severe negative psychological effects of unemployment are not likely to take advantage of training or other programs.

Schlossberg (1984) stated that adaptation to a major life transition involves the process of moving from a state of pervasiveness, in which the transition is all consuming to the individual, to a state of containment, in which the transition has been confined to a part of the individual's life. Stages of adaptation to loss generally describe a process of development from pervasiveness to containment. Most theories of loss have stemmed from the work of Kubler-Ross (1969). One of her major contributions was to identify the stages experienced by those undergoing loss: denial, anger, bargaining, depression, and finally acceptance.

Gordus (1981) adapted Kubler-Ross's stages to job loss. Gordus noted that there is an internal cycle of adaptation which is coupled to an external cycle of events. The internal cycle consists of the stages enumerated by Kubler-Ross and the external cycle is the series of events related to the job loss. Gordus stated that the stages of
denial and anger often occur at the time of and shortly after the job loss. Bargaining occurs as the individual, or family, attempts to live on a reduced income. Depression often follows when attempts to gain employment are unsuccessful and the person is faced with exhaustion of unemployment benefits. Acceptance may occur at about the time of reemployment. The timing and intensity of these stages vary from one person to another.

Bakke (1960) described a series of stages of adjustment to unemployment experienced by the whole family: momentum stability, unstable equilibrium, disorganization, experimental readjustment, and permanent readjustment. These stages were derived from observations of families with traditional role relationships in which the male was head of the household and the primary wage earner. During the first stage, the pattern of family relationships remains relatively undisturbed. During the unstable equilibrium stage the wife often seeks work. This may lead to conflict in the family if the husband does not approve, is threatened, or does not alter his behavior regarding the domestic work and care of the children. During disorganization the conflicts begun in the previous stage intensify and the family may experience severe problems. This is especially true when the husband is unwilling or unable to find work and does not help at home. Experimental readjustment is marked by the realignment of family
relationships into new roles that are more helpful and positive. Failure to reach this stage may lead to family break-up as it is not possible to exist as a unit for an extended period of time in the disorganized stage. When the family has adopted stable patterns of relationships and new routines, the final stage of permanent readjustment has been reached.

The degree to which Bakke's stages are applicable will depend on the degree to which family roles are traditional. Families with more traditional structure may be more prone to experience the stages he described. This may result in increased stress and decreased family support for activities such as retraining.

Schlossberg and Leibowitz (1980) identified a number of stages of adaptation to job loss experienced by 53 workers displaced from the Goddard Space Flight Center. They found the following stages: disbelief, sense of betrayal, confusion, anger, and resolution. Disbelief and sense of betrayal were almost simultaneous and were a part of the initial shock of learning about the layoff. As the reality of the situation set in, confusion followed. At this stage many of the subjects did not know what to do or where to turn for help. Confusion was followed by anger for those who did not bring quick resolution to their problems. Resolution was the last stage and occurred as the subjects were able to decide on a course of action.
Jones (1979) discussed strategies to lessen the negative impact of the grief caused by involuntary job loss. He stated that the degree of grief is determined by two factors: the person's understanding of why the job loss occurred, and the effectiveness of the informal support systems available to the person. Effectively managing the grief caused by job loss involves facing the reality of the situation, breaking ties with the previous job, and developing ways to pursue new interests and abilities.

**Career Development Factors**

Adults are considering or engaging in mid-career changes more frequently than ever before (Arbeiter, Aslanian, Schmerbeck, & Brickell, 1978; and Sarason, Sarason, & Cowden, 1975). While mid-career changes are desired and prepared for by many, there are others who do not anticipate or want to change occupations. Heddesheimer (1976) developed a model to describe various motivations for mid-career change. The model is displayed in Figure 2. She noted that motivation for mid-career change can be initiated by pressures from two sources: from the environment, and from within the person. Examples of pressures from the environment which cause mid-career changes are layoffs, family changes, and social or economic changes. In general these are beyond the control of the individual. Some internal pressures which may cause mid-career changes
### Figure 2: Motivations for mid-career change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRESSURE FROM THE ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Routine Career (No Career Change)</td>
<td>Self-Determined Career Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situationally Determined Career Change</td>
<td>Self-Determined Accommodation Career Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

are the search for satisfaction and changing personal needs linked to adult developmental stages. Each of these sources of pressure can be characterized as being on a continuum from low to high. A person with low pressure from the environment and low pressure from within would have a routine career devoid of career changes. A person with high pressure from the environment and low pressure from within to change careers would have a situationally determined career change. A self-determined career change comes about as the result of high internal pressure to change but low external pressure for change. Self-directed accommodation career changes result from high pressure from both the environment and within the person.

Many displaced workers can be characterized as experiencing situationally determined career changes. The workers are often not seeking job or occupational change prior
to losing their jobs and, furthermore, they seldom desire job change. Many displaced workers consider the jobs they obtain as the result of reemployment to be less desirable than their previous ones (Haber, Ferman, & Hudson, 1963; and Zahniser, Ashley, & Inks, 1985). Because many displaced workers enter the career change process unwillingly, they are often ill-prepared for its challenges.

Campbell, Cellini, Shaltry, Long, and Pinkos (1979) identified stages of adult career development and the tasks that are associated with them. The stages of career development are preparation, establishment, maintenance, and retirement. The primary goal of the preparation stage is to prepare for an occupation and to obtain a position in that occupation. Examples of persons who might be in the preparation stage include young people entering the labor force for the first time, older people entering the paid labor force for the first time, people reentering the labor force after a period of absence, or people making occupational and/or industry changes. The major tasks of the preparation stage are assessing oneself and the world of work; making career decisions; implementing career plans; performing adequately in the execution of career plans (e.g., good academic performance while in preparation for a job); and obtaining a position in the chosen occupation.
During the establishment stage the primary goal is to demonstrate one's ability to function effectively in an occupation and organization. The major tasks of this stage are to become oriented to the organization, demonstrate satisfactory position performance, and explore career plans for the future. Individuals in the establishment stage may be young and just entering the work force. Another group of individuals in the establishment stage are more mature workers who have made mid-career changes or come out of retirement. This second group of workers may not need to relearn work attitudes and values, but usually need to be reoriented to new organizations and to learn new job skills.

The maintenance stage is more age-related than the preparation and establishment stages. This stage implies a long-term commitment to an occupation and/or organization and has as its primary goal the maintenance of a desired level of functioning in an established position. The tasks of this stage are to assess oneself in terms of status within one's present occupation, position, and organizational setting; to decide on and implement a master career plan for the future; to adjust to changing personal and organizational events; and to maintain satisfactory position performance.

The retirement stage is usually associated with leaving the work force. The primary goal of this stage is to
maximize options in retirement. The general tasks are to decide whether to retire full-time or part-time, explore options for part-time retirement, assess interpersonal relationships, and develop and maintain a retirement plan. Most retirees are in their mid-sixties, but there are increasing numbers at younger and older ages as well.

Mid-career changes generally involve recycling through the preparation stage. Displaced workers are usually in the establishment or maintenance stages of career development at the time of job loss. The tasks of the preparation stage may cause additional problems for displaced workers who are not prepared to cope with them.

Gottfredson (1981) proposed a theory regarding the development of career aspirations. During youth, people develop career aspirations which are based on widely shared images of occupations. As children mature, their career aspirations are tempered by the impact of social class membership and sex-role identification on their self-concept. This process of compromise is guided by three general principles: a) "Some aspects of self-concept are more central than others and will take priority when compromising occupational goals." Three aspects of self-concept from the least likely to be compromised to the most flexible are sex-role identification, social class membership, and interests and abilities. b) "Exploration of job options ends with the implementation of a satisfactory
choice, not necessarily the optimal choice." and c) "People accommodate psychologically to the choices they make" (p. 572).

These principles have direct implications for displaced workers. Many blue-collar workers, especially those coming from lower socio-economic backgrounds, may have already made compromises regarding their career aspirations. Losing a job after a period of stable employment, especially in a saturated local economy, may force these workers to further compromise their career aspirations. According to Gottfredson's theory, the most likely aspects of the displaced workers self-concept to be compromised are interests and abilities.

Gottfredson's principles of compromise are similar to the concept of "satisficing" used by Foltman (1968). He used the terms "maximizing" and "satisficing" to describe the behavior of displaced white- and blue-collar workers respectively. He found that, in general, white-collar workers were more likely to maximize, that is follow their own interests and look for the most advantageous course of action open to them. Blue-collar workers, on the other hand, were more likely to satisfice, that is, they opted for the easiest or most convenient solution to their employment problem.

In terms of Heddesheimer's model, those displaced workers that maximize can be classified as self-directed
accommodation career changers, while those that satisfice are situationally determined career changers. Some displaced workers will view their job loss as an opportunity to maximize by pursuing new goals or realizing old goals that had been previously compromised. Other displaced workers will view their job loss as an additional burden and engage in satisficing behavior which will result in further career compromises.

Based on an extensive literature review Latack and Dozier (1985) developed a model depicting career growth resulting from job loss. Although they reviewed literature related primarily to unemployed managers, some of their findings are relevant to displaced workers. They found that career growth is related to job loss in two ways. First, career growth results from job loss if the person makes the transition to a new job that provides opportunities for a psychological success. Second, career growth can result from job loss if the person can be considered to be better off after the ordeal. The authors identified three sets of factors that influence whether career growth or stagnation results from job loss. These are the characteristics of the individual, environmental characteristics, and the transition process itself. The individual characteristics most likely to be found in individuals experiencing career growth were less satisfaction with the previous job, positioning in the late establishment stage of career
development, and ability to maintain a high degree of activity during unemployment. Those more satisfied with their previous jobs were more likely to see the job loss as negative and have suffered greater trauma from the job loss. Those in the early establishment stage viewed the job loss as interrupting the process of establishing independence and proving competence on the job. Those in the maintenance stage saw the job loss negatively because of their age.

Environmental characteristics had an impact on career growth in several ways. Those experiencing more financial deprivation during unemployment were less likely to experience career growth. Positive social support and flexible family structure both contributed to career growth.

Career growth is also affected by the transition process. The authors referred to the "professionalism" of the termination process. Advance warning, explanations of the reasons for the job loss, and personal approaches to breaking the news to the affected employees are all examples of a professional approach to the termination process which will aid career growth. Persons experiencing prolonged and/or intense stages of anger and/or denial were less likely to experience career growth. The longer one is unemployed, the more difficult it may be to reestablish the positive approach to work that is necessary in order to experience career growth from a job loss.
Motivation for Participation in Education and Training Programs

Maslow (1970) proposed a hierarchy of needs consisting of five levels: physiological needs such as food and shelter, safety needs, belongingness and love needs, esteem needs, and self-actualization. He described motivation as a discrepancy between an ideal and real state of being. Motivation at each level of the hierarchy is the need to reduce a discrepancy between the ideal and reality. Discrepancies at lower levels of the hierarchy take precedence over, or preclude a person from attending to discrepancies at higher levels in the hierarchy. Behavior, then, is determined, at least in part, by the lowest level of unmet needs a person has.

Based on Maslow's hierarchy of needs, Boshier (1973, 1977) developed a theory to explain participation in adult education. Boshier stated that the motivation for voluntary participation in adult education can have a deficiency or growth base. Individuals functioning in the upper levels of Maslow's hierarchy have a growth motivation for participation in adult education. Boshier hypothesized that these individuals are continuous learners whose present and future participation in adult education stems from past participation. Deficiency motivation, on the other hand, stems from a need to maintain a basic level functioning on Maslow's hierarchy of needs. Boshier hypothesized
that people with a deficiency base for motivation will only participate in adult education when there is an immediate need to do so and they will stop participating when that need has been met. Present and future participation for these persons is not necessarily related to past participation.

The implications of Boshier's theory for displaced workers are that those with a previous history of participation in adult education are more likely to take advantage of educational programs during unemployment. In addition, those persons who have had more success in school, or those who have a better attitude toward education, are more likely to participate in training. Those without a history of participation in adult education, with less success in previous education, or with poor attitudes toward education are less likely to take advantage of education and training programs during unemployment.

Several studies have shown that displaced workers with more education find reemployment more easily than those with less education (Haber, Ferman, & Hudson, 1963; and Foltman, 1968). Boggs and Buss (1983) found that displaced workers with less education were more willing to participate in education and training programs. The displaced workers they studied may have participated in training based on deficiency motivation. The extent to which present and future participation in adult education by
displaced workers is influenced by previous participation in adult education, success in elementary and secondary schools, and attitude toward education is not clear.

Reemployment and Retraining of Displaced Workers

Displaced workers and their families face many difficulties. The most immediate, and often the most severe, is the loss of income. Barth and Reisner (1981) stated that for the traditional blue-collar worker "family and home ownership ties and a history of working and providing make work an economic and socio-psychological necessity" (p. 6). There are many other ramifications of involuntary job loss for displaced workers that affect their opportunities for reemployment and retraining. The issues of reemployment and retraining are linked. Opportunities for reemployment affect interest in and enrollment in training programs and opportunities for training may affect interest in reemployment. The following studies are cited because they explore the relationship between reemployment and participation in educational programs.

Haber, Ferman, and Hudson (1963) conducted a comprehensive review of 18 studies of displaced workers conducted between 1929 and 1961. They were able to draw several generalizations from these studies which are relevant to the current displaced worker population. a) Older workers find employment less readily than younger workers.
b) Skilled workers find employment more easily than less skilled workers. c) Less educated workers find reemployment more difficult than more educated workers. d) Workers with seniority generally fare no better in finding reemployment than those with less seniority. e) Displaced workers are frequently required to make industry and/or occupation changes to find reemployment. f) Displaced workers often receive lower wages when reemployed. g) Reemployed displaced workers generally consider their new jobs to be less desirable than their old jobs. h) Most displaced workers have strong attachments to their communities and do not wish to relocate.

The authors stated that retraining was not emphasized in the studies they reviewed. In most cases retraining programs were not made available to the displaced workers. Workers who desired training were on their own to locate training and to finance the training. For these reasons the participation rate in retraining programs in the studies they reviewed was very low.

Foltman (1968) studied the effects of unemployment on 1,400 workers displaced from the Wickwire Spencer Division in Buffalo, New York. His principal area of investigation was the difference between white- and blue-collar workers' responses to the plant shutdown. He hypothesized that white-collar workers would tend to maximize while blue-collar workers would tend to satisfice. Using a
combination of closed and open questions on a mail questionnaire, Foltman was able to derive conclusions from 486 responses (33% response rate), 72% of which were from blue-collar workers and 28% from white-collar workers.

Both blue- and white-collar older workers found new employment less readily than younger workers. Older blue-collar workers were more likely than other subjects to have found temporary work. Older white-collar workers were more likely to have suffered downward mobility than younger white-collar workers. Blue-collar workers in general were more likely to have suffered greater downward mobility than white-collar workers. Older blue-collar workers were less likely to want permanent jobs in occupations different from their previous one. Older workers in general were more likely to accept any job available than younger workers.

Foltman also found that the more educated displaced workers had a greater chance of becoming reemployed. Educated white-collar workers were more likely to be reemployed than educated blue-collar workers. The less educated workers, both blue- and white-collar, experienced more downward mobility than the more educated. The trend was greater for blue-collar workers than for white-collar workers. The more educated displaced workers, both blue- and white-collar, were more likely to maintain their previous level of income.
Skilled workers found more job opportunities after job displacement than less skilled workers. Skilled white-collar workers were more successful in finding reemployment than skilled blue-collar workers. White-collar workers were more likely to have found permanent jobs than blue-collar workers. Within the blue-collar ranks the skilled workers were more likely to have found permanent jobs than the unskilled workers.

Other findings of Foltman's were that some displaced workers who found new jobs perceived these jobs as less desirable than their previous jobs. Most of the workers, both blue- and white-collar, received lower pay on their new jobs. Blue-collar workers were less satisfied with their new job responsibilities and working conditions than the white-collar workers. Blue-collar workers were more likely than white-collar workers to take any job available. Blue-collar displaced workers were strongly attached to their communities and less likely to consider relocation than white collar workers.

Foltman stated that retraining or continuing one's education was not considered a realistic alternative by the displaced workers in his study. Only 5% of the white-collar and 6% of the blue-collar workers saw retraining as a viable option.

An in-depth qualitative study of 40 displaced workers in the northwest part of the country was conducted by Clark
and Nelson (1983). Their sample is not necessarily representative of all displaced workers. It consisted of professionals and administrators (n=21); clerical, sales, and technical workers (n=8); skilled labors (n=4); and semi-skilled and unskilled labors (n=7). Participants in the sample had been unemployed from 6 to 18 months from jobs they had held an average of 4.5 years. The subjects' ages ranged from 33 to 61. Twenty of the subjects were male and 24 female.

Four general areas of impact on displaced workers were identified in the study: economic effects, psychological effects, sociological and family effects, and barriers to education and reemployment. Economic and financial concerns were reported as the most serious problems by 60% of the subjects. Subjects in their 40's were more likely to report this while subjects in their 30's were more likely to be concerned with the psychological effects.

The psychological impact of job loss was significant for most subjects. Eighty percent of the subjects reported personal changes for the worse. Over 40% stated that work was central to their lives and that being out of work had negatively affected their sense of self-worth.

The families of the displaced workers were also affected. One-third of the subjects reported that they believed the experience would have serious long term consequences for their families. However, most subjects (75%)
reported receiving emotional support from their families. This study is consistent with other studies which indicate that unemployment is a family experience not just an individual one.

Many barriers to reemployment and further education were identified by the subjects. Barriers to reemployment included lack of money, lack of information and access to information, lack of job search skills, a strong attachment to the previous occupation, inability to identify transferable skills, and age. Barriers to further education were the cost, inconvenient scheduling of classes, lack of information about training, a perceived lack of responsiveness on the part of institutions to individual needs, perceived inability to succeed in training (often related to age), and strong attachments to previous occupations. Blue-collar subjects were more likely than the white-collar subjects to believe that they could benefit from training and were more likely to view it as a necessity.

Boggs and Buss (1983) studied the educational activities of steel workers laid off from the closing of the Youngstown Sheet and Tube Company. The study was conducted in two phases. In Phase I, 282 steel workers who had been laid off from 6 months to 1 year were interviewed. During Phase II, 155 of the 282 subjects from Phase I were contacted for follow-up interviews one year later. The subjects were divided into four groups: a) those still
employed at the steel mill (involved in closing down the works); b) those who had retired from the labor force upon termination from the steel mill; c) those who had been rehired to another full time job; and d) those who remained unemployed after termination.

Analysis of variance at Phase I revealed that the unemployed group had a higher level of education, were younger, and had lower incomes than the other three groups. Phase II results revealed that only about 9% of the subjects remained unemployed. Many of the workers gave up other jobs to be temporarily reemployed at Youngstown Sheet and Tube. Of the 127 subjects not responding in Phase II, only 15.7% were reported to have left the area in search of work.

The number of steel workers opting for additional education was small despite conditions which would have seemed to favor additional education or training. The authors cited three reasons for the lack of interest in additional education: many workers were able to find jobs elsewhere, there was continued hope that the mill would reopen, and there was reluctance on the part of the steel workers to abandon their previous occupation and way of life.

Several hypotheses were tested in this study. It was found that those subjects who were encouraged to enroll in educational programs were more likely to do so than those
who were not encouraged to enroll. Those who had initially indicated interest in enrolling in an educational program were more likely to follow through and enroll than those who did not indicate an interest. Those subjects moving from the area were not as likely to enroll in educational programs. Of those remaining in the area, the subjects rehired into jobs outside the steel industry were most likely to enroll in educational programs. The authors suggested that the security of some income combined with dissatisfaction with the new job led these workers to view education as a viable option. Subjects in the unemployed and rehired groups who had turned down jobs were more likely to have enrolled in educational programs. Older subjects were less likely to enroll than younger subjects. More educated subjects were less likely to enroll than the less educated subjects.

Zahniser, Ashley, and Inks (1985) interviewed 120 reemployed displaced workers to determine the long term effects of their unemployment experience. Ten field sites in the northeast and midwest sections of the country were selected to conduct the interviews. The subjects were blue-collar workers ranging in age from 30 to 54. Male, female, and minority group members were included. Ten subjects had less than a high school education, 46 had completed high school, 33 had completed some post secondary trade school or community college, 19 had completed some
college, and 2 had graduate degrees. All of the subjects in this study had participated in some form of outplacement training or skill training programs designed for displaced workers.

Twenty-eight percent of the subjects had been reemployed in jobs requiring more skill than their previous occupations, 20% were reemployed in jobs requiring less skill, and 52% experienced no change in skill from their previous jobs. Despite the fact that most subjects held their skill level constant or increased it, 72% experienced a decrease in wages.

Many subjects indicated that they had suffered from stress, loss of self-esteem, the need to readjust their relationships with family and friends, and intense financial problems. The most frequently mentioned source of stress was from financial problems. Other sources of stress included the job search process, loss of self-esteem, dealing with the unemployment insurance system, family changes, and accepting the loss of the former occupation.

The displaced workers sought help from three types of sources. Informal assistance was sought from family, friends, and community groups. This consisted of both intangible types of help such as emotional support and job leads and more tangible types of help such as donations of food and financial assistance. A second type of assistance
was government transfer payments such as unemployment insurance, welfare, and food stamps. Third, the displaced workers received help from programs specifically designed to assist the workers. These programs were often funded by the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), the outplacing employer, local government, or labor-management agreements.

Many different types of services were needed by the displaced workers. Some of the services provided by the special programs included skill assessment, self-assessment, career and life planning, labor market orientation, resume writing, interviewing skills, job and employment orientation, job search skills, and job development. Educational services received included basic skills training, occupational cross training, skill and upgraded skill training, skill enhancement training, and on-the-job training.

Seventy-five percent of the subjects participated in job search and outplacement programs, 20% received formal skill training, and 15% participated in both training and job placement programs. Generally, the subjects were positive about the programs and the help they had received. Subjects who had enrolled in job search classes stated that the primary benefits were the psychological support received and the assistance in coping with a hostile labor market. Subjects who had enrolled in training also
indicated that the psychological support was very important to them. Subjects who were reemployed in both training related and nontraining related jobs felt that training was a positive experience. Many reported that they had grown personally and were now using more of their potential as a result of training. They also felt better prepared to face the future.

Some barriers to training were noted by the subjects: lack of financial resources (even when financial assistance was available), lack of information about training, age barriers for certain apprenticeship programs, and lack of training within commuting distance.

Cochran (1985) surveyed 300 blue-collar workers laid off from a General Electric plant in Tiffin, Ohio. The workers had been laid off from 6 to 72 months with an average of 42 months out of work. At the time of the survey, there were 43 subjects enrolled in adult education programs. Thirteen were enrolled in non-vocational adult education, 11 were enrolled in vocational training programs, 11 in 2 year college and technical schools, and 8 were in 4 year colleges or universities. An additional 154 subjects indicated an interest in participating in some form of educational program in the future. Almost all of these indicated they would need some form of financial assistance if they were to do so. The following services were desired by the subjects: career counseling (107
subjects), pre-retirement counseling (25 subjects), investment counseling (57 subjects), financial management (51 subjects), medical counseling and help (38 subjects), counseling for coping with stress (56 subjects), family counseling (32 subjects), and legal counseling (37 subjects).

Summary of the Literature Review

Several authors have questioned the utility of retraining displaced workers. Bendick and Devine (1981) stated that the small numbers of displaced workers indicated that they should not receive high priority in the expenditure of scarce federal funds. Foltman (1968) stated that older displaced workers who are likely to be hardest hit by unemployment often have psychological and motivational barriers to retraining. He stated that they also have less education, and therefore, are not likely to be successful in training. He concluded by stating that retraining programs could be devised for older displaced workers "but at a disproportionately high cost, and the investment involved cannot economically be amortized over the short working span remaining to them" (p. 117-118).

Boggs and Buss (1983) noted, however, that "it is generally agreed that retraining of unemployed workers is a sound investment and perhaps even an obligation" (p. 241). Zahniser, Ashley, and Inks (1985) found a number of
benefits of retraining that transcend the specific occupational skill being learned. Some of these benefits included increased self-confidence, renewed faith in education, better preparation for the future, and personal growth and increased satisfaction. These findings suggest that displaced workers can benefit in a number of ways from participation in adult education and training programs.

The following items summarize the literature reviewed. They indicate the factors identified in the literature review which are most likely to affect participation by displaced workers in adult education and training programs.

The psychological factors influencing participation of displaced workers in adult education and training programs are listed below.

1. Based on the studies of Schlossberg and Leibowitz (1980) and Gordus (1981) it can be inferred that the ability of displaced workers to successfully negotiate the stages of adaptation to involuntary job loss, disbelief, sense of betrayal, confusion, and anger will affect their participation in retraining programs.

2. Based on the studies of Brenner and Bartell (1983) and Swineburne (1980) it can be inferred that displaced workers who make more effective use of their time after job loss will be more likely to participate.
3. Based on the study by Hartley (1980) it can be inferred that the ability to maintain a moderate or high degree of self-esteem, or only experience intermittent periods of reduced self-esteem will facilitate participation in retraining programs.

4. Based on the studies by Bakke (1960), Swineburne (1981), Jones (1979), Zahniser, Ashley, and Inks (1985), and Boggs and Buss (1983) it has been shown that the existence of family, peer, or other informal support systems facilitates participation.

5. Boggs and Buss (1983) demonstrated that receiving encouragement from counselors or other representatives of educational institutions, displaced worker programs, or other community resources facilitated participation.

6. Based on the studies of Bakke (1960) and Latack and Dozier (1985) it is indicated that having a flexible family structure and gender-role identification would support participation.

7. Based on the the work of Schlossberg (1984) it is indicated that the ability to move from a state of preoccupation with the job loss, pervasiveness, to a state where emotions are contained, containment, will facilitate participation.

8. Based on the studies of Jones (1979), Schlossberg (1984), and Latack and Dozier (1985) it is indicated that having an understanding of the reasons for the plant
closing will facilitate participation.

9. Based on the studies of Swineburne (1981) and Schlossberg (1984) it is indicated that those experiencing less trauma as a result of the job loss would be more likely to participate.

10. Based on the study by Swineburne (1981) it is indicated that those who believe they have control over the situation would be more likely to participate.

11. Based on the work of Jones (1979) it is indicated that those who have been able to break ties with their former job would be more likely to participate.

12. Based on the work of Jones (1979) it is indicated that the ability to develop new interests and/or abilities would facilitate participation.

Following are the career development issues influencing participation of displaced workers in adult education and training programs.

13. Based on the work of Heddesheimer (1976) it is indicated that motivation for career change based on high internal pressures resulting in self-directed accommodation type of career change rather than situationally determined career change would facilitate participation.

14. Based on the study by Foltman (1968) it can be deduced that approaching the tasks and decisions of unemployment by maximizing behavior rather than satisficing would be an indication of participation.
15. The study of Latack and Dozier (1985) indicated that placement in the career development stage of late establishment rather than preparation, early establishment, or maintenance would facilitate participation.

16. From the work of Gottfredson (1981) it can be inferred that higher degrees of career aspirations and less willingness to compromise career decisions is an indication of participation.

17. Based on the work of Gottfredson (1981) it can be inferred that those with more awareness of the process of career planning, decision making, and compromise in earlier occupational changes including initial entry into the labor force would be more likely to participate.

Below are listed the motivational factors influencing participation of displaced workers in adult education and training programs.

18. Based on the work of Gottfredson (1981) it can be inferred that a higher degree of value placed on education in family in which the worker grew up would facilitate participation.

19. Based on Boshier's (1973, 1977) theory it can be deduced that a growth orientation for participation in adult education would result in participation.

20. Based on Boshier's (1973, 1977) theory it can be deduced that a higher degree of success in previous educational activities would be an indication of participation.
21. Based on Boshier's (1973, 1977) theory it can be inferred that those with more positive attitudes toward previous educational activities would be more likely to participate.

Following are the reemployment and retraining factors affecting participation of displaced workers in adult education and training programs.

22. In the studies of Clark and Nelson (1983) and Zahniser, Ashley, and Inks (1985) it is demonstrated that displaced workers with additional sources of income in the family and/or reduced expenses were more likely to participate.

23. In the studies of Haber, Ferman, and Hudson (1963) and Boggs and Buss (1983) it is shown that displaced workers with lower skill levels were more likely to participate.

24. In the studies of Haber, Ferman, and Hudson (1963) and Boggs and Buss (1983) it is demonstrated that displaced workers who were reemployed and found their new jobs to be less desirable were more likely to participate.

25. In the study by Boggs and Buss (1983) it is shown that those who experienced greater downward mobility (loss of status, skill, or pay) were more likely to participate.

26. In the studies of Clark and Nelson (1983) and Zahniser, Ashley, and Inks it is shown that displaced workers with more information regarding training programs and community resources were more likely to participate.
27. Boggs and Buss (1983) and Foltman (1963) demonstrated that younger displaced workers are more likely to participate.

28. The study of Boggs and Buss (1983) indicated that the less educated displaced workers were more likely to participate.

29. In the study by Boggs and Buss (1983) it is shown that those who had previously indicated an interest in education and training program were more likely to participate.

30. In the study by Clark and Nelson (1983) it is shown that displaced workers who are unemployed and have low prospects for reemployment are more likely to participate.
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to describe and explain the factors affecting displaced workers' enrollment in adult education and training programs. This chapter describes the following: the rationale for using qualitative analysis, the setting of the study, the subjects, the methods of data collection and analysis, and the usefulness of the data.

Rationale for Qualitative Analysis

The primary method of data collection was semi-structured interviews with the subjects. This method is based on the grounded theory approach described by Glaser and Strauss (1967). Darkenwald (1980) described grounded theory as "an inductive approach to research that focuses on social interaction and relies heavily on data from interviews and observations to build theory grounded in the data rather than to test theory or simply describe empirical phenomena" (p. 64).

Kuhn (1970) described the importance of paradigms in determining the nature of scientific inquiry. He stated that researchers in the social sciences have by and large
tended to emulate those in the natural sciences. Inquiry in the natural sciences has its roots in empiricism and the generation of a priori reasoning. Grounded theory, however, does not rely on preconceived ideas about the phenomena under study (a priori assumptions), but allows theory to develop from the data gathered. This approach is better suited to the study of complex human behavior because it is not necessary to determine in advance what is relevant and what is not. In the study of self-esteem and unemployment, Hartley (1980) was not able to discover significant differences between employed and unemployed subjects using quantitative analysis. Using grounded theory, however, four different patterns of self-esteem were identified. The issues studied and reported in this dissertation are as complex as those Hartley studied. For this reason, qualitative analysis, particularly the use of grounded theory, is appropriate for explaining why some displaced workers participated in adult education and others did not.

According to Guba and Lincoln (1982) there are three conditions that determine when qualitative analysis is appropriate. These are that it is important to understand the meaning making of the subjects, exercise flexibility in conducting the study, and understand the complexity of one situation rather than pieces of many situations.

The first condition is that the meaning making of the subjects as well as their behavior is desired to be known.
Based on surveys, the demographic characteristics of the displaced workers who participate in adult education are known. The purpose of this study was to go beyond demographic characteristics and identify factors affecting participation and nonparticipation from the perspective of the subjects. Insights into why they made their decisions regarding education are provided by their perceptions of themselves, their lives, their families, their current situations, and future prospects. It is important that the actions of displaced workers be understood from their perspective and in the context of their lives. This degree of understanding will better enable those in helping professions to plan and deliver needed services. An inaccurate or less complete understanding of the factors affecting participation in adult education and training programs by displaced workers may lead to poor program planning, inappropriate or non-existent services, and lost human potential.

The second condition for the use of qualitative analysis is that the investigator wishes to exercise flexibility in the conduct of the study rather than rigorous control. This was the case in this study where there were many unknowns. The literature provided only a limited ability to predict the factors affecting participation. It was necessary to exercise flexibility in the control of the
interviews to be able to pursue ideas as they were raised by the subjects.

The third condition for the use of qualitative research is that it is desirable to describe the complexity of one situation rather than pieces of many situations. The purpose of this study was to increase understanding of displaced workers' perceptions regarding education and training options. This is a complex issue which involves the subjects' perceptions on many issues affecting their lives. The understanding of these complex issues was best approached by examining a few subjects in-depth in one location rather than conducting a more superficial analysis of many subjects in several locations.

Setting of the Study

Lancaster is a medium sized town located in southeastern Ohio about 30 miles from the state's capital, Columbus. According to the 1980 census, the population of Lancaster was approximately 35,000. Anchor Hocking is the major employer in the area with two production plants, corporate offices, division offices, and a distribution center located in Lancaster. In 1977, the larger production facility, plant #1, employed about 2,300 workers. It employed about 1,800 workers in 1985. This plant produces household glass products. Plant #2, which was closed on May 11, 1985, employed about 500 workers at the time that
it was closed. Approximately 900 workers were employed at
plant #2 in 1977. Plant #2 produced commercial glass
items.

The reasons for the plant closure were explained in
the 1984 Anchor Hocking Annual Report:

"The strength of the U.S. dollar, combined with
severe import restrictions in several tradition-
ally profitable foreign markets, restrained both
domestic and export sales for the Consumer and
Industrial Division in 1984.... Several deci-
sions have been made in the division to limit the
effect of imports and maintain its leadership
role in the domestic marketplace. The first was
to eliminate the excess production capacity by
closing one of four manufacturing facilities in
the division." (p. 8)

For the employees of Anchor Hocking, the net result of the
decision to close the plant was the loss of over 500 jobs.

Several programs have been funded to help the laid-off
workers: outplacement classes, a job club program, reloca-
tion assistance, financial assistance for education and
training, extended unemployment insurance benefits for
those enrolled in training, and on-the-job training. These
programs were administered through the Resource Center,
operated by the Private Industries Council (PIC) #17 (for
Clinton, Fayette, Ross, Pickaway, and Fairfield counties).
The programs were funded through the Job Training Partner-
ship Act (JTPA) and the Trade Adjustment Act (TRA). The
Resource Center was located in the building which served as
the personnel office for plant #2.
Eligibility for JTPA funds was determined by the Resource Center staff. Eligibility for TRA funds was determined by the local Ohio Bureau of Employment Services Office. Many of the displaced workers were eligible for a combination of both sources of funding. Enrollment in training also qualified a person for extended unemployment insurance benefits.

In addition, Anchor Hocking offered severance pay for plant #2 employees of $25.00 per year of service for hourly (blue-collar) employees and 2 weeks pay per year of service for salaried (white-collar) employees. The employees had 30 days after the notice of separation to accept the severance pay.

Subjects

The sample consisted of blue-collar workers laid off from Anchor Hocking as the result of the May 11, 1985 plant closing. Approximately 500 employees were affected by the plant closure. Others have been laid off before and since plant #2 closed. Of the 500 workers laid off as a direct result of the plant closing, less than 100 were salaried. The remaining were blue-collar workers. Approximately two-thirds of the blue-collar workers were unskilled material handlers and general laborers. The other one-third consisted primarily of semi-skilled and skilled machine operatives with skills particular to the glass industry and
Anchor Hocking. There were a few skilled workers with transferable skills such as electricians.

**Rationale for the Selection of Subjects**

The sample for this study was drawn from the blue-collar workers affected by the plant closure. The following criteria were used to select subjects: a) male, b) blue collar, c) ages between 20 and 50, and d) with families. The subjects were both participants in funded education and training programs and nonparticipants. These criteria were chosen to facilitate the comparison of the responses given by the participants and nonparticipants and to facilitate the application of the findings of this study to other displaced workers.

While many women were employed at Anchor Hocking and were participants in the education and training programs, only men were interviewed in this study. The 1984 Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) study showed that the large majority of displaced workers are male. Zahniser, Ashley, and Inks (1985) reported that 65% of the BLS sample was male. Despite changing conditions in our society, the family and occupational statuses of men and women are still significantly different. By focusing on males only, the findings of the study are more in-depth. A study of both males and females would have been more superficial. Using a male only sample helped focus the study and at the same
time made the sample similar to a significant portion of the national displaced worker population.

The age range of 20 to 50 included many of the men employed at the plant but excluded those who were the least likely to enroll in the education and training programs. Approximately 75% of the 1984 BLS sample was between the ages of 20 and 54. By focusing on the 20 to 50 age group, the sample of this study is similar to the largest group of workers in the national displaced worker sample. The problems and conditions faced by older workers are sufficiently different to demand a separate study.

**Subject Selection Process**

The files of the 104 participants in the JTPA-funded education and training programs (with the names of the individuals removed) were reviewed. Male, blue-collar workers, between the ages of 20 and 50, and with families were identified. From these, subjects were selected to be contacted for interviews. This resulted in the selection of 10 subjects. These subjects were all participants in the JTPA-funded training programs.

An additional 11 subjects were nominated by the Resource Center staff. Nine of these subjects were not participants in the education and training programs and two were participants. The nominated subjects met the criteria of male, blue-collar workers, aged 20 to 50, and with
families. They were nominated from among those who had contacted the Resource Center about training.

The Resource Center staff made the initial contact with the individual to explain the nature of the research project and elicit their willingness to be interviewed. When the individuals expressed a desire to cooperate, their names were given to the researcher. The initial contact by the researcher was by mail. The letter (Appendix A) described the purpose of the research project and the nature of the subjects involvement in it. The letter was followed by a telephone contact in which a meeting time and place were arranged. All of the displaced workers contacted agreed to be interviewed.

**Characteristics of Subjects**

In this section the characteristics of the subjects are described. There are four groups which are referred to in this section. The first group is the JTPA program participants. These are the total number of displaced workers who were enrolled in training programs through the Resource Center at the time this study was conducted. There were 104 JTPA program participants as of December 1985. The second group is the subjects interviewed in this study. There were 21 subjects. The third group is the subject participants. These are the subjects who were enrolled in the JTPA-funded training programs operated by
the Resource Center. There were 12 subject participants. The fourth group is the subject nonparticipants. These are the subjects who were not enrolled in training programs. There were 9 subject nonparticipants. The demographic characteristics of these groups is summarized in Table 1.

The 104 JTPA program participants averaged 33.9 years of age, were employed an average of 9.1 years at Anchor Hocking, averaged 12 years of education, and had an average family size of 3 members (including the JTPA program participant).

The 21 subjects averaged 34.9 years of age, were employed an average of 12.3 years at Anchor Hocking, averaged 11.76 years of education, and had an average family size of 3.9 members.

The 12 subject participants averaged 34.5 years of age, were employed an average of 13 years at Anchor Hocking, averaged 11.6 years of education, and had an average family size of 4.3 members.

The 9 subject nonparticipants averaged 35.4 years of education, were employed an average of 11.4 years at Anchor Hocking, averaged 11.8 years of education, and had an averaged family size of 3.6 members.

It is illustrated in this comparison that the subjects selected for this study were similar in age, number of years employed at Anchor Hocking, years of education, and family size to all of the JTPA program participants
Table 1
Demographic Characteristics of All of the JTPA Program Participants and the Subjects in This Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristics</th>
<th>All JTPA Program Participants</th>
<th>ALL Subjects In This Study</th>
<th>Subject Participants</th>
<th>Subject Nonparticipants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>23-59</td>
<td>25-50</td>
<td>29-50</td>
<td>25-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Employed at Anchor Hocking:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>2-24</td>
<td>5-31</td>
<td>5-31</td>
<td>5-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Education:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>3-16</td>
<td>9-15</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>9-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Size:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>2-7</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
Types of Programs in Which All of the JTPA Program Participants and the Subjects in This Study Were Enrolled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Program</th>
<th>All JTPA Program Participants</th>
<th>Subject Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

enrolled by the Resource Center. In addition, the similarities between the subjects who were participants in the JTPA program and the subjects who were not participants is also shown.

The JTPA program participants and the subject participants were enrolled in a variety of programs. The types of programs that they were enrolled in are listed in Table 2. There are six types of programs: business, education, medical, secretarial, service, and technical. The business category was comprised of accounting, business management, computer programming, and entrepreneurship training. Only one student was studying education. He was completing a
degree in secondary education. Students in medical programs were enrolled in medical assisting, medical laboratory technology, medical records technology, recreation therapy, and registered nurse programs. The secretarial programs consisted of data processing, office management, secretarial brush-up skills, secretarial training, and word processing. The service programs included hotel and restaurant management; parks, recreation, and wildlife management; retail hospitality; and travel and tourism. The technical programs included automobile body repair and mechanics, carpentry, ceramic engineering technology, electronics and electricity, heat processing technology, heating and air conditioning, industrial maintenance and technology, numerical machine control, and welding. The distribution of all of the JTPA male program participants and the subject participants in this study were similar.

The JTPA program participants and subject participants were enrolled in a variety of institutions as shown in Table 3. Types of institutions in which they enrolled were vocational schools, proprietary schools, and community and technical colleges.

The JTPA program participants and subject participants were enrolled in programs of varying lengths. These are displayed in Table 4. The length ranged from less than 4 months to 4 years. All program had a maximum of 2 years of funding from JTPA. Those enrolled in 4 year programs had
Table 3
Types of Institutions in Which All of the JTPA Program Participants and the Subjects in This Study Were Enrolled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Institutions</th>
<th>All JTPA Program Participants</th>
<th>Subject Participants In This Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Schools</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Schools</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Technical Colleges</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
Length of Programs in Which All of the JTPA Program Participants and the Subjects in This Study Were Enrolled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Program</th>
<th>All JTPA Program Participants</th>
<th>Subject Participants In This Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Months</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Months</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
completed a portion of the program prior to enrollment under JTPA funding. Most of the JTPA program participants and the subject participants were enrolled in 2 year programs. Nine month programs were the next most popular. Programs lasting 4 months, 1 year, and 4 years had the fewest numbers of participants.

In Table 5 The employment status of the subject nonparticipants at the time of the initial interview is displayed. At that time there were 10 nonparticipant subjects. One of these subjects subsequently enrolled in a JTPA funded program and became a participant. Two of the subject nonparticipants were unemployed. Six were employed at Anchor Hocking. Of those employed at Anchor Hocking, two were employed full time and four were employed intermittently. Those employed intermittently usually worked less than 40 hours per week and did not work every week. Two were employed at places other than Anchor Hocking. One was doing construction work for a friend and one was self-employed in the lawn and garden business.

A complete description of all of the subjects interviewed in this study is contained in Appendix B.

Data Collection Process

Data collection and analysis are interactive in qualitative procedures. They are discussed separately here for clarity. Some overlap of discussion is necessary because


Table 5
Employment Status of Subject
Nonparticipants at the Initial Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed at Anchor Hocking (Steady)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed at Anchor Hocking (Intermittent)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed Elsewhere</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of the interactive nature of the two processes.

Data collection was primarily accomplished through the use of semi-structured interviews. Other sources of data were interviews with the Resource Center staff, school officials where subjects were enrolled, spouses of several subjects, printed information regarding JTPA funded programs, and a tour of plant #1 at Anchor Hocking.

Prior to conducting the interviews for this study, four trial interviews were conducted. The subjects for the trial interviews were nominated by the Resource Center staff from their JTPA program participants. The subjects interviewed in the trial interviews met all of the demographic criteria outlined earlier. Data collected from the trial interviews were not used in the data analysis. This
data was used to modify and improve the interview process and content.

Two primary data analysis activities were conducted during the data collection process. First, active listening to the tape recorded interviews provided the researcher with the opportunity to reflect on the content and process of each interview and to use that information in planning subsequent interviews. Second, Interview Summaries were written after each interview and a Personal Log was kept by the researcher. These vehicles provided the researcher with opportunities to record feelings and observations regarding the interviews and progress of the study. Comments from the Interview Summaries and the Personal Log are included in the Data Analysis section when appropriate.

**Interview Process**

As described earlier, each subject was contacted by the Resource Center staff before being contacted by the researcher. The researcher's first contact was by mail followed by a telephone contact. At the time of the interview each subject was given the following verbal instructions:

The purpose of this study is to learn more about the workers who were laid off from Anchor Hocking when plant #2 was closed. Participation in the study is strictly voluntary. You have the right to not participate or to withdraw from the study at any time. You will be asked to sign a consent
form indicating your understanding of the research and your agreement to participate in it.

The interview is going to focus on your life and work and what has happened to you since you were laid off. I am going to tape record the interview so that I can concentrate on our discussion and remember what you say without taking notes. No information that could be used to identify you will be reported. Your identity will remain confidential. A summary of the findings of this study will be mailed to you upon the completion of the study.

At the interview each subject was given a one-page description of the research and two copies of the consent form (see Appendix A). The researcher retained one copy of the consent form and the subject kept the other one and the description of the study. When these formalities were completed, the tape recorder was turned on and the interview proper began. At the beginning of the interview the Subject Data Sheet was completed (see Appendix C). This provided basic demographic data. After each interview the researcher completed an Interview Summary to record notes and observations about the subject, the interview, and the progress of the study (see Appendix C). In addition, a Personal Log of observations and reflections was kept.

The interview process was not changed substantially during the course of the data collection. The interviews averaged about 1 hour and ranged from 41 minutes to 86 minutes. The interviews were conducted at the Resource Center, the school attended by the subject, the Public
Library of Lancaster, or the subject's home. The interview location was determined by each subject.

**Interview Content**

The following items represent those used in the interviews. Each item is followed by prompters in parentheses which were used to promote and facilitate exploration of subjects' responses as needed.

1. Please tell me a little about yourself. (Where are you from? What do you like to do? Tell me about your family. How long have you lived in Lancaster?)

2. Tell me about the work you did before you came to work for Anchor Hocking. (How did you get those jobs? Which ones did you like best and why? How did you come to work for Anchor Hocking?)

3. Tell me about the job you had at Anchor Hocking. (What type of job was it? What was good and bad about it?)

4. What were your main work related concerns prior to learning about the layoff?

5. How do you feel toward Anchor Hocking and about losing your job? (How did you feel when you first heard about the layoff? Do you feel differently now?)

6. How would you feel about going back to work for Anchor Hocking?
7. Has being out of work affected you and your family? If so, in what ways?
8. How have your friends and family reacted to your situation?
9. Had you ever planned to leave Anchor Hocking prior to when you heard about the layoff? (Are you in any way glad that you got laid off?)
10. Have you ever thought about getting training or going back to school before you knew about the layoff?
11. Tell me about your high school experiences? (What do you remember as being important? What did you like? What were you good at? Did you like high school in general?)
12. Tell me about any post high school training or education you have received. (How successful were you? Did you like it?)
13. How would you feel if you were to go into a classroom right now?
14. Given the chance, what would you really like to do for a living? (Do you ever think you could really do that?)
15. What are your plans for the future? (Next year? Five years from now?)
16. Who has been helpful to you? (What kind of help have they provided?)
17. What kind of help or information could you use at this time? (What would be most helpful to you at this time? Do you know where to find that kind of help?)
18. What do you think of the programs being offered by the Resource Center?
19. What are the reasons you decided to enroll in this program?
20. Who, if any one, has been most supportive of your efforts to go to school?
21. What effect has being in this program had on you and your family?
22. How do you believe attending school will affect your future?
23. What education and training program options are available to you?
24. Have you ever considered enrolling in an education or training program?
25. Do you feel that friends and family would be supportive of you if you did decide to enroll in an education or training program?
26. What are the reasons you have not decided to enroll in an education or training program?

During the process of interviewing, the interview content was monitored and changed as needed. There were several minor changes in wording of items but the only major change took place during the practice interviews. It was discovered that the subjects were not responding to the items concerning their career development in the way the researcher had anticipated. The subjects showed little
awareness of the stages of career development or the various tasks associated with each stage. It was determined at that time to eliminate references to stages of career development. Stages of career development was a construct of the researcher and was not part of the subjects' perspective.

A major concern during the data collection process was the recruitment of appropriate nonparticipant subjects. Early entries on the Interview Summaries and the Personal Log indicated that achieving a balance between participants and nonparticipants was a concern. The primary problem was lack of accessibility of nonparticipants. Participants were readily accessible through the pool of JTPA program participants. There was no such pool of nonparticipants. The researcher was forced to rely on the staff of the Resource Center to nominate workers who had contacted them regarding training but did not follow through. Only nominated workers who met the demographic criteria (with the exception of one who did not have a family) were interviewed.

One result of the problem of obtaining nonparticipants was that it was necessary to interview most of the participants before interviewing the nonparticipants. This posed a potential problem in that information gained in the nonparticipant interviews could not be used to restructure the participant interviews. This was corrected during the
follow-up interviews which were used to determine the status of the subjects, correct information, and obtain missing information as necessary. The follow-up interviews were conducted by telephone approximately 6 months after the initial interviews. The Subject Summary Form (see Appendix C) was used to insure that complete and accurate information was obtained from each subject during the follow-up interviews.

Data Analysis Process

Qualitative analysis was used in the study to explore the factors affecting the participation and nonparticipation of the subjects in education and training programs. According to Miles and Huberman (1984), the process of data collection, data reduction, data display, and the drawing and verifying of conclusions are interactive and occur simultaneously in qualitative analysis.

Analyzing qualitative data is an iterative process. It is the process of finding meaning from the raw data. This requires much time and energy to sort through transcripts and other data, to organize the data, to determine which data are relevant, and to identify the patterns of meaning in the data. The process used in this study was repetitive, interactive, and creative. It was repetitive in that the same data was reviewed many times and the same data analysis procedures were applied to all sections of
the data. It was interactive in that the findings of one section often influenced the process of analyzing other sections. The creative aspect of data analysis occurred when patterns emerged from the data which helped to explain the subjects' attitudes, values, or behavior. These moments of insight were rewarding for the researcher.

**Development of Codes**

Miles and Huberman (1984) stated that data reduction is "the process of selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and transforming the raw data that appears in the written-up field notes" (p. 21). Several methods of data reduction were used. After each interview an Interview Summary Sheet was completed (see Appendix C). The researchers' impressions of the subject, the interview, the data collected, its implications for the study and for the future selection of subjects were reported. The interviews were audio-tape recorded and the tapes transcribed. The transcriptions of the interviews were coded. The codes were used to describe and explain the responses of the subjects. A "start-list" of codes (Miles & Huberman, 1984) was devised based on the factors identified in the literature review. The start list was abandoned after attempting to code two transcripts. It was discovered that the codes based on the literature review did not accurately reflect the responses of the subjects. The transcripts
were recoded using a list of codes developed heuristically. These codes reflected the content of the interviews. They were derived from the subjects' views of their situations. They reflected the subjects' decisions, attitudes, values, and behavior. The list of codes (see Appendix D) stabilized by the fourth transcript and was used to code the remaining transcripts. The codes later were referred to as groups. Each group, or code, contained several themes.

After all of the transcripts were coded, a Subject-Code Response Matrix was developed. This matrix listed the subjects in the horizontal rows and the codes in vertical columns. The number of responses of each subject for each code was recorded in the matrix. For example, subject #1 may have made six comments regarding "Prior Participation in Adult Education." The purpose of the Subject-Code Response Matrix was to determine the distribution of responses by subjects in various codes. This enabled the researcher to identify which codes had been explored with all subjects and which had only been recorded for selected subjects. Some codes only appeared sporadically, that is, they were found in the responses of some subjects but not all. These codes were later subsumed by other codes or abandoned as not important for data analysis.

In the next step, all the responses across all of the subjects with a given code were identified, summarized, and rewritten. This process served two purposes: a) to
further familiarize the researcher with the subjects' responses, and b) to determine the themes within each code.

**Development of Themes, Groups, and Categories**

As indicated, the initial coding of the transcripts represented groups of themes. Each group contained a range of subject responses. The range of responses became the various themes. For example, a code was developed entitled "Attitude Toward High School." This code was used to label every reference concerning subjects' feelings about their high school experiences. The range of attitudes expressed provided the basis for the development of themes. The range included subjects who liked high school a great deal, those who thought high school was just all right but liked their vocational courses, those who were indifferent toward high school, and those who disliked or had difficulty in high school. Each of these "attitudes" became a theme. The group of themes "Attitude Toward High School" became a part of the category of themes entitled "Education." The five categories of themes included: Work and Layoff Experiences; Education; General, Personal, and Family Concerns; Factors Affecting Participants; and Factors Affecting Nonparticipants. A complete list of themes, groups and categories is contained in Appendix D.

The themes were derived from varying levels of inference of the subjects' responses. Some responses were
concrete and involved no inference. At the most concrete level, themes were derived from the demographic data and closed questions which required a yes or no answer. Examples of these themes are skill level of the subject (skilled, semi-skilled, or unskilled) and participation in the outplacement classes (yes or no). Other themes required varying degrees of inference from the subjects' responses. Attitude Toward High School is a theme which required some inference from subjects' responses. Subjects did not always state, although a few did, that they had a certain attitude toward high school.

Development of Matrices

Explanation of the subjects' behavior was accomplished through the use of matrices. These were used to compare and contrast the various themes. Many of the matrices were developed to compare the responses of participants and nonparticipants. In several instances, three-way matrices were developed. Selection of themes for matrix construction was based on: a) the literature review, b) logical analysis of the factors involved, and c) the findings of previously constructed matrices. The matrices were constructed only for the purpose of comparing and contrasting themes. They are not statistical representations of data.
Usefulness of the Data

Guba and Lincoln (1982) noted three potential problems in qualitative analysis: a) establishing boundaries for the study; b) focusing the study; and c) establishing rigor, or trustworthiness, in the study.

Boundaries of the Study

Establishing boundaries has been a problem in some studies of the unemployed. Researchers have attempted to incorporate the total unemployment experience of the individual in one study. This study was limited to issues directly related to participation by displaced workers in education and training programs. A number of factors which may affect participation were identified through the literature. These factors, plus others which emerged from the responses of the subjects, defined the boundaries for this study.

Focus of the Study

According to Guba and Lincoln (1982) the focus of the study should be defined with a clear issue or problem to be addressed. Focusing a study relates to the process of developing themes for the data that is collected. The themes should be distinct, explain all of the data, and each theme should be complete. This study addressed the factors affecting participation and nonparticipation of
displaced workers in education and training programs. The factors identified provided the focus for this study.

**Trustworthiness of the Data**

Insuring rigor, or trustworthiness of the data in qualitative analysis is often problematic. Guba and Lincoln (1982) stated that there are four aspects of rigor which require attention: applicability, consistency, neutrality, and truth value.

**Applicability**

Applicability refers to the generalizability of the findings. A case will not be made that the findings of this study can be generalized to all unemployed persons or even all displaced workers. Detailed descriptions of the setting, circumstances of the plant closing, and the educational programs available as well as "thick" descriptions of the subjects will enable readers to determine the applicability of the findings of this study to other circumstances.

**Consistency**

Consistency refers to reliability. One way of approaching the problem of insuring consistency is to have the process and results of the research audited. An audit trail was developed to aid in the auditing process. An
audit trail is documentation of the process of collecting and analyzing data. A person knowledgeable about qualitative research methodology, but not involved with this study, conducted the audit. The audit lends credibility to the results of the study by indicating that the procedures followed and the findings obtained in the study were sound.

The audit was conducted according to the process outlined by Lincoln and Guba (1982). That process includes the following steps: a) the decision by the researcher to have the study audited; b) acquisition of the report and audit trail by the auditors; c) determination of the adequacy of the audit trail; d) comparison of the research procedures to the research question; e) comparison of the raw data to the findings; f) explanation of shifts in the researcher's methodology; and g) notation of whether inferences made by the researcher flow from the data.

The materials provided to the auditor included copies of each of the following: the research proposal, all raw data collected including transcripts and tapes, Subject Data forms, Interview Summary Sheets, the Personal Log of the researcher, copies of all forms used in data collection and analysis, and the completed dissertation. The report of the auditor is contained in Appendix E.
Neutrality

Neutrality refers to the issue of objectivity. In qualitative research, neutrality is a matter of the confirmability of the findings obtained in the study. Guba and Lincoln (1982) stated that the qualitative researcher is no worse off than the quantitative researcher with regard to objectivity. For the quantitative researcher, objectivity is obtained through the use of instruments and disassociation with the phenomena and subjects being observed. However, since the questions asked, their relative importance and order, and the instruments used to gather the data are all influenced by the beliefs and values of the researcher, these methods do not insure objectivity. They only insure quantified subjectivity. Qualitative researchers, on the other hand, are obliged to proceed cautiously, constantly checking data obtained against other sources, and to engage in reflective thinking regarding their own biases about the phenomena under study.

Neutrality was maintained by two procedures in this study. First, the findings obtained from the data analysis were compared to the literature. Discrepancies between the findings of other studies and this study were explained in terms of the setting, the subjects, or the methodology. The second method of insuring neutrality was through self-monitoring. The Interview Summary Forms and Personal Log
enabled the researcher to reflect on the process of data collection and analysis and modify them as necessary.

**Truth Value**

Truth value refers to the credibility of the study. In quantitative methodology this is referred to as internal validity. The primary methods of establishing credibility in this study were establishing rapport with the subjects, self-monitoring, member checks, authority checks, and comparison of the findings with the literature.

Guba and Lincoln (1982) noted that there are several methods of negating possible distortions in the data arising from the researcher's involvement with the subjects. The fact of the researcher's presence may affect the subjects and distort their responses. Establishing rapport with the subjects can help to reduce this effect. The researcher used several methods to establish rapport. First, the Resource Center staff made the preliminary contacts with the subjects. This helped to reduce anxiety in the subjects regarding the purpose and legitimacy of the study. Second, the researcher contacted the subjects by mail and telephone before the actual interview. In each contact the purpose of the research was explained, the nature of the subjects' involvement was described, and the voluntary nature of participation in the study was stressed. Third, the subjects were assured of
confidentiality of their identity. These measures were taken to help insure that the subjects would not be afraid to report their true feelings and thoughts.

Self-monitoring is another method to help reduce distortions in data collection. Self-monitoring in this study consisted of reflecting on the process of conducting the research through the use of Interview Summary Forms and a Personal Log.

Member checks were conducted in two ways. First, all subjects received a summary of the results of the study and were invited to make comments to the researcher regarding those results. Second, the four subjects represented in the case studies were interviewed by telephone regarding the inferences made by the researcher about them. Notes from these interviews are contained in the researcher's Personal Log.

Authority checks consisted of the process of consulting Resource Center staff often during the process of data collection and analysis. This enabled the researcher to determine if findings obtained were consistent with the knowledge and beliefs of the Resource Center staff who were intimately familiar with the subjects and their situations. Notes on the authority checks are contained in the researcher's Personal Log.

The findings of the data analysis were compared to those of other studies regarding displaced workers and
unemployment. Discrepancies between this study and others were explained in light of the special characteristics of the subjects, their circumstances, or the method of data collection and analysis. These comments are contained in the chapter on data analysis.
CHAPTER IV: ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

The purpose of the study was to identify factors affecting participation in training programs by displaced workers. The data were collected by means of semi-structured interviews with 21 displaced workers. The findings of the data analysis are reported in two ways. First, case studies describing four of the subjects are reported. The primary purpose for providing the case studies is to present thick descriptions of the subjects to aid the reader in applying the findings of this study to other populations and settings. The second method of data reporting compares and contrasts the themes among the subjects. This type of data analysis emphasizes the themes and the findings which were be drawn from them.

Case Studies

Purpose

This section contains case studies of four of the subjects. There are several purposes for using case studies as a means of data reporting. First, the case studies provide "thick descriptions" of the subjects and their experiences. This is intended to aid others in the
application of the findings of this study to other settings and populations.

Second, the case studies provide background information to aid in understanding, interpreting, and applying the analysis of themes among the subjects in the second part of this chapter. The results of the analyses of themes are better understood if the reader has a sense of the source of the findings, the subjects themselves.

Third, the case studies provide an understanding of the reasons for participation and nonparticipation in the education and training programs from the context of the lives of the subjects. Reasons for participation and nonparticipation and the factors affecting participation are reported in the analysis of the themes. These reasons and factors can be more completely understood when the context of the individuals' lives from which they were drawn is understood.

Fourth, practitioners should be able to use the case studies to discern patterns of education, work, and family involvement which helped shape the decisions made by the subjects. This should be especially useful in developing counseling approaches and strategies and designing program components to aid displaced workers.

Fifth, the case studies demonstrate the similarities and differences among the subjects. General patterns of work, education, and family involvement emerge from the
case studies. The similarities and differences in socio-economic background, work experience, attitudes, values, and outlook are described.

**Background**

Anchor Hocking's first wave of layoffs in this series was in April and May, 1984, 1 year before plant #2 was closed. The second major wave of layoffs occurred from May to September, 1985, and resulted directly from the plant closure. These layoffs took several months because of the bumping procedure between plants #2 and #1. Layoffs continued at a reduced but steady rate after September, 1985. In addition, many workers have been laid off both permanently and temporarily at various times over the last several years.

Workers laid off from plant #2 had several options:

a) Accept severance pay and a permanent layoff; b) bump into plant #1, if they had enough seniority; c) be placed on a call-in list to work when they were called; d) transfer to a plant in Clarksburg, West Virginia if they had enough seniority; and e) accept layoff without severance pay leaving open the possibility of returning to Anchor Hocking. Options for persons laid off from plant #1 were similar except no severance pay was offered.

Anchor Hocking's retirement plan is owned and operated by the company. To be eligible for retirement benefits a
worker must have 10 years continuous service with the company. This played a major part in the decisions of some subjects.

During the year preceding plant #2's closure, Anchor Hocking attempted to reduce operating costs and increase productivity through the use of an outside consulting firm. The firm and the resulting experience of the workers was generally referred to as "Impact." Impact had many ramifications, almost all negative from the workers' point of view. The results of Impact for the workers were increased workload and pace, loss of jobs, increased stress and tension on the job, further separation of management and union, and increased tensions among workers and local unions.

Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) and Trade Readjustment Act (TRA) funding was made available to workers displaced by the plant closure. Eligibility for TRA programs was determined at the Ohio Bureau of Employment Services (OBES) office in Lancaster. JTPA staff operated their programs out of the Resource Center, which was formerly the personnel office for plant #2 of Anchor Hocking. The Resource Center offered placement services, training programs, and outplacement classes. The outplacement classes were offered only during the summer of 1985.

Many of the enrollees in the education and training programs began school either in June or September, 1985.
Most participants were enrolled through a combination of JTPA and TRA funds. The participants were informed that they would receive living allowances which consisted of extended Unemployment Compensation (UC) benefits while enrolled in school. These living allowances would be continued for the duration of their training up to a maximum of 2 years. The UC benefits of many of the subjects expired during or before December, 1985. At that time the TRA legislation was under debate in the U.S. Congress. No living expenses were sent to the program participants until the TRA bill was passed. Participants then received lump sum back payments for the months of January, February, and March in March, 1986. The winter of 1986 was a lean one for many of the participants and caused at least one participant to drop out of school.

The data collection interviews were conducted in two phases. Initial interviews were conducted during the months of January, February, and March of 1986. The researcher met with each subject at a place of mutual agreement. The interviews lasted approximately 1 hour each. Follow-up interviews were conducted by telephone during the month of August, 1986. The subjects were all cooperative.

The interviews with the subjects were conducted using a semi-structured interview guide. This resulted in consistency of responses among subjects. There were, however, differences of focus and emphasis in the various inter-
views. The four case studies reported contain the following basic information: the subject's involvement with the training programs, high school and family background, work experiences at Anchor Hocking, prior adult education activities, and current family and economic status. Quotes and paraphrases from the subjects are included in the case studies in quotation marks. The Descriptions of Subjects (see Appendix D) contains detailed information about each subject interviewed.

Carl

Carl grew up in a rural area outside of Lancaster. Except for time in the military, he has lived his entire life in the Lancaster area. His early years were spent on the family farm. Carl graduated from high school in the early 1950's and was 50 years old at the time of the interview.

Carl had always worked and for much of his life he held two jobs. His father also worked for Anchor Hocking. The summer before he graduated from high school he worked for Anchor Hocking. He started to work full time at Anchor Hocking as soon as he turned 18, a few months after he graduated. He did not plan to continue his education after high school. He stated, "In that respect, I thought, well I don't need it. Of course, I figured I'd be working at
Anchor Hocking and I wouldn't need any further education anyhow, as far as that goes."

Many people in Carl's family worked for Anchor Hocking. "Dad worked there, he retired from there with 41 years, my grandmother worked there, my oldest brother did work there for a while, and my next oldest brother, ... he was a mold maker [at Anchor Hocking]."

Carl always assumed that he would work for Anchor Hocking. He stated that he liked working there. "I liked it ... I liked working with glassware. I didn't mind the hard work, I enjoyed it." He is proud of his work record.

When Anchor Hocking was getting ready to close plant #2, the attitudes of many of the employees were very negative. About this period Carl stated, "I'd say the last 2 months, why everybody down there had this I don't give a darn attitude. It was going down anyhow and [they] didn't really give a darn whether they made good ware or not. ... Myself, I still wanted to make quality ware, because that was what I was there for. I can't see having to back up to the pay master."

Throughout his life, Carl has been involved in a number of business ventures. While in the service, he got a part time job in a shoe repair shop. He stated, "When I first started I was a hustler, getting customers in off the street. Then I did sales work, then I started working on the shoes themselves, and then 3 weeks before I quit [the
service] and came back here I was assistant manager." While employed at Anchor Hocking, Carl owned a truck to haul sand and gravel, had an import business, a mail order business, started a photography business, and set up an arts and crafts shop that his wife operated. He is a very enthusiastic and energetic person. At the time of the interview he was involved in several projects: the photography business, the arts and crafts shop, a part time job at a gas station, and managing a rental property.

Carl made some general preparations for the layoff. His various interests placed him in a position to take advantage of the layoff. Long before the plant closed, he felt that something was going to happen. When he received his 25-year watch several years before the plant closed, he told the people that he worked with that he would not be there for 35 years. "I says I ain't going to be here. I saw it back then and that's the reason I started studying even more, trying to push myself a bit more on photography, trying to get [my skills and business] built up, though I was hoping I was wrong."

Carl had worked for Anchor Hocking for 31 years when the plant closed. He had mixed emotions about the plant closing. On the one hand, Carl stated that he had many good friends and memories from Anchor Hocking and he hated to see the plant close. On the other hand, this was the opportunity to do things he had always wanted to do. He
could have moved to the Anchor Hocking plant in West Virginia or bumped into plant #1. He decided to take his retirement benefits instead. He intended to use this opportunity to pursue his photography business.

Carl was angry at Anchor Hocking and the union when the plant closed. Although he did not dwell on his anger, he felt as though he had been let down. He stated: "I feel the company and the union went together on the way it was closed down. I think that was illegal too. And personally, I think the union and the company still has got law suits that should be filed against them." He stated that he would never work for another union again and that he would not return under any circumstances to work for Anchor Hocking.

When he left high school, Carl felt that he would not need any more education because it was not needed to work at Anchor Hocking. Later in life he developed a different perspective. "But the older I got, the more I realized I needed more education no matter what I was going to do. And I wasn't satisfied with where I was at. But working the swing shift I couldn't go back to school because it interfered with the work and everything, so that's the reason why I'd get different books on different subjects and try to learn more. Just teach myself, what the heck." At various times he studied business management, accounting, and photography on his own. He also completed
a correspondence course on how to run an import-export business.

Photography has been a consuming interest of Carl's for a long time. He was interested in it even in high school. He has joined professional associations and subscribes to several photography journals. In addition he has attended workshops and seminars in photography. He stated, "I was starting to get serious about photography. [During] the last 4 years, I went to St. Louis for a wedding portrait seminar, and had another course, and I went to a portrait class. And of course, I went to one Nikon school, which was a seminar. This week on Wednesday and Thursday there's [a workshop] out here at Ohio University and I'm already scheduled. You can learn a lot from workshops and seminars like that." Carl's enthusiasm when talking about these workshops indicated that he enjoyed learning and had learned a great deal from them.

After he was laid off Carl worked at a gas station part time. It was here that he learned about the JTPA program opportunities. At first he did not think he was eligible for any benefits. He stated, "I didn't think that with my retirement that I was eligible for any other benefits, see. That wasn't explained to me." He found out about the program and his eligibility by chance from another Anchor Hocking employee who had stopped at the gas station. Carl wanted to enroll in training for
photography. He checked into several area colleges and an art school but the programs were not what he wanted. He then found out about an entrepreneurship training program. He said, "And in a way I fell into it by accident, trying to get in some place where I could take photography schooling part time." He was very enthusiastic about the entrepreneurship program. "I love it. I love it. ... It was a challenge."

Carl wanted to continue his education and was considering enrolling for formal photography training in a university. He felt that he still had a lot to learn. "I know I'm going to to have to start at the very beginning, black and white [photography]. That's fine with me. ... Of course I know I'm going to have to pay for my own schooling, but what the heck. ... I'm willing to do that. Darn willing." He was even considering working toward a bachelor's degree in photography.

Carl's energy and enthusiasm were infectious. Despite 31 years of service to Anchor Hocking, he was able to concentrate on starting a new life. His interests were focused on making a success of his photography and other businesses. He felt that his photography business would pick up in the next few months and that he would soon be able to quit his gas station job. Despite his long years of service for Anchor Hocking, Carl looked forward to the future.
Roger

Roger was interviewed in March, 1986. At that time he was 25 years old, married, and had one child of pre-school age. He was still employed at Anchor Hocking as an unskilled general laborer. He had been working intermittently for the past several months.

Roger was born in the Lancaster area. His family moved across the country when he was six. He returned to the Lancaster area when he was 16. At that time, he got a job in a factory and worked there for 2 years. After he turned 18 he started to work for Anchor Hocking and has worked there ever since. He started to work in plant #2 but transferred to plant #1 a couple of years ago. At the time of the interview Roger had been employed at Anchor Hocking 7 years, 3 years shy of the 10 years required for eligibility for retirement benefits.

Roger spent most of his youth in the western United States where he went to school. Roger had a difficult time in school and dropped out after the ninth grade. His troubles were not all academic. He stated, "The schools out there was really bad. That's the reason why I quit. Real bad, and I couldn't hack it, so I quit school and started to work right then. ... There were a lot of Mexicans and a lot of Blacks out there, and it was very bad." He described an incident where a kid in his class was stabbed while the teacher was out of the room. He stated,
"Then it started happening to me and I said there was no way I was going through it. I wanted my education, but not if it would cost me my life. It was scaring me that bad."

He changed schools and was even enrolled in an out-of-school program for a while, but these actions were too little too late. He said, "I enjoyed school so much, I really did ... but I just didn't get to fulfill my dreams. It really upset me and I just couldn't put up with it." In retrospect, Roger said, "Now that I'm the age I am, I regret that I didn't pick up a ball bat or something, just get me a gun and take it to school with me. Now, here I am sitting here in this position because of guys like that out there. I regret that and I imagine I always will."

Upon returning to Lancaster, Roger tried to enroll in a local high school. They were going to make him repeat the ninth grade. He did not feel he should have to repeat the ninth grade and so he did not enroll in school. It was at this time that he began working.

After he started to work Roger made two unsuccessful attempts to get his GED. While on his first job, he attended GED classes. His employer let him have 2 days a week off to attend the classes. However, he eventually had to discontinue the classes. "They let me have the time, but about the time I got in the middle, where I was about to finish, [they said] I couldn't have no more time, so I
had to quit right in the middle of that." A similar situation occurred while he was employed at Anchor Hocking.

During the summer of 1985, Roger was laid off and attended the outplacement classes sponsored by JTPA. He considered enrolling in a training program at that time. He wanted to enroll in training and continue to work at Anchor Hocking at the same time. He stated: "When I got done with the [outplacement] classes and signed up for the [training] classes ... [I] went to see about getting excused [from work]. I found out all these other guys had beat me to it. They couldn't let me off and I lost out on my schooling there." He then learned that in order to enroll in the training program he would have to take a voluntary layoff. This would have meant giving up his job with the company. He stated that once an employee takes a voluntary layoff he "ain't got no possibilities of getting back in there. Me and my wife think that it might be for the best that I didn't go to school. But deep down inside I don't know."

From Roger's perspective, his desire for additional education was blocked by other people at every turn in his life. The Mexicans and Blacks kept him from completing high school. An uncooperative high school in Lancaster kept him from reenrolling. His two employers blocked his attempts to get his GED. The other workers beat him to the training programs and kept him from enrolling in them.
Finally, the fear of losing his job at Anchor Hocking made enrolling in training appear to be undesirable.

Roger has had two main jobs in his life. The first he held from ages 16 to 18. The second was with Anchor Hocking. He left the first job to work at Anchor Hocking because he was afraid that having worked there under age might hurt him in the future. The primary reason he went to Anchor Hocking was because he "wanted a job with a good strong background and at the time Anchor was the place. Back then everybody talked about Anchor. If you worked at Anchor you're set for life." He liked working for Anchor Hocking but had to face continual layoffs. "I was never employed a whole year all the time I was out there."

Roger faced many decisions and was having a difficult time making them. His primary concern was to work long enough at Anchor Hocking to be eligible to receive retirement benefits. The decision of whether to continue working at Anchor Hocking or quit and go to school was tied up with his concern for retirement benefits. At one point he was ready to sign up for school. "But then I chickened out, I didn't go because ... I was afraid I'd lose my job. I couldn't do it." He described this decision as being "caught on a rock." He stated, "I just can't get over that rock. Every time I think about it I just keep stumbling."
His desire for job security, however, was frustrating his desire for more education. He said, "Like I told my wife, we get straightened around one day and I will go back to school. Right now I'm just putting my dreams aside. [I've got to] think more about my family than I do myself. That's all I can do."

Roger outlined his options as staying at Anchor Hocking at least until he had his 10 years in; taking a voluntary layoff and enrolling in training; entering the Army Reserves or the National Guard and continuing to work for Anchor Hocking; or enlisting in the Army. This last option he considered a contingency plan if all else failed.

Roger did not want his wife to work. He stated that she could only earn $3.00 to $4.00 per hour and that would not be enough to meet their expenses. He also stated, "Our boy was young, and I didn't want her to work, really didn't want her to work, not if I could help it. Just the way I felt about it. ... I wanted to take care of it if I could. I didn't want her to work unless she had to. Just the way I felt about her being home with my boy. I didn't want him to get to know a baby-sitter. I wanted him to know his mother, especially if I'm gone all the time. So far we've made it just on my income."

One option Roger had was to live with his wife's parents while he attended school. While he stated, "They would O.K. that", he chose not to do it. It appeared as
though he felt that he would be giving up his responsi-
bility to and authority over his family if he moved in with
them.

Roger felt a great deal of frustration. He wanted to
go to school but felt that he could not take the risk. He
stated that starting and not being able to complete a
training program would be like getting "shot out of the
saddle again." He compared this to his previous unsuccess-
ful attempts to complete his education. Many of his ex-
pressions indicated that he did not feel in control of his
life. This is especially true regarding his missed
opportunities for education. It may be that as a result of
this frustration he exercised greater control in other
areas of his life, such as in regards to his family.

Tom

Tom, 35, is married and has three children, all in
school. Born and raised in the Lancaster area, he has
lived there most of his life. His family moved around when
he was young and he attended several different schools in
the Lancaster area. He started to work for Anchor Hocking
right after he finished high school and worked there for a
couple of years. He quit but later returned to Anchor
Hocking where he worked until plant #2 was closed.

Tom described his high school days as "party time."
He stated that he "didn't really care much for school. [I]
just did enough to get by and graduate. In my junior year I thought I'd straighten up and go into electronics. That didn't work out. So I ended up going back to the regular stream and didn't like any of that. So it was just party time, just enough to get by."

While he was in school, Tom did not think about what he would do after school. He said that he "just wanted to get out and find a job." After he graduated he said, "I walked out of that high school, walked over to Anchor Hocking, picked up an application, went to work two days after I graduated."

When he first started to work for Anchor Hocking he did not take it very seriously. "Then I got my wife pregnant, got married, and then decided well now, its time to think about what I'm going to do. Kind of late, but that's when I started thinking about what I'm going to do." He worked for Anchor Hocking for two and a half years but did not like it very much. He said, "This wasn't where I wanted to be, I want a trade. So I got out and tried cabinetmaking for a while. Went to work for a couple of cabinet companies and they weren't paying anything. That's when I got into trouble." Tom stated that he has always had a desire to learn a trade. He stated, "A trade was where I wanted to be. Some kind of trade, but I didn't know how to get it. ... I didn't have the money at the time
[and didn't think] about going to school to get the trade. [I] always thought it had to be on-the-job training."

The trouble Tom referred to was a scrape with the law. As a result he could not find work in Lancaster. He and his family moved to Florida where his father lived. His father was a plumber and Tom learned the plumbing trade from his father. He and his wife did not like Florida and moved back to Lancaster after about 3 years. They, "just picked up and came back and hoped for the best."

He worked as a plumber for a while but the work was not steady and he did not receive the benefits that he needed for his family. At this time in his life Tom desired security. He said, "I ended up going back to work for Anchor Hocking. I had to fight to get on at Anchor Hocking. At that point I really wanted to [get on at Anchor Hocking] because I was on welfare, I didn't have no insurance, bills were getting behind." He had mixed emotions about going back to work for Anchor Hocking. "So I ended up going back to work for Anchor Hocking and just accepted it. Hated it, but I accepted it. Worked there 11 years."

For the next several years Tom was occupied with the routine of work and family. He did not think about leaving Anchor Hocking again, "for the simple reason I had a family to take care of and I finally got into what is called the Operator's Local. I was beginning to learn how
to run the machinery and that was more or less a trade so that more or less satisfied me learning how to do that." He did not think about returning to school during this time either. He stated, "When Anchor was going strong we had students come in and work during the summer and I thought they're dumb, what are they going to school for."

This period of complacency was broken by the closing of plant #2 and the threat of layoffs. Tom worked in plant #1. According to Tom no one in plant #1 was sure how the closing of plant #2 would affect their jobs until plant #2 workers began bumping into plant #1. He said, "seeing them there physically and seeing what jobs they were taking, who was getting bumped and where I stood on seniority, then I figured I had about 3 months of work left. I had to do something." He took a couple of months to think about what he was going to do. He decided to go to school. "I knew there wasn't any work out there any place because the guys that were laid off before were looking for jobs. ... I said, well, the only thing I can do is go back to school. What really made up my mind is when I found out that TRA was going to pay for school. Once I found out about that, there was no other decision other than what school to go to. I knew I had to go back to school."

Tom did not visit schools because he was still working at Anchor Hocking. He read brochures from various schools provided by the Resource Center. He did not have a clear
idea of what training he wanted to take. At first he
decided to go to a technical college for Heat Processing
Technology. He had completed the paperwork for that pro-
gram when he found out about Heating and Air Conditioning
Technology at another technical college. He said, "I was
all signed up to go down there until I heard about [the
other program]. I got their booklet and I said, look, this
is what I've been wanting. So then I switched schools."
He felt that the Heating and Air Conditioning Technology
program went along with his plumbing experience. It also
better fit his notion of the type of trade in which he
always saw himself.

Tom did much better in the training program than he
did in high school. He stated, "Its different than high
school, its something I really chose to do and something
that I know I have to do in order to make it in the work
field, where high school was forced on me. ... It was some-
thing you had to do, forced to do, this isn't forced on me,
this is my decision."

However, Tom was not well prepared for school. He
said he, "didn't know what to expect. I didn't know what
it was going to be like till I got here. I figured it was
going to be mostly younger kids, you know, fresh out of
high school." He was also required to take some remedial
courses. The technical courses did not pose an academic
problem to Tom but the writing and social science courses
did. He did not see much relevance for them at the beginning. He said, "Composition, that was my worst subject in high school. I hated to write. I can't spell, I can't read that well. It was my fault in high school and junior high because I just didn't take the time to do it."

Going back to school and encountering some success, however, has helped to improve his skills and attitudes. "I'm beginning to get to the point where I enjoy writing where I hated it at the beginning. I hated it. ... I've talked to several instructors and I can see where the writing is coming into effect, like having to write reports for somebody. So I can see where the writing is coming. That's been easier because I know where its going."

Tom made the Dean's list his first term at school and he feels he will continue to do well. An overriding concern for Tom, however, is his finances. The layoff and previous reductions in hours hit him hard and he had to file bankruptcy. With funding for the training programs being uncertain, Tom is not sure that he will be able to complete school. He does not want to try to work and go to school because "I just won't get as much out of it as I should. I won't be able to give my 100% either way. It will be 50% school and 50% work. Both will hurt."

Despite his financial troubles Tom is determined to finish school. He stated, "let's put it this way, if TRA will work with me I'll end up with maybe 3 associate
degrees instead of just one. There's other ways I can go, but I figure I'm here, I decided to go [to school, and] I'm going to finish it. And I'm going to do the best I can at it too. ... Its going to be tough, I'll do without a lot of things, but I'll make it."

Being in the program has been good for his family too. He stated that his wife, who has not worked for some years, had recently decided that she would like to go to school also. Tom stated, "I think it would be great, her going back to school and going out working. I think it would help her a lot too." He also stated that his eldest child's education has also benefited from his being in school.

Tom is not clear about his career goals. He stated that he did not "know exactly what's out there" in the way of jobs. It appeared as though he had not given this a great deal of thought. When asked what he wanted to be doing in 5 years, he replied, "Working for somebody knowing that I'm not going to get laid off. ... Five years down the road, just too far to think of right now." While he had started to think about the future, he had not fully developed his plans. He further stated, "I always had this idea that whatever will be, will be. However it works out, that's the way its supposed to work out. There's a guiding light, you might say."
Douglas

Douglas, 35, was married and had two school age children. At the time of the interview he had been employed at Anchor Hocking for 12 years and was still employed at Anchor Hocking on an intermittent basis. His was employed as a burn-off machine operator.

Douglas did not grow up in Lancaster. He was raised in a larger city and moved to Lancaster after he was married. While in high school, Douglas considered going on to college but did not pursue it. He stated, "I wasn't that tired of school at that time, and I knew that might be the best course but I didn't have the money to go to school. I didn't want that burden on my parents because they were already putting my brother through school, and I got a job in construction."

Douglas considered himself an intelligent person. "I'm considered intelligent by my fellow workers at the plant because I can talk about any subject, but I don't know a whole lot about any one thing." He also stated, "I was always kind of interested in [medicine]. I've been a medical advisor to our people over there at the plant because I used to do a good bit of reading on the study of anatomy." These feelings of accomplishment, however, were tempered with feelings of self-doubt. He stated, "I think for the last 30 years or so I've been wondering what I'm going to do when I grow up." He stated that he has always
been an outdoors person and very athletic. Partly as a result of this orientation he went into construction work. This left him with ambivalent feelings about his career choice. "I didn't want to be a common laborer, which is pretty much what I ended up. I can't complain, I like the work."

At the time of the interview, Douglas was holding on to his job at Anchor Hocking but he had mixed emotions it. He stated that if he left Anchor Hocking, he "really didn't want to go into another factory. If there was a business opportunity which came up that I thought I could handle I was going after it." At the same time, however, he stated, "it frightens me to try to step out into something. ... I don't have the skill it takes to start a business on my own. Partially, it's a matter of initiative. I have difficulty with the motivation to make responsible decisions where there's a certain risk factor."

When Douglas started at Anchor Hocking he considered it a better job than construction work since he did not have to work outside in the cold weather. "It looked like it was a job that I could stick with if I wanted to. I could stay there till I retired." Despite "some poor [working] conditions" and continual layoffs, Douglas considered the job at Anchor Hocking to be pretty good. He summed up his general attitude toward the job by saying, "As far as factory labor it was average or above as far as
wages. The job was fairly hard work. I can't say I really liked it, but it paid my bills and I was a good worker."

On several occasions Douglas considered leaving Anchor Hocking. "Simply because of the work schedule, quick changes, all the smoke and heat and everything." He stated, however, "I can't say that I really looked for [other] work."

Douglas was employed at plant #1. After plant #2 workers began bumping into plant #1, Douglas stated, "I really didn't feel that my job was really that much jeopardized." Consequently he did not make any preparations for the layoff. "I didn't really feel there was anything I could do, other than make adjustments in my budget. And I didn't feel it would be wise to do anything other than make those types of adjustments. Well, you know, there's really no reason to jump ship when it's not going down yet."

While Douglas was employed by Anchor Hocking, he expressed an interest in enrolling in school and learning but he did not pursue those interests. Looking back on his career he said, "I would have liked to go to school some time along the way but I did have the burden and obligation of a family." In addition, he had his property to pay for and his job at Anchor Hocking which he said, "was all swing shift, 6 days a week, and there's no way that I could go to school." He did learn welding, however. He stated, "I wanted to improve that skill. But as far as [going to
school for] a career change, I didn't have that in mind so much, just having some more talents, personal satisfaction."

In general, Douglas indicated that he did not consider school because of his satisfaction with his job, the restrictions of it, his family obligations, and ignorance of his options. He stated, "I was happy in that situation [working for Anchor Hocking] and I really couldn't see myself trying to go to school and work at the same time. Of course, I wasn't real familiar with what was available as far as night school, nor technical schools, if they really had any worth. It was a matter of ignorance. Really, I was very ignorant of what my options were."

Douglas also expressed a lack of self-confidence regarding his ability to learn. He stated that he did not "have that much academic determination." He also stated, "I do have a problem with recall. ... I can remember a lot of trivia about things, but still, I can study and go to take a test and not remember half of what I studied."

Douglas was laid off for several months during the fall of 1985. At that time he checked into the training programs at the Resource Center. He considered several schools but was most interested in welding at a vocational school. He wanted to attend school and continue to work for Anchor Hocking at the same time. He stated, "Even though I was classified as laid off, I was still working
too much to qualify for the TRA program. So since they couldn't accommodate me there, I didn't pursue the matter any further." He would have been eligible for the JTPA-funded training programs if he had taken a voluntary layoff to go to school but he was not ready to give up his job for school. He stated that his wife "would be supportive of my going to school, we've discussed it." Douglas did not want his wife to work even though it would be possible for his wife to get a good job (she had very marketable skills). He said, "I have to be able to support the family before I can even consider going to school."

Douglas indicated that changes in his employment status might affect his family status. He stated, "In every marriage there's a certain amount of frustration that spouses tolerate with each other, and being laid off and being in a decision-making situation where you're going to make major changes, it brings things to a head." He continued by stating, "I have to take into serious consideration that if I'm going to make a major change, is my marriage going to be one of them?"

Douglas's ideal job was as a game protector. He stated, "I've always been involved with the outdoors, hunting, fishing, etc., and I have a certain sense of justice about me, I like the idea of law enforcement." This was an ideal that he did not consider practical, however, because "it doesn't pay enough to support my
family." For similar reasons he had rejected the idea of returning to school for a college degree. He stated, "Most of those types of entry level jobs, even if you do have a degree in something pay less than what I'm making now. So I can see that I'm probably in a situation, where if I lose my job at Anchor Hocking, I'll just have to get another job."

One of Douglas's major problems is the uncertainty of his working situation. He stated, "That's the major problem with the situation here. You don't know what to do." Douglas had conflicting feelings about the career choices he had made, not having pursued college, what to do about Anchor Hocking, and his family status. It seems as though these feeling of uncertainty and ambiguity were related to his feelings of self-doubt.

Discussion of Case Studies

The four case studies reported were selected to present some of the differences and similarities among the subjects. These four subjects displayed a range of responses regarding some of the important factors differentiating participants and nonparticipants. At the same time, they displayed some of the underlying similarities among the subjects.

Many of the subjects had mixed emotions about Anchor Hocking. While most of them thought it was a good place to
work, they also felt they were not treated well by Anchor Hocking. Carl's mixed emotions about the company typified these feelings. He was angry about losing his job and the way he had been treated but at the same time he had many good memories of people and times at Anchor Hocking. However, he had put Anchor Hocking behind him and was able to look to the future. The inability of others such as Roger and Douglas to do this appeared to be related to their inability to take risks. The better the subjects were able to cope with these mixed emotions of relief, sorrow, anger, and resentment, the better they were able to get on with their lives.

Many subjects also had strong family attachments to Anchor Hocking. Carl's family attachments were very strong as were Roger's and Tom's. Many subjects had several family members employed by Anchor Hocking. One subject, not represented in the case studies, was a third generation employee of Anchor Hocking. It was often referred to as a family plant. These feelings of family loyalty to the company deepened the sense of resentment felt by many of the subjects.

Another way in which these four subjects are typical of the others is in their attitudes toward their families, especially their wives. For the most part, they tended to view themselves as the head of the household and the major decision-maker in the family. This indicated that they had
traditional family and gender-role orientations. Roger's and Douglas's positions of not wanting their wives to work, even when it made good economic sense for them to do so, exemplified this attitude. They were, it appeared, exercising control over an area where they felt they could, while control was slipping away in other areas of their lives.

The areas in which there appeared to be more differences among the four subjects in the case studies were in their attitudes toward and involvement in education, their ability to plan for the future, and the formation of a dream in their lives. Levinson (1978) defined the formation of a dream as "a vague sense of self-in-adult world. It has the quality of a vision, an imagined possibility that generates excitement and vitality" (p.91).

The attitudes toward education of the four subjects varied. Carl had a love of learning and a desire for continued self-improvement through learning. Tom had never valued learning or had much involvement with it. Impending unemployment, however, helped him to develop an appreciation for learning, even if it was only as a means to a goal of secure employment. Roger claimed to have always valued education but his behavior belied his words. He could never seem to get enough control in his life to pursue his educational dreams. Douglas had valued education in the
past, but could not see, or was afraid to see, how it could help him now.

Future orientation was a critical element in the ability of the subjects to recover from losing their jobs at Anchor Hocking. The ability of the subjects to plan for the future was closely related to their feelings of personal control over their lives and the formation of a dream in their lives. These factors differentiated between those who more successful in coping with the situation from those who were less successful. Carl displayed enthusiasm, love of learning, and an ability to look to the future with hope despite his strong attachments to the past. Despite his attachment to the past, the layoff presented Carl with the opportunity and challenge to pursue his dreams. Roger felt frustration from the lack of control he experienced in his life. He was trying to plan for the future but could not get past the present. He felt forced to give up his dreams for survival. Tom had never been very future oriented. The loss of his job, however, helped him to develop a future orientation. He was beginning to develop a dream in his life. Douglas had dreams at one point in his life but let them languish. At the time of the interview, he was drifting without a clear direction, trying against the odds to keep a job which seemed determined to slip away from him.
Analysis of Themes

This section is based on the themes that emerged from the interviews. The findings in each section are reported using several levels of analysis. The themes relevant to each section are defined and evidence from the raw data (transcripts) is reported to support the themes. Matrices are used to compare and contrast the themes. The matrices were constructed and are reported with the intention of indicating trends in the data. They are intended to indicate relationships among the themes and to show the trends of the themes among the subjects. They are not intended to demonstrate statistical relationships among the data. It is not appropriate to view the matrices in terms of percentages, means, or other statistical interpretations of the data. The findings drawn from the themes and matrices are reported and are explained based on the literature reviewed, the subjects, the setting, and the methodology.

Not all of the themes which were developed in the course of data analysis are reported. The themes and matrices reported were selected because they contributed to understanding the decisions made by the subjects. Some of the themes and matrices that are reported do not show important differences between participants and nonparticipants. They are reported because their lack of association with participation in the training programs helps increase understanding of the subjects. The themes
reported are divided into the following sections: Education Factors, Work and Layoff Factors, Personal and Family Factors, Training Program Factors, and Nonparticipation Factors.

Education Factors

Prior Participation in Adult Education

The responses of the subjects regarding prior participation in adult education were classified into three groups of themes: degree of interest in prior participation, type of prior participation, and consistency of prior participation. Prior participation in adult education includes participation in formal postsecondary educational programs, correspondence courses, and self-initiated learning projects.

Four degrees of intensity of interest in prior participation in adult education were noted. The lowest level of interest was indicated by subjects who never thought about participating in educational activities while they were employed at Anchor Hocking. Some examples of comments from subjects in this theme are as follows:

I never thought about going to school, it wasn't important.

I only thought about it when Anchor Hocking started to go under.

I'm just not into going to school, I'm not that great at book work.
These subjects gave many reasons for not having had an interest in educational activities after high school. Their reasons included the demands of their jobs, family and financial concerns, and interests in other activities. An underlying reason for the lack of interest in adult education appeared to be a lack of perception of adult education as important.

The second level of interest in education was shown by subjects who thought about going to school but felt they could not afford it or could not work out the logistics with their work schedules. Comments made by these subjects included:

Oh, I tossed it around in my mind, that I would like to have went back to school, but there was no way. I couldn't afford it.

I would have liked to go to school sometime along the way, but I did have the burden and obligation of a family. I did have a farm in Hocking County and a house in Columbus to pay for.

Once I got into Anchor Hocking, it was all swing shift, 6 days a week, and there's no way that I could go to school.

An interesting point of difference between these subjects and those in the first level is that these subjects did find value in learning. This value was typified by one subject who stated:

I was interested in some schooling, but it still was not possible [because of] working swing shift. . . . I wanted to develop some other
skills—I liked welding, just farm welding. ... I wanted to improve that skill.

The third level of interest included subjects who enrolled in adult education but did not complete it because of family, financial, or work-related problems. Some comments from those subjects are as follows:

I started a home art course but my father's drinking problems kept me from finishing it.

My employer [not Anchor Hocking] let me have time off to get my GED, but then they said they couldn't afford to let me off, so I quit in the middle of that.

The highest level of interest in prior adult education consisted of subjects who enrolled in and completed adult education activities. Some of the topics studied by these subjects were auto body repair, electronics, and correspondence courses in air conditioning and refrigeration, drafting, import and export business, and business management. Some examples of comments made by these subjects included:

I'm always trying to find something to do. I was motivated by boredom.

I knew I needed higher education, and I started as soon as I was settled down enough to start.

In Matrix 1 the distribution of participants and nonparticipants regarding interest in prior participation in adult education is displayed. There are four levels of interest: level 1, did not think about adult education
Matrix 1  
Distribution of Participants and Nonparticipants  
Regarding Interest in Prior  
Participation in Adult Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest In Prior Adult Education</th>
<th>Program Status</th>
<th>Nonparticipants</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Consider Enrolling</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considered But Did Not Enroll</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled But Did Not Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled And Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(two nonparticipants and three participants); level 2, thought about adult education but did not enroll (three nonparticipants and one participant); level 3, started but did not complete adult education (one nonparticipant and three participants); level 4, started and completed adult education (three nonparticipants and five participants).

Both participants and nonparticipants were in all four levels. The first two levels, those who did not consider enrolling in adult education and those who considered but did not follow through, did not appear to be associated
with participation in the training programs. There were four participants and five nonparticipants in those two levels. However, more participants (8) than nonparticipants (4) had started and/or completed adult education activities (levels 3 and 4). Starting and completing adult education activities appear to be associated with participation in the training programs.

Several different types of participation in adult education were noted. Of the 21 subjects, 12 had participated in some form of postsecondary learning. Subjects who did not enroll in previous education included five nonparticipants and four participants. The numbers of participants and nonparticipants in each type of prior adult education are reported in Matrix 2. They are as follows: a) college, one nonparticipant, three participants; b) vocational courses, one participant; c) self-initiated learning projects, one nonparticipant, five participants; d) correspondence courses, one nonparticipant, four participants; e) GED preparation classes, two nonparticipants; and f) workshops or short courses, one participant. Topics studied by these subjects included agriculture courses, air conditioning and refrigeration, art, auto body repair, business management, computers, drafting, electronics, engineering, GED preparation, ham radio operation, import-export business, insurance and financial planning, and photography.
Matrix 2  
Distribution of Participants and Nonparticipants  
Regarding Type of Prior Participation  
in Adult Education*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Of Participation</th>
<th>Program Status</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonparticipation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Courses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Learning Projects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence Courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Basic Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total adds to more than number of subjects because of participation in more than one type of adult education activity by some subjects.
Participants were more likely than nonparticipants to have attended college, enrolled in vocational courses, engaged in self-initiated learning projects, taken correspondence courses, and enrolled in workshops. Nonparticipants were more likely to have participated in GED preparation classes. Four participants and five nonparticipants had not previously engaged in learning activities.

It appears that not only were more participants engaged in educational activities than nonparticipants, but they engaged more consistently and in a greater variety of subjects. It is demonstrated in Matrix 3 that only one nonparticipant was engaged in more than one adult education activity. Persistent, intermittent, and nonlearners are identified in Matrix 3. Persistent learners were those who engaged in two or more prior adult education learning activities. Intermittent learners were those who engaged in only one prior adult education learning activity. Nonlearners were those who did not engage in prior adult education. Six of the participants were persistent learners. Two of those six had been involved in at least three different learning activities.

Persistent learners tended to reflect what Boshier (1973, 1977) referred to as a a growth motivation for participation in adult education. Some of the attitudes expressed by the persistent learners are as follows:
Matrix 3
Distribution of Participants and Nonparticipants
Regarding Consistency of Prior Participation in Adult Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consistency Of Prior Participation</th>
<th>Program Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonparticipants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistent Learners</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermittent Learners</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonlearners</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The older I got, the more I realized I needed more education no matter what I was going to do. I wasn't satisfied with where I was at.

I tinkered around with air conditioning and refrigeration, I was trying to find something that I liked to do. I always liked to work with my hands. If there was something there, when I was a kid, I wanted to tear it apart to find out what makes it tick. I wasn't happy sitting around doing nothing.

I've always been fascinated by the automobile. Always wanted to learn more about it if I could.

Intermittent learners, on the other hand, displayed more situational motivation for participating in prior adult education activities. Some of their comments reflecting this motivation are as follows:

Well I tried to go back to school. After I was into it for a while it didn't hold my attention. It wasn't the teacher's fault. The worst thing
about it was the lab; lab was absolutely boring to me.

Went to GED classes last summer. I figured I'd advance myself a little bit more. None of the teachers would push me and they were glad to help me. They were just courteous and they don't laugh at you or say anything bad or nasty about you behind your back.

These attitudes do not reflect involvement in learning for the sake of learning but desire for secondary rewards such as a job or social acceptance.

These findings are consistent with Boshier's (1973, 1977) theory of motivation to participate in adult education. Boshier stated that current and future participation in adult education is contingent upon prior participation and previous success in adult education.

**High School Experiences**

Subjects were asked to reflect on their high school experiences during the interviews. Two groups of themes which proved to be important emerged from these reflections. These are the subjects' attitudes toward high school while they were in it and their plans for after high school. These groups of themes are important because the attitudes of the subjects towards education can in part be identified through them. These groups of themes were closely related to two other sources of information about the subjects: the educational level of their parents and
Matrix 4
Distribution of Participants and Nonparticipants Regarding Attitudes Toward High School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Toward High School</th>
<th>Program Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonparticipants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty In School</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liked Vocational/Industrial Arts Courses</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liked High School</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

siblings and the type of program they pursued in high school.

Attitudes toward high school. Most of the subjects went to high schools that had similar characteristics. Despite this, the subjects exhibited a wide range of attitudes toward high school. This range of attitudes is displayed in Matrix 4.

First, some subjects reported having difficulty in school, being held back, and having problems with teachers and other students. These subjects did not like high school, did not take it seriously, were not interested in it, got into trouble in school, felt it was not worthwhile,
or reported that they did not learn anything of value. Three participants and three nonparticipants expressed this theme. Some responses of these subjects are:

It was party time in high school. Didn't really care much for school. Just enough to get by and graduate. In junior year I thought I'd straighten up and go into electronics. That didn't work out. So I ended up going back to the regular stream, and didn't like any of that. So it was just party time, just enough to get by.

I was in trouble all the time [in high school]. I was an instigator. . . . They threw me out in the tenth grade. I went up to . . . [another high school]. That lasted about a week. That was when I quit.

Couldn't stay interested in school. It wasn't interesting enough. There wasn't anything there to keep me interested.

It wasn't worthwhile. I wasn't learning anymore. I doubt if half the kids in my class got over a seventh or eighth grade education. It was just like they didn't care. The teachers had a job to do so they put it up on the board and you did it. You didn't have no help.

When I was in the third grade I was held back by the teachers because I wasn't making what you call accurate grades. . . . I see my friends go on and I'm left behind. I kind of put up a defensive wall then, and, of course, back then the other kids were teasing, call you stupid or whatever. . . . Kind of lost interest in school.

Second, several subjects reported a generally indifferent attitude toward high school. Their interests were primarily outside of school, in their families, jobs, or other activities. Two participants and one nonparticipant have responses in this theme. Some of their comments are:
High school was O.K., no big deal. Just general classes.

There wasn't anything about high school I really liked.

Like a typical boy, I didn't like high school.

Third, some subjects reported that high school was just tolerable overall but that their vocational and industrial arts courses were a positive experience. Data on high school courses is based on the report of the subjects. The subjects did not distinguish between vocational and industrial arts courses. This theme contained four participants and two nonparticipants. Some of their comments are:

I wasn't a good student all the way through school, from first grade on. They told my mom in the first grade up there you might as well take this kid out of school 'cause he won't get nothin' out of school--I really never did. Till I got in automotive shop. I made A's and B's in automotive. . . . It was something I wanted to do.

Academic subjects--I could give a nickle less about them. . . . I could do them if I really wanted to, but really didn't want to. . . . I took every type of shop, wood shops, metal shops, drafting, things like that. I took all I could take.

I always hated book work when I was in high school . . . I never had any trouble with any school if I applied myself. Lots of times I didn't get motivated to do it. I was in the vocational agriculture program. I had four years of that.
Last, three participants and three nonparticipants reported that they generally liked high school and most of their subjects. Some of the comments they made are:

I enjoyed high school. In fact, I think I was the only one in my graduating class that had a perfect attendance through high school.

I liked it [high school]. 'Course my English subjects were good.

I was very involved in all social and athletic affairs, member of the Student Council, very active in sports, track, football, cross-country intramurals. . . . I took the top subjects, and had a good background to probably do well in college.

Ninth grade as far as point average—-I scraped by with a 2.5. I did a lot better in the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades. Made the Honor Society, I think, all three years. . . . I liked school.

Both participants and nonparticipants were found in all of these themes. Almost half of the subjects (five participants and four nonparticipants) were in themes one and two, disliking or having an indifferent attitude toward high school. Themes three and four, indicating a more positive attitude toward high school, had seven participants and five nonparticipants. The almost equal distribution of program participants and nonparticipants indicates that attitude toward high school is not a factor that can be used with these subjects to predict later participation in training programs.
Plans for after high school. There are four themes representing subjects' plans for after high school. The first theme is comprised of those who did not have any plans (four participants and five nonparticipants). Example of their comments are:

I just wanted to get out and that was it. I didn't want to go any further. . . . I just wanted to get out of school and get my diploma and that was it.

I never really thought about it, I guess. I was just out running around after I got out of school.

Didn't care. Knew I could do something.

I didn't have any particular goals. If I wasn't happy with one job, I'd get another.

It never crossed my mind what I'd do after I got out of school.

The second theme consisted of subjects who planned to go to work for Anchor Hocking after high school (one participant and one nonparticipant). Their comments are:

I figured I'd come to Anchor Hocking, I knew I wasn't quality to go to college.

My dad never finished the eighth grade, I figured I'd be working for Anchor Hocking [like my father] and didn't need more education.

These two subjects grew up with the expectation that they would work for Anchor Hocking like their parents and peers. This expectation affected their attitudes toward high
school. They did not plan for the future because it was already planned for them.

The third theme included those who planned to get a job for which they had vocational or industrial arts training in high school (two participants and one nonparticipant). These subjects represent a change in attitude about the future from those in the first two themes because they had thought about the future and had made plans for it. Both of these subjects had a very strong interest in their vocational courses. One of them stated:

Well, naturally, I must have thought I was going to be a machinist. Took vocational machine shop. . . . I actually started [working] while I was in high school.

The fourth theme consisted of those who planned to enroll in college or other educational programs after high school (five participants and two nonparticipants). Some of the comments made by subjects representing this theme are as follows:

I wanted to go to school but I knew my family didn't have the money to send me.

I thought about going to school, but got on at Anchor Hocking and started making serious money.

I would have liked to have gone on to college after high school, I wasn't that tired of school, but I didn't have the money and my parents didn't have it after they put my brother through school.
Participants and nonparticipants were in all themes regarding plans for after high school. It should be noted that these plans were the intentions of the subjects and not all of them were carried out. Seven subjects (five participants and two nonparticipants) planned on further education after high school, but none of the subjects enrolled in educational programs directly after high school. However, having stated interest in further education after high school indicated a value for education which was later born out by their attitudes toward education in general and participation in the JTPA-training programs. Most of the subjects who indicated an interest in more education after high school participated in the JTPA-training programs.

The types of courses taken by the subjects in high school are shown in Matrix 5. Three types of high school courses were identified: a) academic or college preparatory (two participants and three nonparticipants); b) vocational/industrial arts or general with some vocational/industrial arts courses (seven participants and two nonparticipants); and c) general courses (three participants and three nonparticipants). One subject, a nonparticipant, did not attend high school.

Enrollment in academic and general courses did not distinguish between participants and nonparticipants, but enrollment in vocational courses did. Almost all of the
Matrix 5
Distribution of Participants and Nonparticipants Regarding High School Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School Course</th>
<th>Program Status</th>
<th>Nonparticipants</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational/Industrial Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

subjects who had some vocational courses in high school enrolled in the training programs. It appears that participation in vocational courses in high school is associated with later participation in vocational education.

Some interesting patterns developed when the themes regarding attitudes toward school and plans for after school are compared. It is demonstrated in Matrix 6 that all of the subjects who had difficulty in high school also had no definite plans for after high school. Most of them just assumed that they would get a job after high school. Of those who planned to pursue more education after high school, almost all had positive attitudes toward high school. Of the subjects who were enrolled in college
Matrix 6
Distribution of Participants and Nonparticipants Regarding Attitudes Toward High School and Plans for After High School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Toward High School</th>
<th>After High School Plans</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Plans</td>
<td>Go To Anchor Hocking</td>
<td>Job In Vocational Training</td>
<td>More Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty In School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liked Vocational/Industrial Arts Courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liked High School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

preparatory classes, all but one had plans for more education after high school. Those subjects enrolled in general courses tended to have no definite plans for after high school. This indicates that for the subjects in this study, degree of planning for the future during high school was associated with attitudes toward high school and high school course of enrollment.

Attitude toward high school was also associated with participation in adult education activities. In Matrix 7 it is indicated that subjects who were not active in adult
Matrix 7
Distribution of Participants and Nonparticipants Regarding Consistency of Prior Participation in Adult Education and Attitudes Toward High School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Toward High School</th>
<th>Consistency of Prior Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty In School</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liked Vocational/Industrial Arts Courses</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liked High School</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

education (nonlearners) or only engaged in one adult education activity (intermittent learners) tended to have difficulty in high school, an indifferent attitude toward high school, or were only interested in their vocational courses. Persistent learners, those subjects who engaged in more than one adult education learning activity since leaving high school, tended to have more positive attitudes toward high school.

Parents and siblings levels of education. The subjects' level of education was generally associated with their parents' and siblings' levels of education. For this
analysis, the number of years of formal education was used, regardless of whether the subject later enrolled in adult education or completed a GED. Approximately three-fourths (16) of the subjects had at least one parent or sibling who did not complete high school. Four subjects completed less than 12 years of school. Two of those four subjects had at least one parent that did not complete high school and all 6 of them had at least one brother or sister who did not complete high school. Most subjects (15) were high school graduates. Of the subjects who completed high school, 9 had at least one parent and 6 had at least one sibling with less than 12 years of school. Two subjects attended college but neither of them completed a degree. Both of the subjects who had some college had at least one parent with some college.

Parents' or siblings' educational levels did not appear to be related to the subjects' participation in the training program. The numbers of participants and nonparticipants with parents and siblings who had less than 12 years of high school are approximately equal. It is the same for participants and nonparticipants whose parents and siblings have 12 years of high school and those whose parents and siblings have more than 12 years of high school.

In general, attitudes toward high school high school experiences did not appear to be associated with
participation in the training programs. The one exception was enrollment in vocational/industrial arts programs in high school which was related to participation. It may be that subjects who had some vocational or industrial arts training were more willing to participate in the training programs because they were familiar with the requirements and rewards of such programs.

**Attitudes Regarding Education and Training**

Subjects were asked about their attitudes toward education in general, and the JTPA and TRA sponsored education and training program being offered.

Most subjects had positive attitudes toward the value of education in general. Those who had positive attitudes toward the value of education also tended to have positive attitudes regarding high school. Some of the positive comments made about education are:

I always thought if somebody had the opportunity to go to school to get an education they ought to take it.

Schooling gives you hope when all hope is gone.

My attitude toward learning has changed since high school.

I always wanted higher education.

Even if you never did anything with the schooling, it helps a lot; it gets you into the routine of doing something instead of thinking about where you can get a couple of bucks to get a six-pack.
Some subjects tended to make more negative than positive comments about the value of education. Most of these subjects had less positive attitudes toward high school. There were more nonparticipants in this category than participants. Some of the negative comments are as follows:

They say you're never too old to learn new tricks, but sometimes that's true and sometimes it's not.

I'm not a brain for school work.

I could never get up in front of a class.

I started and stopped a couple of times to find out about school, but never took it. When I was working I didn't worry about school because you can't make that much with an associate's degree anyway.

I never liked school.

I don't want to go to school, I want a job.

The attitudes expressed by subjects toward the JTPA Education and Training Programs were parallel to their attitudes regarding education in general. Only one negative comment from a participant about the value of the training programs was noted. This comment was in regard to the marketability of some of the programs given the nature of the local labor market. The subject expressed concern that some of the other participants would be disappointed by the lack of jobs and/or the low starting wages (in comparison to their previous earnings at Anchor Hocking)
for jobs that would be available to them. Several nonparticipants also expressed the same concern. Only one nonparticipant made strong positive comments regarding the value of the training programs. This subject had a desire to enroll in training, was a persistent learner in his prior adult education participation and had completed 3 years of college, more than any other subject. He did not enroll in the training programs because he started his own business after he was laid off from Anchor Hocking.

In general participants expressed more positive comments than nonparticipants regarding the value of education in general and the training programs in particular. Those who expressed more positive attitudes toward education and the training programs also tended to have more positive attitudes toward high school. These relationships are consistent with the ideas of Boshier (1973, 1977) regarding the effect of attitude toward previous education on current and future participation.

Work and Layoff Factors

Work Experiences

The subjects made many comments regarding their employment at Anchor Hocking. In most of the interviews, the subjects' attitudes toward the company, their jobs with the company, and the layoff were the primary concerns of the subjects. Many themes were generated from these concerns
including themes that differentiated between participants and nonparticipants and themes that were common to all subjects but did not clearly differentiate between the training program participants and nonparticipants.

Several groups of themes emerged from the study which did not serve to differentiate between participants and nonparticipants but have value because they help to describe the experiences of the subjects. These are the work patterns of the subjects, reasons for starting work at Anchor Hocking, and attitudes toward working at Anchor Hocking.

Three work patterns emerged among the subjects. The first pattern consisted of those subjects who went directly to work for Anchor Hocking after leaving high school without any other significant work experience and continued their employment there without interruption until they were laid off (two participants and two nonparticipants). This group averaged 11 years employment at Anchor Hocking.

The second pattern consisted of those subjects who had other jobs and/or military experience following high school before they started at Anchor Hocking. They averaged 6.5 years work experience before going to Anchor Hocking and 11 years of employment at Anchor Hocking (eight participants and six nonparticipants).

The third pattern consisted of those subjects (two participants and one nonparticipant) who started at Anchor
Hocking directly after high school but left for a period of
time for other jobs and/or the military. These subjects
were employed at Anchor Hocking for an average of 20 years
and had about 2.5 years of work experience outside of
Anchor Hocking.

A variety of reasons were stated by the subjects
regarding why they started work at Anchor Hocking. For all
of the subjects, the money and benefits of a major employer
like Anchor Hocking were motivating factors to seek employ-
ment there. There were several other factors, however,
which emerged. Most of the subjects saw Anchor Hocking as
the major employer in the area and they had relatives
and/or friends employed there (seven participants and seven
nonparticipants). A few subjects (three participants and
one nonparticipant) went to work for Anchor Hocking
strictly for the money and benefits. They stated that they
did not like the company or its reputation as an employer
but felt that they could not afford to pass up an opportu-
nity for the money, benefits, and security Anchor Hocking
offered them. These subjects did not appear to have given
much thought to making vocational choices, their vocational
interests, or seeking satisfaction through work. Some of
their comments are:

I got laid off, next day I was hired by Anchor
Hocking. I had some pull to get in. . . . [It
was] just something to do. To make extra money.
It wasn't bad, work wasn't hard.
I absolutely, positively never had any desire to work for Anchor because everybody I knew . . . would be laid off [part of the time]. And I just didn't like the company. . . . But this was a different kind of job, maintenance. It allowed me to do things I wanted to and it was $1.00 more on the hour.

Two participants and one nonparticipant saw employment at Anchor Hocking as an opportunity to do better than they had in the past and/or expressed a desire to work in a factory. For them, Anchor Hocking was an escape from low-paying, low-skilled employment with little security. Some of their comments are:

I was out of work again. So I spent a couple of weeks looking around and got this job at Anchor Hocking. A nice warm factory job and gave up the construction trade.

All these part-time jobs weren't getting it, so they were hiring out here, so I came out here. I really enjoyed the work out here when I first started out. The pay was good being union.

Almost all of the subjects had relatives employed at Anchor Hocking. It appears as though it was fairly common for people to be hired because their father or mother, aunt or uncle, or brother or sister was employed there, knew of an opening, and spoke to one of the foremen for them. Only five subjects (two participants and three nonparticipants) got their job at Anchor Hocking strictly through an application process without help from an insider.
The subjects were asked to reflect on their attitudes toward the work they did, the working conditions, and Anchor Hocking as an employer. The subjects expressed a variety of feelings about working at Anchor Hocking when they first started. All of the subjects mentioned the good pay and benefits as being a positive factor of their employment. In addition, a number of themes emerged regarding their attitudes toward the work itself. First, there were those subjects who did not particularly like the work, the working conditions, and/or Anchor Hocking as an employer (three participants and two nonparticipants). Examples of comments typifying this attitude are:

Never really did like the job, it wasn't a challenge, it was repetitive and boring. It was just the money.

At that point I really wanted to [get on at Anchor Hocking] because I was on welfare, didn't have no insurance, bills were getting behind. Had to do something. No money coming in at all. So I ended up going back to work at Anchor Hocking and just accepted it. Hated it, but I accepted it. Worked there eleven years.

It wasn't like any other job that I went to because I had to deal with a lot of things. It wasn't dealing with individuals that was so bad, it was dealing with what you had to endure like the heat, and, of course, the smoke, open flames, and the sulphur smell. . . . How to walk on hot glass without getting your pants caught on fire.

Second, some subjects felt that the work was tolerable (three participants and two nonparticipants). Examples of comments in this theme are:
I just got on at Anchor Hocking for something to do, for the extra money. The work wasn't too bad.

Didn't mind the work.

Third, several subjects expressed general satisfaction with the work, working conditions, and the company (two participants and two nonparticipants). Two comments made in this theme are:

It was a good job.

My father worked at Anchor Hocking, it was a family plant; it looked like a good job to me, good job, pay was good, people good to work with; a come and go job.

Last, a number of subjects felt that working at Anchor Hocking was a good opportunity, expressed a great deal of satisfaction and enthusiasm about the work, the conditions and the company, and felt that there were opportunities for advancement (four participants and three nonparticipants). Several comments made regarding this theme are as follows:

I really enjoyed the work when I first started.

I was happy to get on . . . I knew a lot of people that worked there . . . I liked it . . .
I took any job they offered me.

In general, most subjects expressed positive attitudes about working at Anchor Hocking when they first started to work there.
In the 2 years prior to plant #2's closing, the company made many changes in order to boost production and reduce costs. One of these changes involved using an outside firm, Impact, to conduct time management studies to help reduce costs. Whatever the economic results of Impact, it was generally regarded negatively by the subjects. Both participants and nonparticipants voiced negative reactions to the Impact experience. Some of the attitudes that the subjects expressed regarding the effect of Impact on their jobs were that they did not care about the work anymore; they lost pride in the job; they no longer got respect as people and workers; Anchor Hocking was out to break the union; there was too much stress on the job as the result of cutbacks in personnel; and the quality of work they produced suffered as a result.

Only two subjects (both nonparticipants) made comments that indicated they viewed Impact from the company's point of view. They stated that they felt Anchor Hocking had no choice but to try and cut costs and boost production through the use of something like Impact.

Most of the themes described above did not differentiate between participants and nonparticipants but served to describe some characteristics of the subjects as a whole. Most subjects had some work experience other than Anchor Hocking, but these jobs tended to be less important from their point of view. Most subjects had relatives
employed at Anchor Hocking and started to work there because of the influence of those relatives, and because Anchor Hocking was the most prominent employer in the area. Most subjects expressed positive attitudes toward working at Anchor Hocking. Finally, most subjects expressed negative attitudes regarding Impact and the effect it had on their jobs, working conditions, and attitudes toward Anchor Hocking.

Several groups of work-related themes served to differentiate between participants and nonparticipants. These are attitudes toward staying at Anchor Hocking, skill level, and retirement plans of the subjects.

In Matrix 8 the subjects' attitudes regarding staying at Anchor Hocking are displayed. The three themes in this matrix are: a) subjects who did not consider leaving, b) subjects who did not want to stay but made no serious plans to leave, and c) subjects who thought seriously about leaving and/or did leave Anchor Hocking.

The largest group of subjects (four participants and four nonparticipants) never thought about leaving. They were generally satisfied with their jobs and the idea of leaving Anchor Hocking to find other types of work did not occur to them. In response to questions about whether they ever considered leaving Anchor Hocking, these subjects made comments such as the following:
Matrix 8
Distribution of Participants and Nonparticipants
Regarding Reasons for Staying at Anchor Hocking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes Toward Staying At Anchor Hocking</th>
<th>Program Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonparticipants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Thought About Leaving</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Want To Stay But Did Not Make Plans To Leave</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had Plans To Leave or Did Leave</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Never had any intention [to leave]. Never gave it any thought.

Not really. I was satisfied with my position. I liked running the lay down [machine]. I liked being in glassware.

Nope. I really didn't believe they would close up as big as they did.

A second group of subjects (five participants and two nonparticipants) were not particularly satisfied and had thoughts about leaving but did not make definite plans to do so. These subjects made comments such as the following:

Well, I made a decision, maybe when I got my apprenticeship, that if I couldn't do something
with that and have some sort of job with security in ten years, I was going to look for something else. I'm not sure when I realized it, but it was before I had my ten years in, that I realized I wasn't going to work for this company [forever]. So there I was just working to get my ten years in [to be entitled for retirement benefits] and look for something else. When I finally did [get my 10 years in], there was nothing else available with the training I had.

[I thought about leaving] a lot of times. But again when you got family, most jobs you look into, unskilled level anyway, wouldn't pay enough to support a family. So what you have to do is keep working for the family. Can't let the family down. So I stuck it out to the end.

There were several times I felt like the job paid good but it wasn't worth the hell. . . . So I felt there's got to be something better.

Yes, I did [think about leaving]. Simply because of the work schedule. Quick changes. All the smoke and heat and everything. But I can't say that I really looked for work.

Third, three participants and three nonparticipants made serious plans to leave and/or did leave Anchor Hocking. Only one subject (a participant) actually left Anchor Hocking for another job because he was dissatisfied at Anchor Hocking. He eventually returned to work for Anchor Hocking when his other plans did not work out. Some of the comments made by subjects who wanted to leave the company are:

I could have had a job with the county [eleven years ago] but I wouldn't have had no insurance. That's the only reason I didn't take the job.

I just hated the job. My wife, she said I was always complaining about it. . . . I never got to the point where I just said I'm quitting. . . .
If things had held out, we'd have had our house paid off in another three years. That's when I was going to make my move [to start my own auto body repair shop].

In fact I tried to go back there [to a previous job] and get on, but my old boss wasn't there anymore. So I couldn't get back on there.

According to Latack and Dozier (1985), the subjects in the second and third themes should experience more positive career growth from the layoff than subjects in the first theme. Latack and Dozier stated that persons with less satisfaction with their previous job were more likely to experience career growth after an involuntary job loss than those who were more satisfied. Participation in the education and training programs is an indication of career growth. More participants than nonparticipants indicted dissatisfaction with their jobs at Anchor Hocking. This is consistent with the findings of Latack and Dozier.

Three skill levels were identified: skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled. Skilled jobs included supervisors, mold makers, machine operators, machine operator apprentices, foremen, and plant maintenance. Semiskilled jobs were burn-off operators, decorators, and lay-down machine operators. Unskilled jobs were material handlers, general labors, roller-porters, and packers.

In Matrix 9 it is shown that seven participants were skilled, two were semi-skilled, and three were unskilled. The nonparticipants included three skilled, two
Matrix 9
Distribution of Participants and Nonparticipants Regarding Skill Level at Anchor Hocking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill Level</th>
<th>Program Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonparticipants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

semiskilled, and four unskilled workers. Most of the participants were skilled while the largest group of nonparticipants was unskilled. These results are somewhat contradictory to those of other studies. Haber, Ferman, and Hudson (1963) found in the studies they reviewed that the skilled workers were likely to find employment more easily than the less skilled. It can be deduced from this that the more skilled workers would be less likely to enroll in training if they could find jobs. This concept was supported in the study by Boggs and Buss (1983) of Youngstown steel workers. In the studies reviewed by Haber, Ferman, and Hudson and the study conducted by Boggs and Buss there were no funded training programs available to the displaced workers. Workers wishing to pursue training in those situations were on their own.
In this study, the existence of funded training programs for the workers provided them with the means to pursue training. Most subjects did not feel there were very many employment opportunities in Lancaster and training became a means to expand the number of employment opportunities available to them. The more skilled subjects took advantage of the training programs more readily than the less skilled subjects. The jobs identified as skilled were obtained by promotion and selection, and usually included an apprenticeship program. Workers who wanted these jobs had to apply and were selected on the basis of their job performance. Workers who were motivated to seek promotions and training through apprenticeship may also have been motivated to seek retraining after being laid off. Workers who were not motivated to get promotions may also have been less motivated to seek retraining. Another factor is that unskilled subjects may have been less able, or have seen themselves as less able, and therefore did not pursue apprenticeships or the training programs.

In Matrix 10 another group of themes that helped to differentiate between participants and nonparticipants is shown. Most of the subjects felt that they were set for life and planned to eventually retire from Anchor Hocking. Only three subjects saw their employment at Anchor Hocking as temporary and did not plan to retire from there. These
Matrix 10
Distribution of Participants and Nonparticipants Regarding Retirement Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan To Retire From Anchor Hocking</th>
<th>Program Status</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonparticipants</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

were all participants. While this category does not represent a majority of participants it is important that only participants considered their employment with Anchor Hocking to be temporary.

The implications of these groups of themes is that the skilled subjects tended to participate in the JTPA-funded training programs more than the unskilled subjects. This may be related to motivation for advancement and/or general ability level. Also, all subjects who considered their employment with Anchor Hocking to be temporary were participants. Those who did not see Anchor Hocking as their final employer may have had plans that went beyond their employment at Anchor Hocking which would indicate a desire for additional training or education in order to initiate those plans.
Layoff Experiences

Several times during each interview the discussion was focused on the subjects' experiences, feelings, and attitudes regarding being laid off. The themes that emerged from these discussions were helpful in differentiating between participants and nonparticipants. Three sets of factors were particularly relevant: the plant in which the subject was employed and the date he was laid off; the subjects' attitudes toward being laid off; and whether or not any preparation was made for the layoff.

Date and plant of layoff. Plant #2 was closed in May, 1985. It was at that time that the JTPA and TRA sponsored training programs were put into operation. News of the programs was disseminated to the workers in plant #2 through supervisors and foremen, employee meetings, and union representatives. The programs were also publicized in the newspapers, through radio announcements, and on company bulletin boards.

The primary target for the programs at the beginning was the workers being laid off as a direct result of the plant closing, although eligibility included all workers laid off from any of the Anchor Hocking plants during the past several years. However, information about the training programs and eligibility requirements was transmitted less systematically to workers who were not in plant #2 at the time of the shutdown. One subject stated that he did
not think he was eligible for unemployment benefits or training because he was receiving retirement benefits. He stated:

I didn't think that with my retirement, that I was eligible for any other benefits, see? That wasn't explained to me.

He found out that he was eligible for training through a chance meeting with another laid-off worker.

Workers laid off prior to the shutdown in May, 1985, and workers employed at plant #1 often received incomplete, inaccurate, or no information about the programs. One result of this is that most of the participants in the sample were plant #2 employees who were laid off between May and September, 1985. Seven of the participants were laid off in May, 1985, one in August, 1985, three in September, 1985, and one in November, 1985. The nonparticipants, on the other hand, had layoff dates from March, 1984, to January, 1986. Those subjects laid off between May and September, 1985, from plant #2 were best informed about the training programs. Consequently, the largest group of participants is from this group.

Attitudes regarding the layoff. Attitudes of the subjects toward being laid off was an important factor in discriminating between participants and nonparticipants. While most of the participants had mixed emotions about losing their jobs, 9 had primarily positive outlooks
Matrix 11
Distribution of Participants and Nonparticipants Regarding Attitudes Toward Being Laid Off

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Toward Being Laid Off</th>
<th>Program Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonparticipants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

regarding the layoff and 2 were more negative. These factors are shown in Matrix 11. Some of the positive comments expressed by the participants are as follows:

Glad to be out of there away from the pressure and working conditions.

Its better this way, at least I get to go to school.

For me, its an opportunity to do what I always wanted to do.

Didn't want to leave but I have to make the best of it.

Have to find something to keep me going so I don't get depressed.

Learned from the layoff not to be so dependent on my employer.

Negative comments were more typical of the nonparticipants, only one of whom had a primarily positive attitude. Some of the negative attitudes expressed are:
Well I have been angry. . . . I used to really get depressed when I'd pass here and see the plant. . . . I know there's a lot of guys [who have been laid off who have] got a lot more years than I did, but it depresses you. When you come in this office, I mean it just starts working on you. Its just like when they first started that class [Outplacement Class]. . . they told you the stages you would go through. And I thought I already had all the bitterness out of me, but I get in there and I get to thinking, I get talking, and then I start getting bitter again.

That's the big thing, being laid off from Anchor Hocking. You don't know what to do. That's the main thing about being laid off from there, you just don't know what to do.

I heard there was going to be a cut. With my record, as long as I been there, I didn't think I'd go. I thought they'd get [rid of] a bunch of young foremen over there first. . . . I still don't see how they kept them young ones--they've been disciplined and everything else. . . . I got a perfect record and I got laid off. I mean, that didn't make sense.

Many of the subjects vented their anger and bitterness during the interviews. They complained about how the company treated employees, the lack of concern for individuals, and poor working conditions. These subjects were expressing their anger over losing their jobs. They had put up with company policies and working conditions for years. Complaining about them now was a way of expressing the anger they felt about being laid off.

Preparation for the layoff. The subjects' preparation for the layoff was closely associated with their attitudes toward being laid off. In Matrix 12 the distribution of participants and nonparticipants regarding their
### Matrix 12
Distribution of Participants and Nonparticipants Regarding Preparation for the Layoff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation For The Layoff</th>
<th>Program Status</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonparticipants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preparation for the layoff is displayed. Six subjects made preparations for the layoff, 5 participants and 1 nonparticipant. Fifteen subjects (8 nonparticipants and 7 participants) did not make any preparation for being laid off. Most of the subjects who made preparation for the layoff were participants while the majority of nonparticipants did not believe they were going to lose their jobs and did not make any preparations. Some of the comments made by subjects who did not prepare for the layoff are:

I didn't really believe plant #2 would be shut down, until the day they actually shut it down. I thought it was a big bluff by Anchor. Shows how much I know. But I really didn't believe it.

I thought they would shut it down a long time ago, and there was talk around the factory but nobody knew for sure until we got the letters. . . . [But I did not prepare for the layoff] because at the time I thought I would either get laid off and find another job or I'd get laid off and bump somebody else out of a job over at plant #1. I knew I had that option.
I didn't really feel that my job was really that much jeopardized. Being there in the furnace room and having the skill that I did. . . . [I didn't prepare for the layoff because] I didn't really feel there was anything I could do other than make adjustments in my budget. And I didn't feel it would be wise to do anything other than make those type of adjustments. Well, you know there's really no reason to jump ship when it's not going down yet.

Subjects who did make preparations for the layoff made comments such as:

We started saving all the extra money we could, paying the house off, getting the car paid off and by the time they shut her down, we had everything paid off.

I had applications out [before they closed plant #2] because . . . you didn't know if you was going to work one day or the other. You might be laid off one day and you might be called back in.

I had been with them [an insurance company] since November and Anchor closed plant #2 in May. You're supposed to start this insurance job on a part-time basis. . . . If everybody had done the things the way they were supposed to I would have made it, if the TRA had continued on.

These differences are further explored in Matrix 13 where preparation for the layoff and belief about losing one's job are compared to program participation. Five participants and only one nonparticipant who thought they would lose their job made any sort of preparation for being laid off. Most nonparticipants did not think they would lose their jobs and did not make any preparations for the layoff.
Matrix 13
Distribution of Participants and Nonparticipants Regarding Preparation for the Layoff and Belief About Losing Job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Status And Preparation For The Layoff</th>
<th>Belief About Losing Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thought Would Be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did Not Believe Would Be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laid Off Laid Off</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nonparticipants:
- Did Prepare 1 0
- Did Not Prepare 1 7

Participants:
- Did Prepare 5 0
- Did Not Prepare 1 6

These analyses led to several important findings. First, receiving accurate, complete, and timely information regarding the availability of and eligibility for training programs appears to be crucial to participation. Subjects who did not receive good information were less likely to participate. This point was also made by workers studied by Zahniser, Ashley, and Inks (1983). Those workers indicated that timely information about programs, presented in a positive way, was very important to getting workers to participate in training programs. Second, subjects who were future oriented, indicated by their willingness to accept the layoff, make preparations for it, and make plans for the future were more likely to participate. Third,
subjects who were most angry and bitter, indicating they had not yet reached the stage of acceptance, were less likely to participate. Attitudes toward being laid off and participation in the training programs appear to be associated with the stages of adaptation to involuntary job loss. Fourth, there was a reluctance to leave Anchor Hocking when there was still a hope for continued employment, even if it was on an intermittent basis. Workers in plant #1 where layoff was less certain were less likely to participate in the training programs.

**Personal and Family Factors**

**Family Factors**

One of the criteria for selecting subjects was that they have a family. This was to help insure that they reflected the national distribution of displaced workers. The effect of the layoff on the family was a topic discussed with the subjects. Several factors were identified that helped to differentiate between participants and nonparticipants. These were the presence of a second income in the family, the number of family members, and the noneconomic effects of the layoff on the family.

**Second income.** The presence of a second income in the family was not so much a catalyst to participation as the lack of a second income was a deterrent to participation. In Matrix 14 it is shown that participants were evenly
Matrix 14
Distribution of Participants and Nonparticipants Regarding a Second Income in the Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Income</th>
<th>Program Status</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonparticipants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

divided with six having a second income and six not. Six nonparticipants, however, had no second income while three had a second income. Several of the comments made by nonparticipants without a second income indicated that they did not feel that they could afford to attend school even with the paid tuition, mileage payments, extended unemployment benefits, and travel allowances. One subject stated:

I can't get from one day to the next just living. I just want to feed the kids, see them through school. Right now they're ready to take my house. . . . I don't want to go to school, I want a job.

Family size. Subjects' family size was determined by the number of people living with the subject (including the subject) and for whom the subject had financial responsibility. In Matrix 15 the range of family sizes is displayed. For a family size of one there were two
Matrix 15
Distribution of Participants and Nonparticipants Regarding Family Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number In The Family</th>
<th>Program Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonparticipants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

nonparticipants, for a family size of two there were two participants and one nonparticipant; for a family size of three there was one nonparticipant; for a family size of four there were five participants and two nonparticipants; for a family size of five there were four participants and two nonparticipants; and for a family size of seven there was one participant and one nonparticipant. The nonparticipants were spread out over the whole range of family sizes. Participants, on the other hand, were grouped primarily on the number of people living with the subject (including the subject) and for whom the subject had financial responsibility. In Matrix 15 the range of family sizes is displayed. For a family size of one there were two
When family size, second income, and program status are compared in Matrix 16, some interesting trends emerge. Of the 7 participants with family sizes of 4 or more, only 1 had a second incomes in his family. It appears as though the combination of a large family and no second income is not a deterrent to participation when the subject is motivated to do so. For the nonparticipants, however, four of the six with no second income had family sizes of four or more. These subjects often stated that they were unable to participate because of their financial condition. It may be that financial inability to participate is only one of the reasons for nonparticipation and provides a convenient and socially acceptable rationale for subjects who do not choose to participate.

Impact on families. All subjects reported negative financial impact on their families. The range of financial impact was from modest to severe with both participants and nonparticipants experiencing the full range of economic impact. Several of the subjects were involved in legal actions at the time of their interviews. Two had filed bankruptcy (one participant and one nonparticipant); one participant had lost his home through foreclosure; one nonparticipant was close to losing his home and had filed for Chapter 13; and one participant's wife lost her job 3 months after he did (she was not employed at Anchor Hocking) contributing to his dropping out of school. No
Matrix 16
Distribution of Participants and Nonparticipants
Regarding Family Size and Second Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Status and Second Income</th>
<th>Family Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonparticipants:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Income</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Second Income</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Income</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Second Income</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

systematic relationship between economic effect of the layoff and program status emerged.

The noneconomic effects of the layoff on the family members are reported in Matrix 17. Of the subjects reporting a positive effect on their family, five were participants and two were nonparticipants. Five participants and three nonparticipants reported no effect on their family or did not make pertinent responses. Two participants and four nonparticipants reported negative effects on their family. Some of the positive comments made included the following:

The family got closer together, all pulling for each other.

I had more time to spend with my family.
Matrix 17
Distribution of Participants and Nonparticipants Regarding Noneconomic Effects of the Layoff on the Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noneconomic Effects On The Family</th>
<th>Program Status</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonparticipants</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I found strength and comfort in religion which the family shared.

Some of the negative comments included:

I had less time to spend with family.

I need to reassess my family status and marriage along with work.

I got divorced because my wife didn't believe it was serious and wouldn't look for a job.

More of the positive comments about the effect of the layoff on their families were made by participants while more of the negative comments were made by nonparticipants. This appears to be related to the subject's attitudes toward the layoff.

Some interesting trends emerge when the themes comprising the subject's attitudes toward being laid off and
the noneconomic effect of the layoff on their families are compared with the subject's program status. These are reported in Matrix 18. All of the subjects reporting a positive attitude toward being laid off and positive effects on their families were program participants. Most of the nonparticipants (seven out of nine) reported negative attitudes toward being laid off and either neutral or negative effects of the layoff on their families (eight out of nine). It appears as though participants had, in general, more positive attitudes and experiences than did the nonparticipants.

**Future Orientation**

Two groups of themes regarding subjects' future orientation were closely associated with the decision to participate in the training programs. The distribution of these themes indicates that participation is associated with a future perspective and a sense of personal control over one's life.

Future perspective is defined as having thought about the future and having made some plans for the future as opposed to being past or present oriented. The three themes which emerged regarding subjects' degree of future planning are displayed in Matrix 19. At the lowest level were subjects who had never thought about their future and had made no plans. This level consisted of two
Matrix 18
Distribution of Participants and Nonparticipants Regarding Attitudes Toward Being Laid Off and Noneconomic Effects of the Layoff on the Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Status and Attitude Toward Being Laid Off</th>
<th>Noneconomic Effects of the Layoff on the Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonparticipants:</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Participants:                                    | Positive | Neutral | Negative |
| Positive                                         | 4        | 5       | 1        |
| Negative                                         | 1        | 0       | 1        |

Matrix 19
Distribution of Participants and Nonparticipants Regarding Future Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Orientation</th>
<th>Program Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonparticipants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Think About Future</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security Primary Future Concern</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plans For The Future</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
participants and one nonparticipant. Some of the comments representing this theme are as follows:

I had no idea of something really, I never thought about what I was going to do over the next 10 years.

I never thought I was going to live this long.

I haven't given it much thought.

I just take one day at a time.

One subject stated that his main goal in life was to be on an island in Canada, fishing. This kind of escapism indicated that he did not want to deal with the future. His position was more extreme than other subjects but demonstrates the lack of concern about the future that some subjects had.

The next level consisted of those who had given some thought to the future but had not made any concrete plans (five participants and seven nonparticipants). The level of planning for this group was typically expressed as a desire for a secure job and a steady income. They did not have specific goals or plans. Some of the comments made by these subjects are:

At that time I was concerned with getting that apprenticeship and doing the best I could at it so that maybe someday I'd get maybe a foreman's job or some kind of a job with a little bit of security.

I would say I've got about a 30 percent chance of having a job at Anchor, five years from now. . . . So I think, well, maybe I am going to have a
job. We've got several people who should retire this year.

I really don't know what I want to do with my life to tell you the truth. . . . Although anything that pays the bills and I can go and do a reasonable 8 hours work. . . . I'm not particular.

The common thread in these subject's responses was the need for security.

At the highest level were those subjects who expressed what Levinson (1978) referred to as a "dream" (five participants and one nonparticipant). Their plans frequently included owning a business. Four of them had actually started their businesses, one had substantial plans to do so in the future, and the last subject's dream centered around completing college.

As is shown in Matrix 20 subjects' belief that they had personal control over their own future also correlated with program participation. There were nine participants and three nonparticipants expressing the belief that they controlled their own future. Three participants and six nonparticipants stated that most, or all, of their future was determined by forces outside of their control. Subjects expressing the belief that they controlled their own future made comments such as:

I'm positive [I would find a job]. Its already mapped out. After I get out of here [school] I'll work for somebody for a couple of years and then in a few more years, I'll have my own business.
Matrix 20
Distribution of Participants and Nonparticipants Regarding Control of Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Of Future</th>
<th>Program Status</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonparticipants</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Control</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Controlled By Others</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since I started to school, I'm going to stick with it. Even if I get another job, I'll still work the job and still go to school.

Some of these subjects indicated that they would finish school even if they had to work and go to school at the same time. Some had plans to start a business on the side and build it into a full-time job. One subject had acquired auto body repair equipment over the years and had worked at that part time. He was enrolled in auto body repair in the JTPA training program. His plan was to eventually open his own business.

Subjects expressing a lack of control over their future made comments such as:

What I do depends on what Anchor Hocking does.

I don't know what is going to happen, I'll just take it one day at a time.
I always had this idea that whatever will be, will be. However it works out, that's the way it's supposed to work out. There's a guiding light you might say.

Subjects with a "dream" were almost all participants and the majority of those expressing the belief that they had personal control over their future were also participants. These data indicate that a future orientation appears to be associated with participation. This is consistent with the growth orientation of ideas of Boshier (1973, 1977). It is also consistent with other studies. Jones (1979), Schlossberg and Leibowitz (1980), Gordus (1981), Swineburne (1981), Schlossberg (1984), and Latack and Dozier (1985) all discussed the importance of the stages of adaptation to job loss and the worker's sense of personal control. Workers who are better able to cope with the stages of anger and frustration over their job loss are more likely to feel as though they have personal control over their future. These are more likely to be the active workers who develop new interests and are future oriented.

Willingness to relocate was associated with participation in the training programs. Eight participants and three nonparticipants expressed a willingness to relocate while six nonparticipants and four participants expressed a desire to stay in the Lancaster area. Participants were more willing to relocate while more nonparticipants desired to stay in the area.
Matrix 21
Distribution of Participants and Nonparticipants Regarding Willingness to Relocate and Control of Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Status and Willingness to Relocate</th>
<th>Control of Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonparticipants:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Relocate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocate</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Relocate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Willingness to relocate is compared to future orientation in Matrix 21. This resulted in some interesting trends. Of those subjects who expressed the belief that they had personal control over their future and a willingness to relocate, seven were participants and two were nonparticipants. Of those subjects who expressed the belief that their future was largely determined by others and who had a desire to stay in Lancaster, five were nonparticipants and one a participant. It appears that subjects who believe they control their own future are also willing to relocate and likely to be program participants. Subjects who believe they have less control over their
future are less willing to relocate and less likely to be program participants.

Training Program Factors

Factors Among Participants

The twelve program participants were enrolled in a variety of institutions and courses of study. Three were enrolled in 2-year community colleges; two for electronics and one for accounting. Four were enrolled in 2-year technical colleges; one for ceramic engineering, two for heating and air conditioning, and one for automobile mechanics. Three were enrolled in a joint vocational school, one for auto body repair (9 months), one for electricity (9 months), and one for carpentry (1 year). One was enrolled in a proprietary school for travel and tourism (9 months). One was enrolled in a special pilot program for entrepreneurship training (3 months).

These participants were queried on a number of issues related to their decisions to participate. The most important themes that emerged were those regarding motivation to participate, how the subjects selected their schools and areas of study, and their level of labor market knowledge.

Motivation for participation. An important group of themes for differentiating among the program participants was the subjects' motivation to participate. Three themes emerged regarding motivation to participate. First, the
primary motivation of three program participants centered around receiving program benefits. Comments from subjects in this theme included the following:

The TRA benefits convinced me to go to school.
This is my prime chance to have somebody else pay for it.

Second, there were four participants who saw enrolling in a training or education programs as their best option given the lack of jobs comparable to their previous employment at Anchor Hocking. Some comments of the subjects in this theme are as follows:

Going to school was my best option.
There's no jobs out there, the ones laid off before me couldn't find any, so the only thing to do is go back to school.
I don't have a job so why not [go to school].

Third, there were five participants who expressed the attitude that this was their opportunity to complete previous training, or pursue a program in which they had long term interests. Some of the subjects with these attitudes commented:

I wanted higher education ever since high school, my dad always said the higher the education, the better.
I planned on school all along.
I've tinkered with electronics for the past 10 years. I started school before they closed the plant and paid for the first term myself.

School-job decision process. Five themes emerged regarding the participants school-job decision making process. First, two participants went to work first (outside of Anchor Hocking) and later enrolled in school when those jobs did not turn out as well as they thought. One subject put in an application at a printing company. He had printing experience from a job he had with his father before he started to work at Anchor Hocking. The subject had stated earlier that he did not want to transfer to plant #1 because the only jobs they had for him were beneath his skill level. Regarding the printing job, he stated:

They called me and said that they had a job for a jogger. When I got there it was standing at the end of a printing press and stacking paper and that was the same thing I would have felt over at plant #1. There's all that machinery back there that I could run better than the next guy. And hiring me at minimum wage, they didn't tell me that when they hired me, they just said they had a job open for a jogger. That job lasted one day. I was up here at the office the next day for information about school.

He would have liked to work at the printing job but the cut in pay and status was too much for him. The other subject took a job at a gas station. He did not think he was eligible for training because he had collected his
retirement benefits. He learned from a co-worker who had stopped at the gas station that he was eligible. He inquired at the Resource Center and eventually enrolled in an Entrepreneurship Training program to help him get his photography business off the ground.

Second, two participants attempted to go to school and hold jobs (one at Anchor Hocking, one outside of Anchor Hocking). One subject was working part-time in insurance sales and attending Ohio University at Lancaster for the accounting program. The uncertainty of the TRA funding, the failure of his insurance job to pay off like he expected, and the fact that his wife lost her job all contributed to his eventually dropping out of school. The other subject tried to keep his job at Anchor Hocking and attend school at the same time. He found this difficult because of the time schedule, the driving distance, and the lack of support from foremen and supervisors at Anchor Hocking. He stated:

I figured I'd try to go back to school and work at the same time. Thought I might try to work and go up there [to school] at nights. But if it don't work out, I definitely will quit Anchor because I don't want to lose my schooling.

Third, one participant decided early to go to school but conducted an active job search before he actually started school. This subject had always been interested in school and had actually attended a local branch campus of a
college in the past. When he decided to return to school it was to resume his program in electronics at the branch campus. Because of his family responsibilities, however, he felt he had to make the effort to find a job before starting back to school. He stated:

When they announced the closing of the plant I told all my friends, first, I will try to spend my time [looking for a job], three months, I said exactly three months, I told everybody if I cannot find a job within three months, I will go back to school. That's what I did.

Fourth, six participants decided to attend school and made little or no effort to find other employment. These subjects did not seriously consider employment as an option. They possessed varying motivations for attending school. Some checked into schools before they were laid off and others after. School, however, was the only real option these subjects considered. Examples of their comments are as follows:

I wanted to go down and take the schooling before they'd even talked about laying off, but it didn't pertain to my job so they wouldn't have paid for it. So when they laid us off, I jumped on it. They were going to pay for it.

I knew when they got to me what I was going to do. In fact, I had even pestered my boss a time or two and said, when are you going to get me on that layoff list so I can get signed up for school?

In April I started checking out this schooling. Because I felt this is the only way I'm going to get away from this hassle anyhow because Anchor
was, in my mind, going to cut us way down to nothing, or very little.

When I started coming to these meetings [outplacement classes] and they told us that if we didn't bump over into plant #1 and we took our severance pay that we would have an opportunity given to us to go to school for up to two years and they would pay for it and give us our unemployment, of course, the wheels started turning in my head... this is my chance, this is my prime chance to have somebody else pay for it. I am laid off anyway, I don't have a job, so why not go ahead and do it.

Last, one participant started school on his own before he was laid off. This subject had been out of work for an extended period of time with a bad back. He returned to work at Anchor Hocking about one year before the plant closed. While he was off work he began thinking about school. He stated:

So I got to thinking about going back to school. And when they decided I could go back to work I just kind of put it on the back burner for awhile. And then about the time they decided they were going to shut down I decided that I'd try to go to school part-time.

He actually started school several months before he was laid off and he paid for the first term himself.

Selection of schools and areas of study. Three themes emerged regarding how the participants selected the schools they attended and their areas of study. The first two themes were descriptive of those who were undecided about their choice of schools and areas of study. First, two
participants displayed predominantly passive attitudes in the selection process. Their decisions were influenced very heavily by relatives and friends. One subject was influenced by his wife. She was also laid off from Anchor Hocking. They attended the Outplacement classes together. She had a clear idea of what she wanted but he floundered, considering a lot of options. He stated:

I think my wife probably helped me decide more than anybody, because she was real sure this was what she wanted to do and I was kind of torn between three or four different things and she helped me decide that maybe this would be the thing to get into.

The other subject had a brother and a sister who were also laid off from Anchor Hocking and opted to attend school. His choice of school was heavily influenced by them and his friends:

I talked to my assistant coaches and some parents [of children in his Little League team] . . . . and one guy, he works for the water works in Lancaster and one of my next door neighbors, she's a nurse . . . . So I guess that's another reason why I came to [this school].

Second, three participants did some research and comparing options. They displayed more activity and were more systematic than those in group 1. One subject checked into two schools, a vocational school and a two-year
technical college. He did not like the vocational school. He stated:

All you get is a piece of paper. You have the training but the piece of paper doesn't really mean that much because it's just a vocational school. They cannot certify you as a maintenance man or a welder or anything like that. That's what I was looking for--certification as a skilled laborer.

With further probing it became obvious that he did not have a clear idea of what he meant by certification. It was a matter of status; the technical college having more status in his mind than the vocational school. The other subject selected his school because it was the only one he knew which offered the course he wanted, auto mechanics. He did not spend time looking for other schools.

These subjects relied heavily on the Resource Center staff for information and direction. One stated:

When I was selecting my schools, I was still working and didn't have time to go to the individual schools so most of it was done through the Resource Center. The only thing that came close was down at Hocking Tech, and that was Heat Processing. I was all signed up to go down there until I heard about CTI. I got their booklet and I said, look, this is what I've been wanting, so I switched schools.

One undecided participant was quite systematic in his selection process. He reviewed programs, read literature, and talked with students, counselors, and employers. This subject stated:
I looked at DeVry, I looked at CTI, I looked down at Hocking Tech, and I came out here [Ohio University, Lancaster]. And I talked to several people that work in the electronics industry, technicians and what have you, engineers, and they all recommended a regular university over a tech school. I spent a day at DeVry, but didn't spend much time at CTI . . . looking everything over, and I came down here and looked everything over and looked at all the programs.

He is the only subject who actually visited more than one school and made an effort to gather data systematically to make his decision.

The third theme which emerged was comprised of those whose choice of school and area of study was based on previous attendance at the institution or long term interests in the area. This theme was descriptive of seven of the participants. One of these subjects selected his school because of previous attendance at the institution. He enrolled to complete a program he had begun several years earlier. Three enrolled in a vocational school. All three of these subjects had worked part-time in the fields they chose while they were employed at Anchor Hocking. They had been involved in those fields for a number of years and saw the schooling as an opportunity to get formal training. One of them stated:

I thought about it a lot [leaving Anchor Hocking]. Like I said, I had this insecurity of leaving because I didn't have my training in the
field of auto repair. I'm finding out now down here at school, really how, if I had felt secure, I could have made it. Its just learning on my own, and this down here just confirms and refines the things that I've always been doing in auto repair. Even though I know a lot, I'm still learning.

The other three subjects in this theme were enrolled in a technical college for auto mechanics, a community college for accounting, and an entrepreneurship training program.

Labor market knowledge. The participants displayed varying levels of sophistication in their understanding of the labor market. Levels of labor market knowledge were inferred from the subject's comments about job opportunities and the type of knowledge they had about the program in which they were enrolled. Subjects were not asked direct questions about their labor market knowledge. They were asked questions about what kind of job they thought they could get after completing their program, what their chances of getting that kind of job were, and what their sources of information were. Three levels of labor market knowledge were noted. At the lowest level, three participants indicated lack of concern or thought about the labor market. At best they possessed a superficial understanding of the labor market. One of theme stated:

Really haven't thought too much about that [getting a job]. It's going to be in the heating-air field, but I don't know.
Another replied that he wanted a job in cabinet making (he was enrolled in a carpentry program). When asked about his chances of getting that kind of a job he replied:

Not very good, unless I can get on at Riveria or something. I'd like to work privately with someone until I knew what I was doing, then start my own place.

These subjects had only a hazy notion of what they were going to do after school.

At the next level, five participants indicated some knowledge of the labor market based on review of newspaper ads, limited work experience in the field, and reports from school placement officials. One subject stated:

Well, according to the newspaper, I just go by the Dispatch, there's plenty of jobs for that position [electronics]. I mean there's not plenty, but plenty for a person to be able to get into.

In response to a question about his hopes of getting an electronics position after he completed his program he replied:

If I cannot find a job in electronics, let's say I take a different job, I can do that at home just like a hobby.

He had been watching the papers for jobs but did not have a clear idea about the kinds of positions for which the associate degree would qualify him.
The highest level was indicated by four participants who consulted labor market information such as the *Occupational Outlook Handbook* and had acquired in-depth personal knowledge of the occupation based on extensive work experience and/or interviewing people employed in the field. One subject who had experience in electronics stated:

My main ambition is service and repair, hopefully in commercial two-way gear.

He had knowledge of electronics and had talked with people working in the field regarding jobs. Another subject, in auto body repair, had worked part-time in that field for a number of years. He had job offers lined up from several sources. His ultimate goal was to open his own shop but he was debating the advantages of a steady income versus the freedom of his own shop. One subject had his own business going part-time in insurance. He saw the training program as a way to increase his related knowledge and a way to build credibility in the business. The last subject in this level had started his own photography business part-time. He enrolled in an entrepreneurship training program already aware of the problems and rewards of starting his own business.

These themes indicate several trends among the participants. First, the largest group of participants were enrolled in programs based on long standing interests in a
Matrix 22
Distribution of Participants Regarding Motivation to Participate and Selection of Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection Of Programs</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence By Relatives</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Research</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Attendance Or Long Term Interests</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

particular subject and attending school. Second, most of the subjects who wanted to enroll in programs did not consider other employment. Third, schools and areas of study were selected by most of the participants based on their areas of interest. Last, knowledge of the labor market varied with approximately equal numbers of participants in each of the three levels of labor market knowledge which emerged.

Interaction of themes. Comparing the themes which emerged from the participants led to a number of interesting trends. Motivation of the subjects to participate was compared to how they selected their schools and areas of study in Matrix 22. A correspondence between low levels of motivation and low levels of activity in selecting programs
was indicated when motivation to participate was compared to the methods of selecting schools and areas of study. The subjects who were motivated to participate by receipt of program benefits were the least active in selecting their programs. Participants whose motivation to participate was based on their belief that participation was their best option under the circumstances or had long term interests in school, were more likely to exercise more activity and self-direction in their selection of programs.

The way in which participants selected their schools and areas of study were also related to their prior participation in adult education. These patterns are displayed in Matrix 23 where it is indicated that selection of program was associated with interest in prior participation in adult education. Those who extended little effort in the selection process also were those who had not participated in prior adult education activities. Those who were more systematic in their method of selecting programs tended to have a record of prior participation in adult education. Subjects who selected their schools and areas of study based on long term interest, work experience, or prior enrollment in that area of study also tended to have participated in prior adult education activities. Those subjects who selected their schools and areas of study based on the influence of others or from a list of
Matrix 23
Distribution of Participants Regarding Selection of Programs and Interest in Prior Participation in Adult Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest in Prior Participation in Adult Education</th>
<th>Selection Of School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influence by Relatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Think About It</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considered But Did Not Enroll</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled But Did Not Complete</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled And Completed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

available options tended not to have prior experience in adult education.

In Matrix 24 it is demonstrated that selection of schools and areas of study were also related to the consistency of subjects' prior participation in adult education. Those who were labeled as persistent learners (demonstrating a consistent pattern of prior participation) tended to select their schools and areas of study based on their prior attendance at an institution or long term interests in an area of study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection Of School</th>
<th>Consistency Of Prior Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence By Relatives</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Research</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Attendance Or Long Term Interests</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Matrix 25 motivation to participate in the training programs was compared with consistency of prior participation in adult education. Those who were intermittent learners or did not engage in prior adult education tended to participate because of program benefits or because they saw the programs as their best available option given the local labor market. Those who were persistent learners tended to participate because of long term interests in doing so.

While most of the subjects planned to retire from Anchor Hocking, the retirement plans of the program participants were related to their motivation to participate in the training program (Matrix 26). Those participants who
Matrix 25
Distribution of Participants Regarding Motivation to Participate and Consistency of Prior Participation in Adult Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Consistency Of Prior Participation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persistent</td>
<td>Intermittent</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Benefits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Option</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Interest</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Matrix 26
Distribution of Participants Regarding Motivation to Participate and Retirement Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Plan To Retire From Anchor Hocking</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Benefits</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Option</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Interest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
indicated they did not expect to retire from Anchor Hocking expressed long term interests in school and enrolling in the program as their best option as the primary basis of their motivation. None of the participants who had plans of leaving Anchor Hocking before retirement reported that program benefits were their primary motivation for enrollment.

Motivation to participate was also related to whether participants thought they would lose their jobs and whether or not they made any preparations for the layoff (Matrix 27). Of the six participants who thought they would lose their jobs prior to actually being laid off, four stated long term interest as the basis for their motivation to participate. Of those four, three had made some sort of preparation for the layoff. Of the six program participants who did not believe they would lose their job, two stated the program benefits were their primary reason for enrolling, and three felt it was their best option under the circumstances.

There was a slight relationship between motivation to participate and labor market knowledge (Matrix 28). Those subjects expressing program benefits as their primary motivation to participate had low and medium levels of labor market knowledge. Subjects stating that participation in the program was their best option tended to have all three levels of labor market knowledge. Subjects
Matrix 27
Distribution of Participants Regarding Motivation to Participate, Belief About Losing Job, and Preparation for the Layoff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief About Losing Job and Preparation For the Layoff</th>
<th>Motivation to Participate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believed Would Lose Job:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Prepare</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Prepare</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Believe Would Lose Job:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Prepare</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Prepare</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Matrix 28
Distribution of Participants Regarding Motivation to Participate and Labor Market Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Labor Market Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Benefits</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Option</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Interest</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
expressing long-term interest as their primary motivation to participate, however, had medium and high levels of labor market knowledge. Higher levels of labor market knowledge are associated with long-term interest in training, while lower levels of labor market knowledge are associated with desire for program benefits.

It is interesting to note that the type of motivation exhibited by the training program participants was not associated with a number of other factors. These are the presence of a second income in the family, the family size, and the school-job decision process. Training program participants who exhibited all three types of motivations were found with varying family sizes. Also, the presence of a second income in the family was not associated with type of motivation. Program participants with and without additional source of income were found to exhibit all three types of motivation. Type of motivation was also not associated with the school-job decision process. Those program participants who had a long term interest in attending school as their primary motivation were found to have engaged in all of the school-job decision processes.

Factors that were associated with motivation to participate were methods of selecting schools and areas of study, prior participation in adult education, and labor market knowledge. Participants who had low levels of motivation to participate tended to be undecided about
their choice of school and area of study and tended to expend less energy in selecting schools and areas of study. Subjects with higher levels of motivation who were undecided about schools and areas of study tended to expend greater energy in the selection process. Most subjects with higher levels of motivation tended to have been decided about their schools and areas of study based on long term interests and/or prior education or work experience in the field. Subjects who had participated in prior adult education activities tended to select their schools based on their areas of study and select their areas of study based on long term interests. Subjects who were persistent learners also tended to select schools based on their areas of study and select areas of study based on long term interests. Subjects who were intermittent learners or had no prior adult education experience tended to exercise less activity and control in selecting their schools and areas of study. Subjects motivated to participate because of program benefits and the perceived lack of other options tended to be intermittent learners or not have engaged in prior adult education activities. Those whose motivation to participate was based on long term interests tended to be persistent learners. Subjects who felt they would leave Anchor Hocking before retirement were motivated to participate based on long term interests or they saw enrollment in the program as their best option. Participants who thought
they would lose their jobs before they were laid off and made some type of preparation for the layoff tended to have long term interests as their primary motivation for participation while subjects who did not think they would lose their jobs tended to state that the program benefits and lack of other options were their primary motivation to participate. Finally, higher levels of labor market knowledge were associated with higher levels of motivation and lower levels of labor market knowledge were associated with lower levels of motivation to participate in the training programs.

Outplacement Classes

Outplacement classes were offered to the employees during the summer of 1985. Response to the classes was not very high and after several sessions they were discontinued. The classes met for four hours once a week for six weeks. Some of the major topics covered in the classes were the reasons for the plant closure, personal reaction to job loss, resume writing, interviewing, job search techniques, transferable skills, and training program options. Of the subjects interviewed, seven participated in the outplacement classes (five training program participants and two nonparticipants). Fourteen subjects did not participate (seven training program participants and seven nonparticipants). Uneven participation in the outplacement
classes was due, in part, to the varying layoff dates of the subjects. Subjects employed at plant #2 who bumped into plant #1 and subjects employed in plant #1 who were laid off after August, 1985 did not have the opportunity to enroll in the outplacement classes. The reasons subjects gave for not participating in the outplacement classes are that they were not laid off at the time the classes were offered, they did not know about them, they did not think they were eligible for them, or they were working at other jobs.

A number of analyses were conducted to determine the effects of participation in the outplacement classes. In one analysis participation in the outplacement classes was compared to training program participants' level of labor market knowledge. The subjects who attended the outplacement classes exhibited all three levels of labor market knowledge. Three exhibited high levels of labor market knowledge, two exhibited moderate levels, and two exhibited low levels of labor market knowledge. Of the training program participants who attended the outplacement classes, one exhibited a high level of labor market knowledge, three exhibited moderate levels, and one exhibited a low level of labor market knowledge.

The school-job decision process was also compared to attendance in the outplacement classes. No clear patterns emerged from this analysis. Those who attended the
outplacement classes were found in four of the five categories of the school-job decision process. Those who did not attend the outplacement classes were in three of the five school-job decision process categories. Most of the training program participants who did not attend the outplacement classes decided to go to school soon after they had been laid off and did not consider looking for a job. It may be that once they decided to enroll in school they felt no need to attend the outplacement classes.

Participation in the outplacement classes was also compared with the method of selecting schools and areas of study. Training program participants in the outplacement classes indicated they selected their schools and areas of study either under the influence of friends and relatives or based on long term interests. Those training program participants not attending the outplacement classes selected their schools and areas of study based on some research, or long term interests. Participation in the outplacement classes did not appear to greatly influence the method of selecting schools and areas of study. Most of the training program participants selected their schools and areas of study based on long term interest. This was true whether they participated in the outplacement classes or not.

No clear trends emerged regarding participation in the outplacement classes for the training program participants.
Participation in the outplacement classes did not appear to affect the level of labor market knowledge, the school-job decision process, or the method of selecting a school or area of study. Also, participation in the outplacement classes was not related to motivation to participate in the training program.

**Nonparticipation Factors**

The subjects who chose not to participate in the training programs gave a variety of reasons for not doing so. All of the nonparticipants at one time or another had contact with the Resource Center regarding the training programs but for a variety of reasons did not enroll in the training programs. All of the nonparticipants also expressed more than one reason for not participating. Two methods were used to derive a primary reason for nonparticipation. In some cases the subjects were able to identify a primary reason for nonparticipation. In other cases, the primary reason was inferred from their comments in the interview.

Four themes emerged regarding the primary reasons for nonparticipation. The first theme was lack of education, preparation, or self-confidence to enroll in training. Two subjects were in this category. Some of the comments made by these subjects are as follows:
I'm ashamed I'm not a good reader.
I can't get up in front of people.
I don't have the skill to go into training.
I'm not a brain for learning.

Second, there were four nonparticipants who did not want to leave Anchor Hocking for training even when they were only working intermittently. Comments made by these subjects are as follows:

I won't give up a job for school.
I want school but I can't take the risk with my family.
I can't leave Anchor Hocking and lose my retirement, pay, and benefits.
I'm afraid to take the step.
I don't want to go to school, I want a job.

Third, two subjects stated they wanted training but just could not afford it even with the JTPA and TRA funding available. One was still employed intermittently at Anchor Hocking and had a large family that he felt he could not support on the living allowance. The other subject was interested in school but was in debt with a new business he had started and could not afford the additional expenses of going to school.

Last, one subject stated his primary reason for not attending school was that he could not work out the
Matrix 29
Distribution of Nonparticipants Regarding Reasons for Nonparticipation and Family Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons For Nonparticipation</th>
<th>Family Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Education</td>
<td>1 0 0 1 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afraid to Leave Anchor Hocking</td>
<td>0 0 1 1 2 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Reasons</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistical Problems</td>
<td>0 1 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

logistics. His wife was employed at Anchor Hocking, working rotating shifts. She could not drive due to a medical condition and he could not work out his schedule to drive her to work and attend school.

Several matrices were developed for the nonparticipant data. Reasons for nonparticipation were compared with family size, second income, skill level, and prior participation in adult education.

When reasons for nonparticipation were compared to the subject's family size (Matrix 29) it became apparent that those who were afraid to leave Anchor Hocking all had children. One had one child, one had two children, and two had three children. In Matrix 30 it is shown that only
Matrix 30
Distribution of Nonparticipants Regarding Reasons for Nonparticipation and Second Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons For Nonparticipation</th>
<th>Second Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack Of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afraid To Leave Anchor Hocking</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Problems</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistical Problems</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two of the nonparticipants had second incomes. All of the nonparticipants who did not want to leave Anchor Hocking did not have second incomes. Skill level also corresponded to reason for nonparticipation (Matrix 31). Most of those who did not want to leave Anchor Hocking were unskilled (one was semi-skilled). Consistency of prior participation in adult education was related to reasons for nonparticipation as well (Matrix 32). Those who did not want to leave Anchor Hocking tended to have no history of prior participation in adult education.

While the number of nonparticipants was small and four different primary reasons for nonparticipation were reported. It was possible to identify a number of trends
Matrix 31
Distribution of Nonparticipants Regarding Reasons for Nonparticipation and Skill Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons For Nonparticipation</th>
<th>Skill Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack Of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afraid To Leave Anchor Hocking</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Problems</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistical Problems</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Matrix 32
Distribution of Nonparticipants Regarding Reasons for Nonparticipation and Consistency of Prior Participation in Adult Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons For Nonparticipation</th>
<th>Consistency Of Prior Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intermittent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack Of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afraid To Leave Anchor Hocking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Problems</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistical Problems</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
from the data. Those nonparticipants who did not want to leave Anchor Hocking tended to have children, no second income in the family, be unskilled, and not have a history of prior participation in adult education.

Summary of the Analysis of Themes

The findings of the analysis of themes can be summarized under several headings: factors not differentiating between participants and nonparticipants, differences between participants and nonparticipants, differences among participants, differences among nonparticipants, and other findings.

Factors Not Differentiating Between Participants and Nonparticipants

Listed below are the factors which did not differentiate between participants in the JTPA funded education and training programs and nonparticipants. These themes and factors were explored because it appeared that they might yield differences between the two groups.

1. Both participants and nonparticipants were enrolled in prior adult education activities.

2. Both participants and nonparticipants expressed positive and negative attitudes toward high school.

3. Both participants and nonparticipants were enrolled in college preparatory and general courses in high school.
4. The educational level of parents and siblings was diverse for both participants and nonparticipants.
5. Both participants and nonparticipants were enrolled in Outplacement Classes.
6. Both participants and nonparticipants had work experience outside of the company.
7. Both participants and nonparticipants had similar reasons for starting to work at the company, attitudes toward the company, and attitudes toward Impact.
8. Both participants and nonparticipants had a variety of family sizes.
9. All subjects experienced negative economic impact from being laid off.
10. Both participants and nonparticipants had high, medium, and low levels of labor market knowledge.

Differences Between Participants and Nonparticipants

Many differences between participants and nonparticipants emerged from the study. These differences are derived from comparing program status with the themes which emerged from the data.
1. Of the subjects who enrolled in prior adult education activities, participants were more likely to have completed than nonparticipants.
2. Participants were more likely to have enrolled in
prior adult educational activities for college, vocational courses, correspondence courses, and workshops, and engaged in significant self-learning projects.
3. Nonparticipants were more likely to have enrolled in GED classes.
4. Participants engaged in prior learning activities more consistently than nonparticipants.
5. Most of the subjects who wanted to continue their education after high school were participants.
6. Participants were more likely than nonparticipants to have had vocational/industrial arts courses in high school.
7. Participants reported more positive attitudes about the value of education in general.
8. Participants had more positive attitudes about the value of the training programs than nonparticipants.
9. Skilled workers were more likely to participate than semiskilled or unskilled.
10. The workers who planned to leave the company before retiring were more likely to participate than those who planned to retire from the company.
11. Participants tended to have more positive attitudes about being laid off and tended to have made more preparations for the layoff than nonparticipants.
12. Subjects who had less accurate and less timely
information about the education and training programs were less likely to participate.
13. Subjects who had the possibility of employment with the company in the future, even if it was part time or intermittent, were less likely to participate.
14. Participants reported more positive noneconomic impact of the layoff on their family relationships.
15. Participants were more likely to have a future orientation (versus a present or past orientation) and were more likely to have formed a dream in their lives.
16. Participants were more likely to believe they controlled their own future while nonparticipants were more likely to believe their future was controlled by forces outside of their control.
17. Participants were more willing to relocate.

**Differences Among Participants**

The differences among program participants were derived from contrasting the various themes relevant to participation among the participants. The most significant differences among participants were motivation to participate, the school-job decision process, how schools and areas of study were selected, and labor market knowledge. Motivation to participate was a key factor in the differences among participants. Among all of the subjects, those with growth motivations to learn, as described by Boshier
(1973, 1977), were more likely to be participants in the training programs than the subjects with deficiency motivations for learning. Among the participants in the training programs, varying levels of motivation were noted. The participants who exhibited higher levels of motivation (growth orientation) tended to be more active, more decisive, and more successful. The participants with lower levels of motivation (deficiency orientation) were less active, less decisive, and less successful.

1. Three types of motivation for attending the training programs were reported: 1) desire for program benefits; 2) participation was the best option under the circumstances; and 3) long term interest in attending school. Most participants were in level 3, long term interest in attending school as their primary motivation for enrolling.

2. Five patterns regarding the school-job decision process were reported: 1) go to school if cannot find a job; 2) try to go to school and work at the same time; 3) want to go to school but feel they must look for a job first; 4) go to school and not look for a job; and 5) start school before laid off. Most participants were in category 4.

3. Three themes regarding the method of selecting schools and areas of study were found: 1) influenced by friends and relatives; 2) some research; and 3) decision based on prior attendance or long term interests. Most participants
selected their schools and areas of study based on prior attendance or long term interests.

4. Three levels of labor market knowledge were reported: low, medium, and high. Subjects whose motivation to participate was based on program benefits (level 1) had low and medium levels of labor market knowledge. Subjects whose motivation to participate was based on long-term interest in school (level 3) had medium and high levels of labor market knowledge.

5. Subjects whose motivation to participate was based on program benefits (level 1) and best option (level 2) tended to expend less energy in the process of selecting their schools and areas of study.

6. Subjects who were undecided and whose motivation to participate was based on long term interests (level 3) tended to expend more energy in selecting their schools and areas of study.

7. Most participants whose motivation to participate was based on long term interests (level 3) were decided about their schools and areas of study based on prior attendance and long term interests.

8. Participants who had prior participation in adult education activities tended to decide on their schools and areas of study based on prior attendance or long term interests.
9. Participants who had consistent prior participation in adult education activities tended to select their schools and areas of study based on prior attendance and long term interest.

10. Participants who had intermittent or no prior participation in adult education activities tended to expend less energy in selecting their schools and areas of study.

11. Subjects whose motivation to participate was based on program benefits (level 1) and best option (level 2) tended to have intermittent or no prior participation in adult education while those whose motivation to participate was based on long term interests (level 3) tended to be consistent learners.

12. Participants who did not plan to retire from the company had motivations to participate based on best option (level 2) and long term interests (level 3).

13. Participants who thought they would lose their jobs and made some preparations for the layoff had motivations to participate based on long term interests (level 3) while participants who did not think they would lose their jobs and/or did not make any preparations for the layoff tended to have motivations to participate based on program benefits (level 1) and best option (level 2).

14. Subjects whose motivation to participate was based on participation being their best option (level 2) or on long
term interests (level 3), tended to have more labor market knowledge.

**Differences Among Nonparticipants**

Nonparticipants expressed a variety of attitudes regarding the training programs and reasons for nonparticipation. All of the nonparticipants had expressed interest in training at some time.

1. Although family size did not differentiate between participants and nonparticipants it was used as a reason for nonparticipation.

2. Four primary reasons for nonparticipation emerged from comments of the nonparticipants: (1) lack of education and preparation for school, (2) afraid to leave the company, (3) lack of money, and (4) logistical problems such as transportation. Most nonparticipants were afraid to leave the company.

3. Of the nonparticipants who were afraid to leave the company most had larger families, no second income, were unskilled, and had no history of prior participation in adult education activities.

**Other Findings**

These are findings which emerged during the data analysis which did not differentiate between participants and nonparticipants but served to provide a general
description of the family and educational background of the subjects.
1. Subjects whose parents and siblings did not finish high school did not tend to finish high school.
2. Subjects who reported having had difficulty in high school tended not to have any definite plans for after high school.
3. Half of the subjects reported having had difficulty in or not liking high school.
4. Subjects who planned for more education after high school had positive feelings about high school.
5. College preparatory students tended to have plans for more education after high school.
6. General education students tended to have no definite plans for after high school.

Discussion of Findings

Many factors affecting participation emerged from this study of displaced workers. The primary factors appeared to be the subjects' prior involvement in education, their reactions to the plant closure, support received from their families, and their ability to plan for the future.

Attitudes toward the value of education in general and the value of participation in the training programs differed for participants and nonparticipants. Participants, in general, tended to have more positive attitudes
regarding the value of education and the training programs. Boshier (1973, 1977) stated that a growth orientation toward education would result in consistent participation in adult education over the life-span. This concept is supported for the sample in this study. There was a pattern among some subjects of positive attitudes toward education traceable to their high school days. These subjects tended to view their high school experiences as more positive, have had plans for more education after high school, and have participated in prior adult education activities more consistently than other subjects. Their positive attitudes toward education were demonstrated in their participation in prior adult education and the JTPA training programs.

Attitudes regarding the plant closure varied considerably among the subjects. Some saw it as an opportunity and some saw it as a burden. Most subjects did not want to lose their jobs. They were forced into a situationally-determined career change. Some subjects were, however, able to exercise more control over their situations than others. They moved from situationally-determined career changes to self-directed accommodation career changes. The career change was thrust upon them and not of their choosing, but once faced with it they attempted to make the best of the situation. They tended to make some preparation for the layoff. These subjects experienced anger and
depression from the job loss las did the less active subjects, but were able to cope with these feelings more effectively than subjects who did not have a clear direction.

Another major difference between participants and nonparticipants appeared in the subjects' attitudes regarding the experience of their families during the plant closure. Some subjects appeared to draw more support and encouragement from their families than others. These subjects experienced the same degree of financial hardship as the others but viewed the impact of the hardship on their families as less severe. They tended to express a more positive outlook about the impact of the job loss on their families. They also appeared to be less threatened by the shifting roles in the family which resulted from the loss of their jobs. Some of these subjects had dual career marriages and, as a result, perhaps, did not feel as great of a loss of status or position in their family as others.

The most important differences between participants and nonparticipants were in their future orientations, beliefs about the control they exercised over their lives, and the formation of a dream in their lives. Participants tended to be more future oriented, believed they had more personal control in their lives, and had formed, or were forming, a dream in their lives. These attitudes were affected by previous successes in life and, in turn,
contributed to their continuing optimism and success. One subject described these differences by stating:

I feel like there's a lot of people who are the doers. They're going to make out anyway. I think I'm in that category. And there are the ones who are never going to make it anyway, unless something falls in their lap. They're the ones who are going to suffer the most. But there are the people in the middle that need something to help them out.

The ability to maintain a positive outlook in the face of adversity appeared to be crucial to the subject's ability to plan for the future.

Subjects' abilities to plan for the future were affected by many other factors. A future orientation implies successful negotiation of the stages of adaptation to involuntary job loss. It also implies the ability to use time effectively. Maintenance of at least a moderate degree of self-esteem is also implied. The ability to break ties with Anchor Hocking and develop new interests and abilities is affected by these factors and in turn contributes to subjects' abilities to plan for the future. Maximizing behavior and self-directed accommodation career change are concepts which characterize subjects with a future orientation.

These factors, attitudes toward and involvement in education, reaction to the layoff, family support, and future orientation, were critical factors in determining
adjustment to the plant closure and participation in the training programs. These factors not only differentiated between participants and nonparticipants but also helped to differentiate among participants in the training programs as well. Not all of the participants were "the doers" described in the comment above. Some were less future oriented. Participants who had a future orientation, however, tended to have had long term interests in school, have selected their schools and areas of study based on those long term interests, had greater labor market knowledge, had participated in prior adult education more consistently, had reacted less negatively to the plant closure, had made some plans for the layoff, and had experienced less negative impact of the layoff on their families. The implication is that the optimistic attitudes and future orientations of these subjects affected all areas of their lives.

The differences between participants and nonparticipants was also reflected in the differences among the nonparticipants. Most of the nonparticipants in this study maintained ties, although for the most part very tenuous ties, with the company. Many nonparticipants were afraid to sever those ties. Their behavior appeared to be based on a desire to maintain the past and present rather than face an uncertain future. Perhaps, they did not see the risk of maintaining part time employment with an ailing
company as great as the risk of leaving that company to face the unknown.
CHAPTER V: SUMMARY OF STUDY AND IMPLICATIONS FOR HELPING DISPLACED WORKERS

Problem

The purpose of this study was to identify the factors affecting displaced workers' participation in education and training programs from the displaced workers' point of view. Most studies of displaced workers have investigated the general impact of unemployment on the lives, families, and communities of displaced workers. Few studies have focused specifically on the issues related to the retraining of displaced workers. The studies that have focused on retraining have been quantitative and have mainly reported demographic characteristics of the displaced workers. This study fills the need for a more in-depth analysis that reports the factors affecting participation in education and training programs from the displaced workers' perspective.

The findings of this study can help those offering services to displaced workers in several ways. First, planners of displaced worker programs can use the findings to help determine the services that are needed. Second, the findings of the study can help those responsible for developing materials and strategies for marketing displaced
worker programs. Third, counselors and others working directly with displaced workers can use the findings to help improve their services.

Subjects and Setting

The subjects were employed in a glass factory in southeastern Ohio. The company had two production facilities, but closed the smaller facility in May, 1985. This resulted in over 500 workers being laid off. In this study 21 of these workers were interviewed.

The subjects had been employed at the company an average of 12 years. The criteria for selecting subjects were male, blue-collar workers, 20 to 50 years old, and with families. The subjects averaged 35 years old. The subjects had been employed in both production plants. Some lost their jobs as a direct result of the plant closure. Others lost their jobs as a result of the bumping procedures.

Several program were made available to the laid-off workers. The primary programs were outplacement classes, a job club, relocation assistance, and retraining. These programs were administered through the Resource Center, the local administrative office for the Private Industries Council. Funding for the programs was provided through the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA).
Methodology

This study is based on qualitative data-gathering and analysis techniques. The primary method of data collection was semi-structured interviews. The content of the interviews was determined by a review of the literature, the subjects themselves, and from input of the personnel at the Resource Center.

The initial interviews were conducted during the winter of 1986. Follow-up interviews were conducted in August, 1986. Each initial interview lasted approximately 1 hour, was tape recorded, and was conducted at the Resource Center, the subjects' home, or the public library. Each subject determined the location of the interview. The follow-up interviews were conducted by telephone approximately 6 months after the initial interviews.

Data analysis was conducted in several stages. Transcripts of the interviews were reviewed and coded. The codes were developed heuristically. Each code was divided into themes. The themes were contrasted and compared with each other in matrices.

The data are reported in two ways. First, selected case studies of the subjects are reported. The case studies contain information about the subjects' education and work history, their families, and their future plans and ambitions. They provide thick descriptions of the subjects to aid those wishing to apply the findings of the
study to other subjects and settings. The case studies provide background for understanding the analysis of themes. They also provide a method for viewing the situations of the subjects from their points of view. They also can aid practitioners in developing strategies and techniques to help displaced workers.

The second method of reporting data is through comparing and contrasting the themes among all of the subjects. The findings of the cross-subject data analysis are reported in several sections. Each section contains definitions of the relevant themes, supporting data from the transcripts for the themes, matrices in which the themes are contrasted and compared, and the conclusions which can be drawn from the process.

Findings

The findings are reported in several sections: factors that do not differentiate between participants and nonparticipants, differences between participants and nonparticipants, differences among participants, and differences among nonparticipants, and major findings.

The findings of this study are derived from the analysis of themes. The themes emerged from the attitudes, beliefs, and behavior of the 21 subjects. The researcher was concerned with the issues of truth value, neutrality, consistency, and applicability for this study. The truth
value was established by using several strategies. These were establishing rapport with the subjects, self-monitoring by the researcher, member checks with the subjects, authority checks with the Resource Center staff, and comparison of the findings of the study with the literature. Neutrality was maintained through self-monitoring and comparison of the findings of the study with the literature. Consistency was demonstrated through an audit of the research process and findings. Applicability of the findings of this study to other situations is the responsibility of the reader. The researcher provided thick descriptions of the subjects, detailed descriptions of the setting, and a thorough description of the data collection and analysis procedures to assist the reader in determining the applicability of the findings of this study to other situations.

Factors not Differentiating Between Participants and Nonparticipants

Of the many themes which emerged from the study there were several that did not differentiate between participants and nonparticipants. These are a) enrollment in (but not completion of) prior adult education activities; b) attitudes toward high school; c) enrollment in college preparatory or general courses in high school; d) educational level of siblings and parents; e) enrollment in
outplacement classes; f) type or length of work experience outside of the company; g) attitudes toward the company; h) attitudes toward company cost cutting measures; i) sizes of the subjects' families (spouses and children); j) economic impact of being laid off; and k) degree of labor market knowledge. These factors were distributed among all of the subjects. It was not possible to use these factors to distinguish between participants and nonparticipants. There were no clear trends in the data regarding these factors.

Factors Differentiating Between Participants and Nonparticipants

Several factors that differentiated between participants and nonparticipants emerged from the study. These are categorized as education factors, work and layoff factors, and personal factors.

In general participants were more likely to have completed prior adult education activities; enrolled in prior adult education for college, vocational courses, correspondence courses, and workshops; engaged in prior adult education more consistently; desired to continue their education after high school; and had vocational courses in high school. Participants in the education and training programs tended to have more positive attitudes about the value of education in general and the JTPA
training programs in particular. Nonparticipants, on the other hand, were more likely to have previously enrolled in GED classes, have had more negative attitudes about the value of education in general, and have received less accurate and timely information about the education and training programs.

The major findings that differentiated between participants and nonparticipants related to work and layoff factors are as follows. In general, participants were more likely to have been skilled workers; had more positive attitudes about being laid off; made preparations for the layoff; and experienced a more positive noneconomic impact on their family from the layoff.

The personal factors that differentiated between participants and nonparticipants were that the participants were more likely to have a future orientation; have formed a dream in their life; and were more willing to relocate.

**Differences Among Participants**

Several groups of themes proved important in differentiating among the program participants. These were motivation to participate, the process of deciding about going to school or getting a job, and the process of selecting a school and an area of study. Three levels of motivation to participate were observed; at level 1, the participants wanted the program benefits; at level 2, participants
believed that participation was the best option under the circumstances; and at level 3, participants had a long-term interest in attending school.

Five patterns regarding the subjects' decision-making processes about looking for work and enrolling in school were observed. First, some subjects decided to go to school only if they could not find a job. Second, several subjects wanted to try to go to school and work at the same time. Third, one subject wanted to go to school but felt he must look for a job before he could make that commitment. Fourth, most participants decided to go to school and not look for a job. Fifth, one subject enrolled in school before he was laid off.

Three themes regarding the ways schools and areas of study were selected emerged from the study; participants were influenced by friends and relatives; had done some research; and based their decision on prior attendance or long-term interests.

The level of motivation to participate in the education and training programs was related to a variety of factors. Those with higher levels of motivation who were undecided tended to expend more energy in selecting their schools and areas of study than those with lower levels of motivation. Those with higher levels of motivation also tended to have enrolled more consistently in prior adult education activities.
Prior adult education experience also affected program participant behavior. Program participants with prior adult education experience tended to be more decided about their schools and areas of study and tended to select them based on established, long-term interests. Program participants who had less experience in prior adult education activities tended to expend less energy in selecting their areas of study and school.

Differences Among Nonparticipants

Subjects who did not participate in the education and training programs gave a number of reasons for not participating. Those reasons were grouped into four categories: lack of preparation for school; fear of leaving the company; financial reasons; and logistical problems. Most of the nonparticipants were afraid to leave the company. They had larger families, no second incomes, were unskilled, and had limited prior experience in adult education.

Major Findings

The most important concepts which emerged from this study are the involvement of the subjects in education, their attitudes regarding the layoff, their family support, and their outlook on the future. For the most part, participants had more positive attitudes regarding the value of education than nonparticipants. They also were more
consistently involved in it. Participants also reported more positive family support and reactions to the layoff. While all subjects suffered some degree of financial hardship, it affected the families differently. Positive family support was a valuable factor in helping some subjects make a successful transition.

Attitudes regarding the layoff were closely associated with attitudes toward the future and personal control. These were the most important findings of the study. Participants tended to have more of a future orientation than nonparticipants. They also tended to believe that they had more personal control over their lives than nonparticipants. These attitudes were related to their abilities to recover from the job loss. They were able to negotiate the stages of adaptation to involuntary job loss and use their time after the job loss more effectively than nonparticipants. The formation of a dream, a vision of themselves in the future, was an important element in their future orientation. Not all subjects with a future orientation had developed a dream, but some had and others were beginning to develop a dream.

Implications for Helping Displaced Workers

Following are the implications derived from this study for helping displaced workers. The first section outlines the bases for the implications. These are derived from
this and other studies reported in the literature review. In the second and third sections the implications of the findings of this study for helping displaced workers are outlined. The implications are organized into two parts: implications for program planning and implications for counseling displaced workers.

**Bases For Implications**

There are a number of bases for the implications for practitioners outlined in this dissertation. These bases are derived from this and other studies reported in the literature review. They serve to describe displaced workers, their needs, and the trends to which they are subject.

According to Gordus (1986), the number of displaced workers will continue to grow as the economy continues to shift from a manufacturing base to a service and information base. One result is that the need for retraining will increase as more workers are displaced from manufacturing jobs and other sectors of the economy that are dependent upon manufacturing industries. Replacement jobs will require more training and education for starting positions.

According to Zahniser, Ashley, and Inks (1983), the most immediate problems faced by displaced workers are financial. Most displaced workers have family responsibilities, own their own homes, and have other major financial
responsibilities. The sudden loss of their major source of income can be traumatic. This may pose a major problem for some displaced workers considering retraining.

Many of the subjects in this study had limited variety in their work experiences. Their primary employment had been with a single employer. Their jobs with this employer were often industry specific and in positions such as semi-skilled machine operatives and unskilled material handlers. They often had limited transferable skills for today's complex labor market.

Many displaced workers have limited experience in job search techniques. They have often worked for one employer for a number of years and have not faced the rigors of looking for a job. Many displaced workers may have originally entered the labor force when jobs were easy to get. They may have had family or friends help them get their jobs. They are not likely to be sophisticated in job search techniques.

Many of the displaced workers in this study were reluctant to sever ties with their former employer. Barth and Reisner (1981), Hartley (1980), Swineburne (1981), and others have noted that the self-identity of workers is closely linked to their jobs. The loss of their job can be a major blow to their self-estees. Reluctance to sever ties with the former employer indicates an inability to recover lost self-esteem and become future oriented.
While many of the subjects in this study had participated in some kind of previous adult education, most had limited experience with and exposure to formal educational programs after high school. For many of the subjects, high school was a negative or, at best, neutral experience. Those who had participated in education since high school tended to enroll in vocational or work-related programs.

Most displaced workers have a strong work ethic (Zahnisser, Ashley, & Inks, 1985). Many have been employed full time since before leaving high school. The subjects in this study often expressed pride in their work history and a strong sense of independence. They often were unwilling to accept that they needed help to make the difficult career and personal transitions they faced.

According to Bendick (1982), the job market faced by displaced workers is likely to be hostile. Not only is there a lack of jobs in general, but there is a severe lack of jobs with similar pay and entrance requirements to the ones they are leaving. Jobs with similar pay and benefits usually require retraining and/or additional education.

The results of this study and others (Clark & Nelson, 1983; Zahnisser, Ashley, & Inks, 1985) indicate that many, if not most, displaced workers require some assistance in making the transition to a new career. Clark and Nelson (1983) and Cochran (1985) noted some of the barriers and needs of displaced workers. These included financial
assistance and counseling, career counseling, personal and family counseling, medical counseling and help, legal counseling, job placement, and training and educational opportunities.

This study indicated that the displaced workers who were most likely to need help were those who do not volunteer for program assistance. Some of those who did not request help will make the transition to new careers smoothly. Others, however, will not make a smooth transition. They will face numerous difficulties including financial, family, personal, and employment problems. These problems may cause them to drop out of the labor market or accept marginal employment.

Implications for Program Planning

A number of implications regarding the organization and administration of displaced worker programs can be drawn from this study. Many of these implications have been noted in other studies cited in the literature review.

The response of displaced workers to retraining programs has been limited (Boggs & Buss, 1983; Haber, Ferman, & Hudson, 1963; and Zahniser, Ashley, & Inks, 1985). This has been true for programs all across the country. A number of factors have contributed to this lack of response. Examples of these inhibiting factors identified in
this study and others are a) antipathy toward the company, b) lack of successful psychological adaptation to the job loss, c) reluctance to sever ties with the former employer, d) belief that they can keep or regain former jobs, e) disdain for government programs, f) inaccurate or limited program information, g) fear of and lack of preparation for education and training programs, h) and financial, logistical, family, and health problems.

The results of this study support the general trend that many displaced workers are reluctant to enroll in retraining programs. The following recommendations are intended to help displaced worker program planners increase participation and success rates.

Publicity and outreach efforts need to be presented through multiple channels and on a continuous basis. Despite efforts to publicize the displaced worker program studied in this dissertation, a number of subjects were uninformed or misinformed regarding program options and eligibility requirements. Initially the program was targeted to the workers who were laid off as a result of a plant closing. The target group was expanded to include other workers but efforts to inform them was less systematic. Suggestions for communication channels to inform displaced workers of programs are the company chain of command, company bulletin boards, public service announcements on television and radio, articles or advertisements
in newspapers and other local publications, community agencies, the local state employment service, and direct mail contact with the displaced workers.

Another important factor is the relationship of the program to the company from which the workers were displaced. If the program is sponsored by an organization external to the company, the program planners should seek to establish a balance in their relationship with that company. Company cooperation in publicizing the program can be critical to success.

The program should be disassociated from the company in a number of ways. It should not be located on company property or use the company name or logo. Zahniser, Ashley, and Inks (1985) noted that many displaced workers have negative attitudes toward the company and will be reluctant to participate if they associate the program with the company. This study supported these findings. Some of the subjects in this study were reluctant to participate because of the close association of the displaced worker program with the company.

A broad-based community approach to helping displaced workers is desirable. This concept was explored in Helping the Displaced Worker: Planning Community Services by Zahniser and Ashley (1984). At the very least, communications links and referral channels among community agencies and service providers need to be established. A network of
service providers, business and labor leaders, educators, and community leaders working together to pool the community resources to help displaced workers is more desirable. Underlying this approach is the idea that a massive layoff or plant closing is a community problem. It affects all aspects of the community and will strain the resources of the community trying to cope with it. Displaced workers' problems are generally beyond the scope of any single agency, program, or service provider. Many displaced workers will not receive help if a comprehensive, community based-approach is not adopted. Most displaced workers will require multiple services such as financial assistance, counseling, training, and job placement which are beyond the scope of a single service provider.

Another implication for program operation is early intervention (Zahniser, Ashley, & Inks, 1985). Most of the subjects in this study did not believe they would lose their jobs. Few made specific preparations for the layoff. Intervention before job loss can help workers accept the impending job loss and make preparations for it.

Staff in displaced worker programs should be knowledgeable in several areas. Staff should be aware of community resources and employment and training options for displaced workers. They should have a thorough understanding of program options, eligibility requirements, and client processing procedures. They also should be
sensitive to the attitudes and needs of displaced workers. Several subjects in this study condemned or praised various staff of the Resource Center based on the reception and processing they received. These subjects were angry and hurt over losing their jobs. Complications in the program processing only served to intensify these feelings. They tended to associate problems in program processing with their negative feelings toward the company and this inhibited their ability to accept the program.

**Implications for Counseling**

This section focuses on specific counseling strategies and objectives for helping displaced workers make successful transitions to new occupations, industries, and locations. The counseling strategies and objectives suggested here can be incorporated into a number of counseling approaches and frameworks. These implications are drawn from the results of this study.

Counseling services should be reality based. All of the subjects in this study cited negative economic impact on their families from their job loss. Several subjects had severe financial problems which resulted in the loss of their homes, bankruptcy, and/or divorce. Financial problems present the most immediate difficulties to displaced workers. In many cases, referrals to supportive services
for immediate needs is necessary before displaced workers can plan for retraining and education.

Displaced workers need to be aware of the stages of adaptation to involuntary job loss. The stages identified by Schlossberg and Leibowitz (1980) are disbelief, sense of betrayal, confusion, anger, and resolution. This study, however, indicated that mere awareness of the stages does not imply successful negotiation of them. Several subjects were stated that they were still angry and bitter over losing their jobs. This knowledge, however, did not insure effective behavior. Displaced workers need support in reestablishing their self-esteem. This is linked to the successful negotiation of the stages of adaptation. Developing a sense of personal control over their lives and developing a future orientation are important aspects of this process.

The passage of time after the job loss may be the only thing that will help some displaced workers to negotiate the stages, reestablish their self-esteem, develop senses of personal control and future orientations. However, many displaced workers can be helped in this process. Following are several strategies to aid in this process.

One strategy is to help displaced workers recognize, own, and share their feelings with others undergoing the same process. This can be done in encounter groups. This strategy was successfully employed by Zahniser, Ashley, and
Inks (1985) and has been used in several displaced worker programs. The group process will help them to realize that they are not alone and that they can be successful in negotiating the transition. The displaced workers in the groups can share information, resources, ideas, and support each other in their efforts to cope with their personal adjustments. Most of the subjects in this study who had participated in the outplacement classes stated positive reactions to the group process and interaction with others.

The families of most displaced workers are a good source of support. Most studies, including this one, indicate that for many displaced workers family support remains positive throughout the ordeal. In some instances in this study, the families of the displaced workers were drawn closer together by weathering the crisis. The support and encouragement of spouses and children can be invaluable in the healing process.

It is essential to help displaced workers take accurate and thorough stock of themselves, especially their accomplishments. Many will believe that they have few, if any, accomplishments and skills to cope in the "outside world." Many believe that they are not prepared for new jobs or the challenges of training programs. A careful accounting of their educational and work history, and other accomplishments will usually reveal more skills than were
at first recognized. Coupled with appropriate aptitude, interest, and skill assessments, this approach will help displaced workers realize their potential worth to themselves, their families, and society. It can help them develop a sense of personal control and future orientation. It is particularly important to help them draw out their educational achievements. Whether these achievements stem from enrollment in formal programs or self-initiated learning projects, most displaced workers will have some learning accomplishments to report. Specific learning activities that they have engaged in may not be applicable to new jobs or training programs but the realization that they can learn and adapt is critical.

It is also important to encourage systematic and thorough investigation of employment and training options. Some displaced workers will jump at the chance to find another employer like the one they left. They are seeking the security they lost. This may result in hasty decisions which can have negative impacts on their future, such as further layoffs. In this study, participants in the training programs expended varying amounts of energy in selecting their schools and areas of study. Those expending less energy tended to have lower levels of motivation to participate in the programs. They could be labeled high-risk participants. More systematic investigation of their options may have helped them increase their
commitment to training. Help in making more appropriate decisions regarding training programs also increases their commitment to training. Reading printed materials is only one method of exploration. Visits to schools and job and education fairs can be more effective methods.

The displaced workers in this study stated many barriers to enrolling in programs. Financial and family responsibilities were the barriers most often stated. Other displaced workers with similar financial and family situations, however, did enroll in programs. Displaced workers stating these barriers to participation must be helped to explore them in order to determine the extent to which they are real barriers. Other barriers, psychological in nature, may be at the core of their resistance to training.

A thorough orientation to training is helpful for many displaced workers. This can help them to overcome anxieties that they may have regarding enrolling in training programs. The orientation should include visits to the school, and discussions with counselors, instructors, and placement personnel. Visits to or contact with employers is also helpful. Many of the participants in this study only had a vague notion of the jobs for which they would be employable after training. More exploration of employment opportunities would have increased their understanding of their options and perhaps strengthened their motivation to complete the training program.
Constant monitoring is required throughout participation in any program. The displaced workers in this study encountered problems at school such as feelings of alienation from instructors and programs oriented toward traditional aged students. They also stated fears related to competition with younger students. Many lacked study skills and a proficiency in basic skills such as reading and math. Financial aid, child care, and personal and family counseling are examples of other appropriate support services which are required during participation.

Implications for Further Research

There are many aspects of the displaced worker problem that require further research. The two areas discussed here are drawn from the observations in this study. The first is the development and articulation of community-based approaches for helping displaced workers. This and other studies indicated that the personal and family needs of displaced workers transcend the resources of single agencies. Community-based approaches offer the hope of comprehensive services which can better meet displaced workers' needs. Massive layoffs and plant closings which result in displaced workers are a community-wide problem requiring a comprehensive, coordinated problem-solving approach. The organization, administration, and funding of a community-based approach can present overwhelming
problems. Further research into ways of developing community-based approaches could help alleviate some of the logistical and political problems inherent in this approach.

The second major area needing attention is that of nonparticipation. Most studies of displaced workers have addressed only the participants. There are many logistical problems in locating and studying nonparticipants. This study identified some of the characteristics and needs of nonparticipants. Further investigation into the characteristics, needs, and barriers faced by nonparticipants could help program planners and operators develop more comprehensive and effective services for displaced workers. In many cases it may be those who do not participate in programs who suffer the most.
APPENDIX A

SUBJECT CORRESPONDENCE
Dear ____________________,

As you are well aware many people were laid-off when Anchor Hocking closed its production plant in Lancaster last May. There are many decisions and problems being faced by those who were laid-off. A research study is being conducted to find out more about the effects of the lay-off. You have been nominated to participate in the research study.

The purpose of the study is to find out more about why some of the workers laid-off chose to go back to school while others did not. Your participation will consist of a personal interview of about one hour in length. The interview can be arranged at your convenience. We can meet at your home, the Resource Center (formerly the personnel office for plant two), or any other place you would like. I will be calling you in a few days to arrange the time and place for the interview.

Participation in the study is voluntary. You do not have to participate and you may withdraw from the study at any time. All your responses will be kept strictly confidential.

Your participation is important to this study. You have been specially selected to participate because you are representative of many of the workers who were laid-off. Your interview will help provide important information that can be used by counselors, teachers, school administrators, unions, businesses, and unemployed workers to help people get started again after losing their jobs.

I look forward to talking with you in the near future. If you have any questions regarding the study or your participation in it please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Gary J. Dean
Graduate Research Associate
486-3655
PARTICIPATION AND NONPARTICIPATION IN ADULT EDUCATION BY DISPLACED WORKERS

The purpose of this study is to learn more about the workers who were laid-off from anchor Hocking when plant #2 was closed in Lancaster, Ohio in May, 1985. You have been selected to be interviewed as a part of this study. The interview will last approximately one hour. The interview will focus on your life and work and what has happened to you since you were laid-off from Anchor Hocking.

Participation in the study is strictly voluntary. You have the right not to participate or to withdraw from participation at any time. The interview will be tape recorded so that the interviewer can concentrate on the discussion without taking notes. The tapes will not be released to any one not involved in the study, information that could be used to identify you will not be made public. Your identity will remain confidential.

You will be asked to sign a consent form indicating your understanding of the research project and your agreement to participate in it.

If you have any further questions regarding the research project please feel free to contact:

Gary J. Dean, Graduate Research Associate
The National Center for Research in Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210
486-3635

or:
William D. Dowling, Professor of Adult Education
The Ohio State University
116 Ramseyer Hall
29 W. Woodruff
Columbus, Ohio 43210
422-5037

PROGRAM AREAS
Curriculum and Instructional Development
121 Ramseyer Hall
614-422-5181

Educational Administration
301 Ramseyer Hall
614-422-7700

Higher Education, Student Affairs and Adult Education
301 Ramseyer Hall
614-422-7700

Humanistic Foundations
121 Ramseyer Hall
614-422-5181

Vocational-Technical Education
185 Ramseyer Hall
614-422-5037
CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN
SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH

I consent to participating in (or my child's participation in) research entitled:

Participation and Nonparticipation in Adult Education

by Displaced Workers.

Dr. William Dowling (Principal Investigator) or his/her authorized representative has
explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my (my child's) participation. Possible benefits of the study have been described as have alternative procedures, if such procedures are applicable and available.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Further, I understand that I am (my child is) free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me (my child). The information obtained from me (my child) will remain confidential unless I specifically agree otherwise by placing my initials here ______________.

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date: Dec. 9, 1985

Signed: __________________________ (Participant)

Signed: __________________________ (Principal Investigator or his/her Authorized Representative)

Signed: __________________________ (Person conducting the interview)

Date: ____________________________

HS-027 (Rev. 12-81) -- To be used only in connection with social and behavioral research.
APPENDIX B
SUBJECTS
**DESCRIPTION OF SUBJECTS:**

**GENERAL INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>DATE 1</th>
<th>STATUS 1</th>
<th>PLACE</th>
<th>LENG</th>
<th>REAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-30-86</td>
<td>In School</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Pos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-30-86</td>
<td>In School</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-31-86</td>
<td>In School</td>
<td>Res Cen</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Pos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2-4-86</td>
<td>In School</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2-12-86</td>
<td>In School</td>
<td>Res Cen</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2-13-86</td>
<td>In School</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2-14-86</td>
<td>In School</td>
<td>Res Cen</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Pos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2-18-86</td>
<td>In School</td>
<td>Res Cen</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2-18-86</td>
<td>In School</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>VenAn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3-3-86</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Pos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3-4-86</td>
<td>Emp-AH</td>
<td>Res Cen</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Pos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3-4-86</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Res Cen</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>VenAn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3-8-86</td>
<td>Emp-Other</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3-10-86</td>
<td>Emp-Other</td>
<td>Res Cen</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Pos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3-18-86</td>
<td>Emp-AH</td>
<td>Res Cen</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Pos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3-18-86</td>
<td>Emp-AH</td>
<td>Res Cen</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Pos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3-24-86</td>
<td>Emp-AH</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>VenAn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3-24-86</td>
<td>Emp-AH</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3-25-86</td>
<td>Emp-AH</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3-27-86</td>
<td>Emp-Other</td>
<td>Res Cen</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Pos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4-17-86</td>
<td>Emp-Other</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Pos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DESCRIPTION OF SUBJECTS:
#### PROGRAM STATUS AT INITIAL INTERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>PR ST 1</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>MAJOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Ohio U-Lan</td>
<td>Electronics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Col Tech Inst</td>
<td>Heat &amp; Air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Tri-County</td>
<td>Auto Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Ohio U-Lan</td>
<td>Electronics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Col Para Inst</td>
<td>Travel &amp; Tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Col Tech Inst</td>
<td>Heat &amp; Air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Tri-County</td>
<td>Carpenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Tri-County</td>
<td>Electricity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Hocking Tech</td>
<td>Ceramic Emg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>Edi Corp</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Ohio U-Lan</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DESCRIPTION OF SUBJECTS:
EMPLOYMENT AT ANCHOR HOCKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRIMARY JOB</th>
<th>SK</th>
<th>PLA</th>
<th>YRS</th>
<th>REL</th>
<th>RETIRE</th>
<th>UNION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Packer</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gen Labor</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mach Oper</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Burn-Off Oper</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mach Op (App)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mach Op (App)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mach Oper</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Decorator</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mach Op (APP)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Gen Labor</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Gen Labor</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mach Foreman</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Foreman</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mach Oper</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Burn-Off Oper</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Relief Packer</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Lay Down Oper</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Packer-Decor</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Relief Packer</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mach Oper</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Description of Subjects: Lay Off Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Date (MM-YYYY)</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>OP</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Prepared</th>
<th>Go Back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5-85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9-85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5-85</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8-85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5-85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9-85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5-85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5-85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9-85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5-85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6-85*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5-85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NoNo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3-84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5-85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>11-85*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1-86*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>11-85*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3-86*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5-84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5-85</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Subject employed at Anchor Hocking at time of initial interview.
**DESCRIPTION OF SUBJECTS:**
**PERSONAL AND FAMILY FACTORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th># FAM</th>
<th>SEC INC</th>
<th>LIV LAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>RELOCATE</td>
<td>DREAM</td>
<td>FAM SUP 1</td>
<td>VET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Pes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Neut</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Neut</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Neut</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Description of Subjects:

#### Educational Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>YRS ED</th>
<th>M ED</th>
<th>F ED</th>
<th>S ED</th>
<th>HS COURSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Col Prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>Gen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12+</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Voc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Voc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>Gen+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>GED</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>Gen+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>GED</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Gen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Voc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>GED</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Voc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Gen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>Gen+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>Gen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>Gen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>&gt;12</td>
<td>Col Prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12?</td>
<td>12?</td>
<td>&gt;12</td>
<td>Col Prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12?</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>Gen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Voc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Col Prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&gt;12</td>
<td>Col Prep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

? Data not available.
**DESCRIPTION OF SUBJECTS:**
**EDUCATIONAL FACTORS CONTINUED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>ATT HS</th>
<th>ED AFT HS</th>
<th>AD ED</th>
<th>TRN AH</th>
<th>OP CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neut</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>App</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neut</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3,4</td>
<td>App</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>App</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Neut</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>App</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>App</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>App</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Neut</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3,4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>App</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>App, CR</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3,4,6</td>
<td>App</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,3,4</td>
<td>App</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

? Data not available.
### DESCRIPTION OF SUBJECTS:
#### FOLLOW UP INTERVIEW DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>DATE 2</th>
<th>PR ST 2</th>
<th>STATUS 2</th>
<th>FAM SUP 2</th>
<th>SEC INC 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8-12-86</td>
<td>Quit</td>
<td>Emp-Non Trn</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8-12-86</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>In School</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8-18-86</td>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>Emp-Trn Rel</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8-12-85</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>In School</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8-16-86</td>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>Emp-Trn Rel</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8-13-86</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>In School</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8-12-86</td>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>Emp-Trn Rel</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8-18-86</td>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>Emp-trn Rel</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8-12-86</td>
<td>Quit</td>
<td>Emp-Non Trn</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8-13-86</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8-18-86</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>Emp AH-Steady</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8-13-86</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>Emp-Other</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8-13-86</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8-13-86</td>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>Emp-Non Trn</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>8-12-86</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>Emp AH-Steady</td>
<td>Neut</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8-13-96</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>Emp AH-Steady</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8-13-86</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>Emp AH-on LO</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>8-16-86</td>
<td>NonEmp</td>
<td>AH-on LO</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>8-13-86</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>In School</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>8-13-86</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>Emp-Other</td>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>8-15-86</td>
<td>Quit</td>
<td>Emp AH-Steady</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED IN THE DESCRIPTIONS OF SUBJECTS

GENERAL INFORMATION

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Number of the interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>DATE 1</td>
<td>Date of the initial interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>STATUS 1</td>
<td>Status of the subject at the time of the initial interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLACE</td>
<td>Place where the initial interview was conducted: School = at the school in which the subject was enrolled; Home = at the subject's home; Res Cen = the Resource Center; Library = the public library in Lancaster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>LENG</td>
<td>Length of the initial interview in minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>REAC</td>
<td>Reaction of the subject to being interviewed: Pos= Positive; None = no reaction expressed; VenAn = subject vented anger toward company and/or being layed off.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROGRAM STATUS AT INITIAL INTERVIEW

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PR ST 1</td>
<td>Status of the subject regarding participation in the JTPA and TRA funded programs at the time of the initial interview: Part = participant; Non = Nonparticipant; Grad = Program Graduate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td>Institution in which the participant was enrolled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>MAJOR</td>
<td>Field of study of the participant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EMPLOYMENT AT ANCHOR HOCKING

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>PRIMARY JOB</td>
<td>The primary job held by the subject at Anchor Hocking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Skill level of the primary job: S = skilled; SS = semi-skilled; U = unskilled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>PLA</td>
<td>The plant at which the subject was employed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>YRS</td>
<td>Number of years the subject was employed at Anchor Hocking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>REL</td>
<td>Whether or not the subject had relatives employed at Anchor Hocking prior to the subject's employment there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>RETIRE</td>
<td>Whether the subject planned to retire from Anchor Hocking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>UNION</td>
<td>Whether the subject was active in the union.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LAY OFF EXPERIENCES**

| 17 | DATE LO | The date the subject was either permanently laid off or faced a lay off of considerable length. |
| 18 | SEV OP | The severance option of the subject: 1 = permanent lay off with no severance pay; 2 = permanent lay off with severance pay; 3 = voluntary lay off (no severance pay); 4 = still employed intermittently; 5 = still employed steady; 6 = laid off but on a call back list. |
| 19 | ATT LO | The subject's attitude about being laid off. |
| 20 | PREP LO | Whether the subject made any preparations for the lay off. |
| 21 | GO BACK 1 | Whether the subject would go back to Anchor Hocking given the opportunity. |

**PERSONAL AND FAMILY FACTORS**

| 22 | AGE | Age of the subject at the time of the initial interview. |
| 23 | # FAM | Number of members in the subject's family, including the subject. |
| 24 | SEC INC 1 | Whether the subject had a second income in the home at the time of the initial interview. |
| 25 | LIV LAN | Whether the subject lived in or around the Lancaster all of their lives. |
| 26 | RELOCATE | Whether the subject indicated a willingness to relocate to find employment. |
| 27 | DREAM | Whether the subject showed evidence of what Levinson refers to as a "Dream" in their lives. |
| 28 | FAM SUP 1 | Whether or not the subject felt their family was supporting them in their decisions at the time of the initial interview. |
| 29 | VET | Whether or not the subject was a veteran. |
### EDUCATIONAL FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>YRS ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>M ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>F ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>S ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>HS COURSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>ATT HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>ED AFT HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>AD ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>TRN AH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>OP CL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEW DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>DATE 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>PR ST 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
42 STATUS 2 Status of the subject at the time of the follow-up interview: Emp-non trn = employed in a non-training related job; In School = still in school, not working; Emp-trn rel = employed in a training related job; Unemployed = unemployed; Emp AH-steady = employed at Anchor Hocking getting full time, or near full time hours; Emp AH-on LO = still employed at Achor Hocking but currently laid off; Emp-Other = employed outside of Anchor Hocking.

43 FAM SUP 2 Whether or not the subject perceives his family as supporting his decisions at the time of the follow up interview.

44 SEC INC 2 Whether or not there is a second income in the home at the time of the follow up interview.
APPENDIX C

DATA COLLECTION TOOLS
SUBJECT DATA SHEET

1. Interview #:_______
2. Date:___________
3. Location:__________________________
4. Starting time:______________
5. Ending time:______________
6. Name:_______________________
7. Phone:_______________________
8. Address:________________________
                                __________________________
9. Age:___________

10. Years of education:___________

11. Family size:__________
    spouse:______________
    number of children:______________
    ages of children:______________

12. Sources of income:
    self:_____________________
    spouse:___________________
    other:___________________

13. Length of time employed at Anchor Hocking:
                                ______________
14. Primary job at Anchor Hocking: __________________________

15. Date laid off: ________________

16. Participant: __________
   Nonparticipant: __________

17. If participant:
   institution: _______________________
   program: __________________________
   date started: ________________
   expected completion date: ________________
   type of job expected upon completion: _______________________

18. Plan to relocate: _____________________
INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Subject's physical characteristics

Physical setting of the interview

Subject's behavior during the interview:

Interview content:
Interview process:

Implications for future interviews:

Implications for selecting subjects:

Other comments:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT SUMMARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Interview #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Name of Sub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Current Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Length of Int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Follow-up Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROGRAM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Program Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANCHOR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Primary Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Relatives at AH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Date Laid off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Prepare for Lay off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Plan to Retire AH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERSONAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Second Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Relocate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Family Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

DATA ANALYSIS TOOLS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td>Dream: hope, or vision of the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time: Use of time, effects on the subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Help: Willingness to help others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Int: Nonwork interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>React: Reaction to being interviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA: Self-appraisal, mental health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fut: Plans for the future for school and work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Init: Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inf: Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rel: Relocate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Network: Use of friends, etc. for help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World View: View of the world politics, economy, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relig: Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Att Help: Attitude toward help offered or needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health: Subject's health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family</strong></td>
<td>Fam Back: Information on subject's current family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fam Back HS: Information on family in which subject grew up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fam Sup HS: Family support and direction received during youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fam Sup N: Support from family at present time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LO-Fam: Impact of lay off on the subject's family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fam Ob: Family obligations: effect on school and work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work</strong></td>
<td>Start AH: Why subject started work at Anchor Hocking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stay AH: Why subject stayed at Anchor Hocking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Att J AH N: Attitude toward job at Anchor Hocking now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Att LO: Attitude toward being laid off, effect on subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Att J AH 1st: Attitude toward job at AH when first hired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fut AH: Opinion about the future of Anchor Hocking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prep LO: Prepare for the lay off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WE: Other Work Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aft LO: Activities after the lay off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att Work</td>
<td>Attitude toward work in general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Int</td>
<td>Interests regarding work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att AH</td>
<td>Attitude toward Anchor Hocking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-Sub</td>
<td>Effect of the lay off on the subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AH-Fam</td>
<td>Effect of job at Anchor Hocking on the family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Sit</td>
<td>Current working conditions or situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go Back</td>
<td>Willingness to go back to Anchor Hocking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Att HS</th>
<th>Attitude toward high school while in it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS Int</td>
<td>Interests while in high school--academic and nonacademic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aft HS</td>
<td>Plans for after high school--academic or work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref HS</td>
<td>Reflections about high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P Part</td>
<td>Previous participation in post secondary education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start S</td>
<td>When decided to participate in program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Money &amp; Logistical problems of participating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coun Sup</td>
<td>Support received from counselors/programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aft Prog</td>
<td>Plans for post training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att Prog</td>
<td>Attitude toward JTPA and TRA funded programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Fam</td>
<td>Effect of participation on family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOO</td>
<td>Learning on own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prog</td>
<td>Nonparticipants involvement with JTPA programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att S</td>
<td>Attitude toward school &amp; education in general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Sub</td>
<td>Effect of participation in programs on subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out Cl</td>
<td>Outplacement Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trng AH</td>
<td>Training received from Anchor Hocking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THEMES, GROUPS, AND CATEGORIES

Category 1: Education

Group: Interest in prior participation in adult education
Did not think about it
Thought about it but did not participate
Started but did not complete adult education
Started and completed adult education

Group: Type of prior participation in adult education
College
Vocational
Self-initiated learning projects
Correspondence courses
GED programs
Workshops
None

Group: Consistency of prior participation in adult education
Persistent
Intermittent
None

Group: Participation in the outplacement classes
Yes
No

Group: Attitudes toward high school
Difficulty in high school
Indifference toward high school
Liked vocational subjects
Liked high school

Group: Plans for after high school
No plans at all, just get a job
Go straight to Anchor Hocking
Get a job for which had vocational training
Plans for more education

Group: High school courses in which enrolled
College preparatory
Vocational or general with some vocational
General
No high school
Category 2: Work and Lay Off

Group: Work patterns
From High School straight to Anchor Hocking
From High School to other work then to Anchor Hocking
From high school to Anchor Hocking, to other work, and then back to Anchor Hocking

Group: Reasons for starting to work at Anchor Hocking
Relatives and friends employed there and/or major employer in the area
For the money and benefits
Better opportunity than previous job

Group: Relatives employed at Anchor Hocking
Yes
No

Group: Attitudes toward job at Anchor Hocking when first hired
Disliked the work but the pay was good
Work was o.k. and pay was good
Liked the work and the pay was good
Enthusiastic about the work and pay

Group: Attitudes toward job at Anchor Hocking after employment for a few years
Did not like it or it was just tolerable
Wanted promotions and/or security
Generally liked the work

Group: Reasons for staying at Anchor Hocking
Never thought about leaving
Did not want to stay but did not make plans to leave
Made plans to leave but did not follow through
Did leave Anchor Hocking

Group: Skill level of job at Anchor Hocking
Skilled
Semi-skilled
Unskilled

Group: Plans for retirement from Anchor Hocking
Yes
No

Group: Attitude toward being laid-off
Positive
Negative
Group: Preparation for the lay off
Yes
No

Group: Believed they would lose their job
Yes
No

Category 3: Personal and Family

Group: Noneconomic effect of layoff on family
Positive
Neutral
Negative

Group: Believe have personal control of future
Yes
No

Group: Future orientation
Did not think about the future
Main concern is for job security
Have formed Dream for the future

Group: Willingness to relocate
Yes
No

Group: Reaction to the interview
Positive
No reaction
Use the interview to vent anger toward Anchor Hocking
other (miscellaneous)

Group: Family support
Positive
Neutral
Negative

Category 4: Training Program

Group: School-job decision process
Job first, then school
School and job at the same time
School first but look for a job
School first did not look for a job
Start school before laid-off
Group: Motivation to participate in training
Program benefits
Program best option because of lack of jobs
Long term interest in school

Group: How selected schools and areas of study
Influenced by family and friends
Some research
Determined by previous enrollment or long term interests

Group: Labor market knowledge
High
Medium
Low

Group: Enrollment in outplacement classes
Yes
No

Category 5: Nonparticipants

Group: Reasons for nonparticipation
Lack of education, preparation, or self-confidence
Afraid to leave Anchor Hocking
Financial reasons
Logistical problems
APPENDIX E

AUDITOR'S REPORT
AUDIT REPORT FOR:

FACTORS AFFECTING PARTICIPATION IN
OF DISPLACED WORKERS IN
ADULT EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

Submitted by:

Anne Leser

May 6, 1987
Introduction

According to Lincoln and Guba (1985) an audit is one of the most important technique available to establish trustworthiness in naturalistic inquiry. Lincoln and Guba (1982, 1985) outlined four areas that have a direct relationship to the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiry. These are credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. According to Lincoln and Guba (1982, 1985) one of the major techniques for establishing confirmability and dependability is through an inquiry audit. Therefore, the role of the auditor is to verify the findings on behalf of the reader.

An audit examines both the process and the product of the research. The researcher, through the auditor, is able to certify that the process by which the research was conducted are within the bounds of professional practice (Lincoln and Guba, 1982). The result is that the dependability of the research can be attested to. An audit must also review the product of the research to ascertain that the product can be substantiated from the data collected (Lincoln and Guba, 1982). This part of the audit then confirms that the conclusions are warranted.

The agreement to conduct an audit of Gary Dean's doctoral dissertation is part of a reciprocal arrangement
between two naturalistic researchers completing doctoral dissertations. Although I have not completed a research audit before, Dean and I have a similar background in naturalistic research.

According to Lincoln and Guba (1982) the auditor is presumed to be a professional peer of the inquirer. There are no specific requirements for an auditor. The primary auditor for Gary Dean's research is a doctoral candidate in Adult Education at The Ohio State University. She has a Baccalaureate Degree in History and a Master's Degree in Education. Her dissertation research is also naturalistic in design. As part of a Graduate Research Associateship she had with the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, she conducted research on the needs of displaced workers.

Initially there was one auditor, but as the audit process developed, a colleague requested to be a part of the auditing process. The second auditor, like the primary auditor, is a doctoral candidate in Adult Education at the Ohio State University. Peter Diaz earned a Baccalaureate Degree in Psychology and a Master's degree in Adult Education. He is employing naturalistic inquiry in his dissertation as well. One of the cognate areas of his doctoral program is Research Methodology, which has included both qualitative and quantitative research approaches.
On February 18, 1987 I received Dean's tapes, field notes, research outlines, and chapters one, two, and three, of his dissertation. I reviewed Dean's work using Lincoln and Guba's (1982) "Establishing Dependability and Confirmability in Naturalistic Inquiry Through an Audit" as a guide. This audit is an attempt to review the naturalistic research and establish that the research was carried out in a reasonable manner.

Lincoln and Guba (1982) stated that the audit provides major assurance of the dependability and confirmability of naturalistic inquiry. This audit of Dean's research will not deal with credibility or transferability but only with the issues of dependability and confirmability. The steps outlined by Guba and Lincoln (1982) were modified for the purpose of auditing Dean's dissertation. The modified steps are as follows:

1. Decision to audit.
2. Acquire report and all parts of the audit trail.
3. Determine completeness of the audit trail.
4. Compare procedures used for research to the research problems addressed.
5. Compare the findings of the research to the raw data.
6. Note shifts in methods of inquiry, analysis, and reporting of data.
7. Concluding statements of the auditor.
The process of deciding to audit and acquiring the data and audit trail has been discussed in the section above. The remainder of the audit report will focus on items three through seven on the above list.

Completeness of the Audit Trail

In order to conduct an audit, there needs to be available to the auditor records reporting the steps taken by the researcher. The audit trail left by the researcher enables the auditor to review all the information used during the research. Unless otherwise specified, the materials used by Gary Dean in his investigation were received on February 18, 1987. The materials are listed followed by the Auditor's comments regarding their composition and completeness. The materials received to audit were as follows:

1. Raw Data. These were the tapes and transcribed interviews of the tape recorded interviews. The tapes were labeled and cross referenced to the written transcripts. The transcripts were dated and coded for future reference.

2. Original Proposal. This included chapters one, two, and three. Chapter three was the methodology chapter.

3. Completed Dissertation. All chapters and Appendices were included. (Received April 14, 1987).
4. Researcher's Personal Log. These were handwritten and dated notes. They were separated into three categories: personal log notes, time log (a record of dates activities were completed), and notes on contacts with resource persons. All notes were indexed and cross-referenced.

5. Subject Data Sheets. These were handwritten. Each included family, employment, and other basic information obtained from each subject during the initial interview.

6. Interview Summaries. These were handwritten notes of the researcher regarding the process and content of the initial interviews with the subjects.

7. Subject Summaries. These were summary notes of the follow-up interviews held with the subjects.

8. Descriptions of Subjects. Included in this summary was a definition of terms, general information regarding each subject, the status of each subject at the time of the interview, and other information important to the research such as the employment status of the subjects, personal and family information, and educational information.

9. Code Summaries. There was a code summary for each category of themes, education, work, family, and general information. The code summaries were handwritten summaries of the coded responses from the
transcripts. They were referenced to the transcripts by subject number and page number.

10. Data Used to Construct Matrices. This contained data from interviews which the researcher used to organize the codes of the original interviews into the matrices. The matrices were divided into the same four categories of themes as the code summaries. Each matrix contained a summary of the relevant themes and the placement of the individual subjects in the matrix.

11. List of Codes. This was a list of the codes used to classify the data in the transcripts. Definitions of the codes were included.

12. Themes, Groups, and Categories. This list summarized the themes and showed the categories, which were derived from the codes, to which the themes belonged.

We have reviewed all of the data supplied by Gary Dean and feel that it is sufficient to carry out an audit. The researcher also provided a key for locating specific coded responses in the transcripts. This was helpful in checking the raw data.

Appropriateness of the Methodology

The research question was one of identifying factors affecting participation of displaced workers in training programs. A descriptive approach was appropriate. Since
this study delved into the thoughts and feelings of the participants, a naturalistic mode of inquiry was necessary. Dean does use matrices which quantify the data. The matrices are only used to compare and contrast the data, however, and not used for statistical analysis.

Some of the data collected could have been obtained through the use of a survey instrument. However, the use of a survey instrument without the interaction between subject and interviewer could not have provided the investigator with the insights into attitudes, feelings, and other nonverbal cues that greatly contributed to the flavor of the dissertation. The use of interviews provided Dean with the opportunity to discover other areas of importance not anticipated and to individualize subsequent interviews.

Comparison of Raw Data to Findings

The codes were theoretically based but as in all naturalistic inquiry they were modified to reflect the responses of the subjects. The codes continually evolved and were used for all of the interviews. The code summaries enabled the auditors to cross-check the interviews with the matrices and the final dissertation report. The codes which were checked by the auditors did conform to the definitions given by the researcher.
After reviewing the coded interviews and matrices, we feel that Dean did select appropriate themes to represent the subjects' responses. These themes are representative of the issues and problems faced by the subjects. Not all of the themes were based on clear cut statements. Some of them were inferred by the researcher from subjects' responses. These themes do reflect what the raw data shows.

The audit trail shows that an enormous amount of work was needed to assign subject responses to the matrices. This is evident by the number of divisions involved in the matrices. It should be noted that most of the matrices were divided into participants and nonparticipants and included the same information for both groups of subjects. The steps used to assign the themes to the matrices was followed closely by the auditors for the subjects represented in the four case studies. We found that the placement of data into the matrices was accurately done. There were no inconsistencies from the transcripts to the matrices even when the researcher inferred the classification from the subjects' responses.

The case studies do reflect the subjects as the transcripts and tapes portray them. Dean first presented a narrative of the subject and his background. He then gave each subjects' narrative a "theme" without making any evaluative statements. These do provide thick descriptions
which are helpful in understanding the subjects and the themes.

Shifts in Methodology, Analysis, and Reporting

Dean noted several changes in methodology in his final report. These included such areas as eliminating questions about career development. He stated that career development was not part of the subjects' concerns. After the four practice interviews he did not pursue questions related to career development.

Another area in which Dean decided to change his methodology was in obtaining information from nonparticipants. His interviews of most nonparticipants came after having interviewed most of the participants. Because of this, information obtained from nonparticipants could not be used to modify the content of the interviews with the participants. Dean addressed this problem by incorporating the information obtained from the nonparticipants into structuring the follow-up interviews. These changes did not weaken Dean's research methodology but enhanced his analysis of the data collected. It must be remembered that in a naturalistic inquiry, the methodology is an evolving one. The shifts noted in Dean's work reflect this evolving nature. They are logical and appropriate.
Conclusions

Upon reflection of the audit trail, we can conclude that Dean used methods that were within the bounds of professional practice. His conclusions are documentable, represented in the data, and are rationally interpreted.

The research question lent itself to the methodology that was used. The analysis is consistent with the form of data collected and reflects the qualitative nature of the study.

The findings are coherent and credible and can be traced to the raw data. It is our judgement that this inquiry does reflect the issues of trustworthiness as addressed by Lincoln and Guba (1982, 1985).
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