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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

One of the most vital issues of the present decade is the problem of unemployment and underemployment. Social ills, too innumerable to cite, pervade the Nation in times of chronic unemployment; as a result, society must cope with more than just an individual who has experienced lack of work. More important, the outcomes of massive unemployment must be dealt with in order to eliminate such factors as fear, anxiety, poverty, ignorance, and sometimes rebellion.

A recognized sociological assumption is that poverty breeds poverty. Educators, and other professional groups, must constantly search for answers to alleviate unemployment and its consequences; this is necessary in order that disillusionment may be changed to hope for those who suffer from this plight.

The Appalachian region has more than its share of non-working individuals. The people of that area often
have been stereotyped as impoverished or disadvantaged. It is generally agreed that many Appalachians do fit the classification; however, the majority of those people seemingly do not want to be labeled with such a stigma. Even though some resist change and think the location of new businesses or federal training programs are an encroachment upon their solitude, most are thankful that opportunities will be available whereby they can upgrade themselves. The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 was designed to have an impact on the social problems resulting from large-scale unemployment and underemployment through providing many members of low-income families with an opportunity to become more productive members of society. Hopefully, this program of education has helped to bridge the gap between unemployment and the issue of deprivation.

The Manpower Development and Training Act had as its underlying objective the meeting of a broad social objective of transforming "non-working or underemployed" individuals to "gainfully" employed members of society. It had its origin in the social and economic needs of the Appalachian region. Manpower Training Centers are operational in a number of locations in Appalachia. The
clerk-stenographer program is one of the more commonly offered programs in these centers.

Because the government has embarked upon such an ambitious program of vocational education involving an investment of millions of dollars, an evaluation of the Manpower Development and Training Act on a local, state, and national basis is imperative. This evaluation must determine whether the objectives of the Act are being met and whether the training is reaching those whom it was intended to reach.

The Problem

The problem of this study was to construct an evaluation model which may be used by the Appalachia centers in evaluating the effectiveness of their clerk-stenographer programs.

Instruments and procedures for the examination and evaluation of four components were considered essential to the model. These four components were:

1. Objectives.--Is there a consistency between the objectives of the program as promulgated by proponents of the MDT Act and the objectives of the program as perceived
by the state administration, center administration, teaching staff, and trainees?

2. Trainees.--Is the program reaching those trainees which the MDTA was designed to serve, and has the training achieved the objectives as identified in the Act?

3. Trainee evaluation.--How do graduates assess major aspects of the MDTA clerk-stenographer programs pertaining to training received?

4. Employer evaluation.--How do employers of MDTA graduates assess the quality of training received through the clerk-stenographer programs?

As already stated, the major objective of the study was to establish a model for use in the evaluation of MDTA Skill Center clerk-stenographer programs in Appalachia. To achieve this objective, it was necessary to apply the proposed model to a specific program and thereby test its value. Thus, a by-product of the study was an evaluation of that program in the selected tryout center. The Abingdon, Virginia, MDTA Skill Center was used as the basis for the model formulation and tryout.
Background and Need for the Study

The Manpower Training Service of the Virginia Division of Vocational Education is charged with the responsibility of providing training in occupational categories for unemployed and underemployed persons within the State who qualify under the provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and as amended in 1963, 1965, 1966, and 1968. This program includes basic and remedial education and "Orientation to the World of Work" for those who need this service as a basis for learning an occupation and/or becoming employable in today's market. Provisions are made for refresher or other training for individuals who have become unemployed because of the specialized nature of their previous employment.

Training is provided for the following categories of persons:

1. Those who are unemployed
2. Those who are working below their skill capacity
3. Those who are working substantially less than full time

1 Data supplied by the Manpower Training Service, State Department of Vocational Education, Richmond, Virginia.
4. Those who will be working less than full time or will be unemployed

5. Those whose skills have been or are becoming obsolete

6. Those who are members of farm families with less than $1,200 net annual income

7. Those who are sixteen years of age but not yet twenty-two and in need of occupational schooling.

Training is provided only for those persons and in those occupational categories requested by the Virginia Employment Commission. Training is provided by establishing training as close as possible to the target group.

**Purposes of MDTA Program**

Basically, the purpose of the Manpower Development and Training Act program is to relieve unemployment caused by automation, shifts in market demands, employment trends, and other economic changes. The program does not replace the need of existing training in vocational education but expands and broadens the training programs available for workers in all occupations.

The Manpower Training Service acts as liaison between the local school boards and the Manpower Division of the U. S. Office of Education in all matters pertaining to

\[2\text{Ibid.}\]
the institutional training phase of the program funded by
the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 and sub-
sequent amendments.

Staff members of the Manpower Training Service work
with school divisions in their localities to achieve certain
objectives. Included among these objectives are:

1. Providing assistance in organizing curriculum guides
   and course outlines and developing standards of
   occupational competency

2. Preparing budgets for each proposed training pro-
   gram and reviewing upon completion

3. Providing courses in instruction based on the needs
   of individuals who are to receive training

4. Providing review and evaluation of training pro-
   grams, including recommendations for improvement
   with need for continuing the program

5. Initiating steps to assure that training programs
   are formulated without delay and that the quality
   and adequacy of the training provided is consis-
   tently maintained

6. Insuring that follow-up of trainees is done in
   order to determine their success in the occupation
   for which they have prepared

Virginia MDTA Centers

Based on criteria from the U. S. Office of Educa-
tion, proposals were formulated for the designation of

3Ibid.
four official Manpower training centers in the state of Virginia as Area Manpower Training Skills Centers. The proposals were approved, and the Centers were located in Abingdon, Crewe, Norfolk, and Wise. The centers have their own identity, provide all services needed by the unemployed and underemployed youths and adults for employment, and have a permanency not experienced by other MDTA training programs in the state.

These four centers provide job-oriented basic education, orientation to the world of work, and occupational training. Job-oriented basic education is provided for school dropouts not having completed the sixth grade. Guidance, counseling, and testing services are provided as an integral part of each training center.

Initially, numerous satellite programs were offered in many communities and locations throughout the state. The offerings at these locations usually consisted of one or two vocational programs only. With the initiation of the Skills Center concept by the MDT administration, a training site must now offer a minimum of five vocational training programs in order to be designated as a center. The four centers in Virginia offer an average of ten vocational programs and are able to provide numerous
services to trainees. The small, sometimes isolated satellite programs do not receive adequate monetary allocations to maintain the status of an MDTA Center. The four designated centers receive first priority for funding.

Table I shows the programs which operated in Virginia during the fiscal year 1968-69. Training was provided for 33 occupational areas. There were 140 programs with an enrollment of 3,574 trainees. The clerical programs comprised the largest enrollment of all occupational areas. Eight clerk-stenographer sections were funded and enrolled 246 trainees. Seventeen clerk-typist sections were funded and enrolled 484 trainees. These statistics reflect a typical statewide annual program of Manpower training in Virginia.

Need for Evaluation

The number of MDTA programs operated as shown by Table I attests to the need for evaluation. This need is further pointed out in statements made by educators who have examined the Manpower training programs. H. H. London writes:

... a program of this kind must be evaluated in terms of the placement and the job success of its trainees, what changes for the better, if any, take
### TABLE I

**VIRGINIA MDTA ENROLLMENT AND PROGRAMS OPERATED STATEWIDE**

**July 1, 1968 - June 30, 1969**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number of Programs</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Dropped</th>
<th>Completed in 1969&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auto Body Repair</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Mechanics</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Serv. Sta. Mech.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Custodian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricklayer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cement Mason</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cert. Med. Lab. Asst.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk-Stenographer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk-Typist</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook, Hotel &amp; Restaurant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Truck Mechanic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draftsman, Junior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicating Mach. Oper.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer, General</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keypunch Operator</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Pract. Nurse</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maint. Nan, Building</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat Cutter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mine Machinery Repair</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse Aide</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse Refresher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Mach. Repair</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prod. Mach. Operator</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmer, Business</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio, TV Repair</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salesperson, General</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seamstress</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheet Metal Worker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Driver, Light</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upholsterer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welder</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>140</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,574</strong></td>
<td><strong>875</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,666</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Many programs extend into FY 1970. Although enrolled in FY 1969, many trainees will not complete training and graduate until 1970. The totals reflect activities for FY 1969 only.

Source: Virginia State Department of Vocational Education, Manpower Training Division, Richmond.
place in their modes of living, and how these results relate to the costs involved. Moreover, if those who are in charge of operating these programs are to improve their methods and procedures in selecting, training, motivating, and placing the unemployed, they must know how well their trainees are doing, what difficulties they encounter with their jobs, and what suggestions they and their employers have for the improvement of the counseling, training, and placement programs. 

Garth L. Mangum, a George Washington University professor, concluded that:

... no federal manpower program now has a reporting system capable of producing data of the kind needed for adequate evaluation. Even the data available are rarely subjected to careful analysis. In addition, many of the benefits and some of the costs are nonquantifiable, leaving to assumption and judgment broad areas of assessment. For example, to incorporate into the mainstream of society an otherwise alienated individual or group may have social value far beyond the potential contributions to earnings or to the gross national product. On the other hand, to create benefits in excess of costs is only a necessary, not a sufficient justification for expenditure of public funds. 

---


Levitan states that:

More than a billion dollars of public funds has been committed to . . . Work Experience and Training programs, while only a fraction of money appropriated was devoted to evaluating the extent to which the programs had achieved their goals.  

Tiffany, Cowan and Tiffany write that it has been apparent that "the evaluation of many programs have frequently been seen as low priority, or in conflict with administrative chores."

After a comprehensive analysis of the status of the manpower program, Mangum concludes:

. . . data on the characteristics of enrollees are adequate in some, but not all, programs. Data on services provided are weak and follow-up data on program results are grossly inadequate and undependable. Ad hoc internal evaluations have been made of most programs, either in house or by contract, but, for the most part, their coverage has been limited, their data weak, and their investigations less than probing. However, efforts to develop data reporting and analysis systems appear to be achieving

---


higher priority, evaluation is receiving a higher portion of program funds, and expertise in doing evaluation is growing.\(^8\)

The preceding statements magnify numerous shortcomings of the evaluation process in Manpower training. Even though deficiencies are prevalent, there are always exceptions. Concentrated efforts are being made by some state departments to improve their total program effort through periodic evaluations.

Mangum writes that:

Administration officials and members of Congress have been too impatient to await the results of new and existing programs and to allow for restructuring, removal of negative elements, and finally their expansion into effective programs. As a result, there has been an excessive resort to gimmicks and attempts to devise "instant policies for instant success." New approaches are designed intuitively rather than empirically. They are launched with public relations fanfare, complete with numerical goals and early target dates. Manipulation of numbers to "prove" success then become a major staff function. . . . Long-range planning, careful evaluation, and more modest and realistic promises are a needed substitute for "panacea hopping."\(^9\)

In order to insure that training programs are meeting their objectives and are proving their effectiveness, adequate evaluations must be a part of training. Manpower


\(^9\)Ibid., pp. 131-132.
program evaluation must not be permitted to serve a minor role as has been evidenced in the past. This is attested to in the writings of Tiffany, Cowan and Tiffany in the following words:

... Evaluation apparently has been relegated to a miniscule role in the making of Manpower training contracts and grants. This is unfortunate. Hopefully, future Manpower training will include a comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness of the training, placement and follow-up of clients as an integral and substantive part of their total program. 10

They say further "it appears that a program evaluation to examine the operating procedures, client attitudes, and the nature of successful placement is long overdue." 11

Definition of Terms

The following are definitions of important terms used in this study:

1. MDTA refers to the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

2. MDTA trainee refers to an individual who met the prescribed requirements for eligibility in the program because of being an educationally disadvantaged jobseeker.

10 Tiffany, Cowan and Tiffany, op. cit., pp. 110-111.

11 Ibid., p. 109.
This would include members of farm families who earned less than $1,200 annually, and those working below their skill capacities.

3. **MDTA training allowance** refers to a weekly stipend paid to trainees in lieu of unemployment compensation.

4. **Subsistence allowance** refers to a stipend paid to those trainees who had to move to the Abingdon, Virginia, area for training purposes. These trainees lived too far from the training facility to commute.

5. **MDTA Skill Center** refers to one which has met the criteria of the U. S. Office of Education and has been designated as a center by that office. As a center, it has a permanency not experienced by other Manpower training programs. A center is one which provides all services needed by the unemployed and underemployed.

6. **VEC** refers to the Virginia Employment Commission which was responsible for selection of trainees, placement of graduates, and payment of allowances.

7. **MDTA certificate** refers to a form of diploma awarded to graduates. The certificate included a designation of subjects studied and the number of hours in specific
areas of concentration. The certificate symbolized achievement in the field of business education.

8. Previous business education refers to business education courses which had been taken prior to entering the MDTA program. The courses may have been taken either in high school or post high school and may have influenced a trainee's decision to pursue additional business training. The specific subjects in this category are: Typing I, Typing II, Personal Typing, Bookkeeping I, Bookkeeping II, Business Machines, Business Arithmetic, Shorthand I, Shorthand II, Notehand, and Office Practice.

9. Appalachia refers to a "highland region which sweeps diagonally across ten states from northern Pennsylvania, Ohio, Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, Virginia, Tennessee, North Carolina, Alabama, and Georgia." West Virginia is the only state located entirely within the region, with the other nine states having only portions of their total area in the region.

10. Model refers to a compilation of validated instruments which may be used to assess the effectiveness

---

of MDTA clerk-stenographer programs in the ten-state Appalachian region.

**Limitations of the Study**

Appalachia is included in the title of the study as a limiting factor. It is a region apart from the rest of the United States—geographically and statistically. Its population is more than 50 percent rural. Many of the inhabitants are frequently deprived of the facilities and services of a modern society. Low income, lack of urbanization, deficiencies in education, and below-average living standards magnify the plight of the Appalachian people. Some of the population live with the problem of severe unemployment, and many have to live within the means of support provided by government subsidies through welfare payments.

In the construction of an evaluation model, it was necessary to make an application of the model components to a specific training center. The Abingdon, Virginia, Skill Center was selected for this purpose. This center was used because of its unique characteristics, and also because the researcher was a former teacher in this center and was informed on its programs.
The Abingdon center is located in the heart of Appalachia. It is unique in that it serves two key states in the Appalachian region. The Abingdon Center is recognized as one of the major MDTA programs in the state of Virginia which is making significant contributions to the education of the "disadvantaged." This center is a "natural" in terms of the objectives mandated by the MDTA legislation. The Abingdon MDTA offerings consisted of twelve vocational programs. The clerk-stenographer course has been considered one of the most successful programs taught. The teaching staff realized that a challenge existed in the attempt to assist the unemployed and underemployed to become more productive citizens through the process of education. A more detailed description of Appalachia and of the Abingdon center is given in Chapter IV.

The fact that the Abingdon center is unique in many respects is recognized. Consequently, the use of the Abingdon center for the tryout and refining of the model components must be considered as a limitation of the study.
In addition to the limitation just described, the remaining limitations were as follows:

1. The model tryout was limited to graduates of the Abingdon, Virginia, MDTA Skill Center clerk-stenographer programs.

2. The model tryout was limited to 118 graduates of the Abingdon, Virginia, MDTA Skill Center clerk-stenographer programs for the academic years 1965 through 1971.

3. The model tryout was limited to 25 employers who have hired training-related graduates from the Abingdon, Virginia, MDTA Skill Center clerk-stenographer programs for the academic years 1965 through 1971.

4. The model tryout was limited in part to objectives perceived by the administration and clerk-stenographer teaching staff of the Abingdon MDTA Skill Center.

Presentation of the Study

This study is presented in the following sequences:

In Chapter I, the introduction, the problem, background and need for the study, definition of terms, and limitations of the study are presented.
In Chapter II, a review of related research is given.

In Chapter III, an explanation of the procedures for conducting the study is presented.

In Chapter IV, the setting for the preliminary tryout of the model is described.

In Chapter V, the application of the preliminary model to trial center is presented.

In Chapter VI, the findings, conclusions, and recommendations are presented.

In Chapter VII, a summarization of the model concept and compilation of all instruments which constitute an "Evaluation Packet for MDTA Clerk-Stenographer Programs" are included.
CHAPTER II

RELATED RESEARCH

The purpose of this chapter was to review related research pertaining to the present investigation. The emphasis was placed on the evaluation of manpower programs. Special attention was given to general evaluation studies which were conducted since the passage of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 and to relevant follow-up studies.

The area of Manpower training research is diverse. Federal monies which have been authorized for the examination of Manpower programs have been quite extensive. A comprehensive search was made of the literature published during the last ten years on the subject of "Manpower Training." Five studies were chosen for review in this chapter because of their close relevancy to and their implications for the present study.
The Squires Study

The objective of the study by Squires was to set up an instrument for evaluation through use of quantitative reporting, qualitative analysis, and supporting descriptive narrative comprehensive data for use in assessing the MDTA Institutional Training projects. The instrument was developed within the Arizona State Department of Vocational Education to assist federal and state administrators to appraise such programs and to assist local programs in their decision-making processes.

Thirteen major guidelines for conducting an evaluation were included in the report. They were: (1) program development; (2) trainees; (3) instructional staff; (4) curriculum; (5) supervision and administration; (6) facilities; (7) equipment; (8) supplies; (9) methods; (10) instructor training; (11) guidance and counseling; (12) placement and follow-up; and (13) evaluation.

---

Relationship to the present study.--The Squires study is directly related to the present study in that both deal with essentially the same factors to be evaluated in Manpower programs. The Squires evaluation system was designed for general use in all MDTA vocational programs in Arizona. The components of the present study were specifically designed for clerk-stenographer programs in the ten-state Appalachian region with an intensive emphasis on trainee and employer perceptions of training.

The Olympus Report

The Manpower Administration of the U. S. Department of Labor and the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare jointly undertook an overall evaluation of the MDTA program in 1970. The Olympus Report is a summary of one section of that evaluation, an evaluation of the Skills Center concept.

The MDTA Skills Center is described as:

An institution established under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, that is a centralized, self-contained facility, operating on a continuous prime-time basis, generally under public supervision or control and

---

especially designed to provide institutional training, guidance, and counseling, and supportive services to individuals referred to the Skills Center under the provisions of the MDTA.³

The evaluation was based on visits to 19 Skills Centers which were selected by the Office of Education in cooperation with the Manpower Administration. The 19-center sample included a variety of labor markets and was located in 16 states--four in the East, four in the South, five in the Midwest, and three in the West.⁴ The Abingdon, Virginia, MDTA Skill Center was one of the 19 centers included in the evaluation. Both rural and urban centers were represented in the sample. The assignment of the Office of Education to the Olympus Research Corporation was to evaluate the Skills Center concept. Its mission was not to pass judgment upon each respective center. The overall purposes of the evaluation were to (1) determine the capability of the Skills Centers as they are conceptualized to meet the training needs of disadvantaged enrollees, and (2) to ascertain how near in practice existing centers approach the desired

³Ibid., p. 1.

⁴Ibid., p. 2.
The charge given the evaluators by the Office of Education was to:

1. Assess the effectiveness of Skills Centers in preparing the disadvantaged for employment.

2. Identify and examine administrative and operational problems of broad scope and general applicability which might seriously impede Skills Center effectiveness.

3. Determine those components and characteristics of Skills Centers which are particularly effective and which should be considered for replication.

Major findings.—The evaluation revealed several contributions of the Skills Center concept, and the report gave these conclusions:

1. Unique program: Skills Centers are one of the few training institutions which are capable and willing to provide disadvantaged adults with skill training. The programs are supported by remedial education, related education, counseling and other related services, which are all necessary prerequisites to a more complete education.

2. Experimental program: Skills Centers have been very innovative in developing new avenues for making institutional training more palatable to the disadvantaged student.

---

5Ibid., p. 3.

6Ibid.
The open-entry/open-exit system and the cluster approach are two examples of the experimental programs.

3. Telescoping of training time: Skills Centers have demonstrated with intensified short courses that it is possible to train individuals with entry-level skills in considerably less time than it takes in most vocational institutions.

Several major operating problems were also included in the report. These were identified as being serious problems which have emerged in practice, though they were not inherent in the concept. Some common problems mentioned were: (1) staff benefits; (2) management information; (3) adequacy of facilities; (4) need for assistance in developing curriculum materials; (5) need for more specialized training programs in specific teaching techniques; (6) need for technical assistance in the field of guidance and counseling; and (7) need for resolution of conflicts between Employment Service and Skills Center staff.

Relationship to the present study.—One of the major functions of the Olympus Report and of the present study was to assess the effectiveness of the Skills Center in preparing the disadvantaged for employment. An examination of the characteristics of enrollees and their status
prior to entering training was also a part of both studies. Placement and job-retention rates were also integral aspects of both research endeavors. The present study was designed specifically to set up a model that could be used by clerk-stenographer programs in the ten-state Appalachian region and used one center as a basis for the model formulation. The Olympus study involved 19 centers, which were located throughout the country. The Olympus Report was not concerned with the development of a model for evaluation.

The Main Study

The basic objective of the Main study was to learn what effects MDTA institutional job-training courses had on income and employment.7

The procedure in the study included a representative nationwide sample of approximately 1,200 former trainees in numerous vocational areas. Interviews were conducted early in 1966 (over a year after the trainees had ended their courses) to get their perceptions of the programs and employment status. A partially matched control group of

925 individuals who were employed at the time the trainees entered training were also interviewed. In addition, 136 persons who had been referred to the vocational training but failed to participate were also interviewed. A comparison of the sample groups, using multiple regression analysis to control the effects of ten factors other than training, was made to determine the effects of training.

**Major findings.**—Several findings were revealed. The most conclusive ones are stated here:

1. Between 13 and 23 percent of the full-time employment experienced after training was attributable to the MDT Act.

2. The training assisted the graduates with obtaining more full-time employment, but it had little effect upon obtaining better-paying jobs.

3. The majority of trainees evaluated their training as favorable.

**Relationship to the present study.**—In the construction of a model for evaluating MDTA clerk-stenographer programs in the Appalachian region, it was necessary to include components of graduates and employers' perceptions of training. A secondary objective of the present study
was to determine whether the Abingdon, Virginia, MDTA clerk-stenographer programs provided training commensurate with qualifications for employment.

The Main study has a direct relationship to the present study in that both include an objective of learning what effects MDTA institutional job-training centers had on income and employment. The Main study involved participants representative of a national sampling of diverse occupational areas. The scope of the present study was much more restrictive. The instruments that constitute the model were designed for use by a center in evaluating only one program in that center. However, "income" and "employment" are factors of major importance in that evaluation.

Follow-Up Studies

Reports on two relevant follow-up studies of MDTA trainees are included, since the present study incorporates both a follow-up of graduates and interviews of selected employers.

The London Study

The London study revealed the outcomes of an eighteen-months follow-up of both pre-training and post-training conditions, experiences and growth of 518 MDTA
ex-trainees. The ex-trainees had completed a training program in one of 51 various classes in 19 different occupations from October 1, 1964, through September 30, 1965, at Kansas City, St. Louis, or Joplin, Missouri.8

The purpose of the study was to answer the following specific questions as accurately and as objectively as possible:

1. What has been the personal, educational, and family backgrounds of the ex-trainees? Where did they reside prior to training, and where have they resided since?

2. What has been the employment and unemployment record of those ex-trainees prior to training; in what occupations were they employed at the time of the three interviews; and how was their employment related to the training received?

3. How well were these ex-trainees doing in the occupations for which they were trained, or others in which they might be employed, in comparison with others similarly employed, as determined by ratings supplied by their employers?

4. What did these ex-trainees earn in their original placements following training, and what were they earning at the time of the three subsequent contacts?

5. What observable changes have taken place, if any, in the modes of living of the ex-trainees following training?

---

6. What suggestions have the ex-trainees and their employers, and what suggestions can be implied from the facts for improving the counseling, training and placement services provided the unemployed in order to better prepare them for satisfactory employment?

7. What likelihood is there that these people will pay income taxes during their normal working lives in sufficient amounts to compensate for their training, and what savings will accrue through reductions in welfare payments by reason of the training and placement provided?9

The data for the study were secured from established records in the state and local offices of the Employment Security, public schools in the three cities, the State Department of Education, and the State Division of Welfare. An interview schedule was used in contacting the ex-trainees six, twelve, and eighteen months following completion of training. The study also involved an employee rating form that was completed by the employers following each of the interviews.

The data were punched on IBM cards and analyzed on a computer at the University of Missouri, Columbia.

9Ibid., pp. 1-2.
Major findings.—A number of findings were listed in the study. Some of the more significant ones were:

1. Approximately 75 percent of the trainees had been classified as primary wage earners prior to enrollment.

2. The trainees had accrued an educational attainment ranging from fourth grade through two years of college. Very few trainees had been enrolled in any type of basic education under MDTA.

3. Some form of welfare had been paid to 21.4 percent of the trainees for an average of 14.8 months some time during the 18 months preceding training.

4. The occupational background of parents varied. Skilled, semi-skilled, unskilled or farm workers were reported for most of the fathers; most of the mothers worked in domestic, personal service, semi-skilled or unskilled occupations.

5. The work record for the trainees prior to training was both erratic and irregular.

6. Earnings prior to training ranged from 60 cents an hour to $3.50 an hour, as reported by trainees.

7. The Employment Security service and personal contacts were the two chief means of seeking employment by the trainees after training.
8. A considerable amount of unemployment was still prevalent after trainees had developed a marketable skill.

9. Employers reported the mean of the highest wage paid for the first, second, and third six-months periods as $1.63, $1.82, and $1.95, respectively.

10. Employers rated most of the ex-trainees as average workers or above on ten job-related factors. Some were rated below average, but more received a superior rating than an inferior rating.

**Relationship to the present study.**—The London study examined the personal and educational backgrounds of ex-trainees; the employment record of the trainees prior to training; the occupations in which graduates were employed at the time interviews were held or the questionnaires were submitted; how their employment was related to the training received; job success as rated by employers; original earnings prior to training and subsequent earnings; and perceptions from trainees and employers regarding training improvement possibilities. These were also factors included in the evaluation model resulting from the present study.

The London study was conducted in a large metropolitan area including 51 different classes in 19 different occupations. The present investigation was confined to a
rural area and included the MDTA clerk-stenographer graduates from nine different contract sections for the academic years 1965-1971. The data for the present study were obtained through means of questionnaires from graduates and through personal interviews with 25 employers of these clerk-stenographer graduates. As mentioned in the preceding paragraph, these data provided the framework for the development of an evaluation model.

Utah Research Coordinating Unit Study

The purpose of the Utah Research Coordinating Unit study was to evaluate the effectiveness of programs as they have been conducted in the school districts of Utah.\(^\text{10}\)

The study sought answers to the following questions:

1. To what extent have the graduates of the MDTA programs been able to find jobs? Were the jobs in the field of training or in closely related fields? How many different jobs has the graduate had since training? How did they locate their jobs?

2. Was the length of training adequate according to the graduate? Would they like additional training in the same field or a different field?

\(^{10}\)Follow-Up of Selected MDTA Programs (Salt Lake City, Utah: Utah Research Coordinating Unit for Vocational and Technical Education, 1970).
3. What was the opinion of the employers who had hired MDTA graduates toward their training?\(^{11}\)

The primary sources of data used in the study were:

(1) An information form which was mailed to 105 of the graduates from seven different programs; and (2) an information form sent to the employers of the MDTA graduates who responded and were employed at the time of the survey.

**Major findings.**--The usable responses from a third of the graduates and half the employers found the training to be effective. The report recommends active placement efforts by the Employment Security office near the end of each training period, and it states that a more effective means of follow-up than mailed questionnaires should be utilized.

**Relationship to the present study.**--The Utah study examined relevant factors to evaluate the effectiveness of MDTA programs in terms of graduates' job success and employer and trainee attitudes through means of mailed questionnaires. The present investigation also designed a mailed questionnaire for the graduates of clerk-stenographer programs as

\(^{11}\)Ibid., p. 2.
part of the evaluation model at the Abingdon, Virginia, MDTA Skill Center; however, the interview method was used with employers. Both studies sought answers to similar questions. The Utah study was confined to trainees for that particular state, and the present study was confined to the Virginia center.

Additional references are listed in the bibliography.

**Summary**

This study differs from the previous studies on the evaluation of MDTA programs in the following ways:

1. It was limited to the clerk-stenography program.

   No previous study has concentrated on this specific area.

2. It was limited to the Appalachian area which encompasses characteristics that are unique and different from other sections of the United States.

3. Its major purpose was not to collect data related to a specific program and to evaluate that program, although this was achieved as a process in the study; but it sought to develop a model which might be used by any MDTA training center in the Appalachian region to evaluate its program.
CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

The purpose of this study, as stated in Chapter I, was to establish a model that may be used in the evaluation of MDTA Skill Center clerk-stenographer programs for the region known as Appalachia. In the construction of a model, it was necessary to make an analysis of the components and an application of the model components to a specific training center. The Abingdon, Virginia, MDTA Center was chosen as the tryout center because of its location in the heart of the Appalachian region, and because of the researcher's familiarity with the center. Since all components of the model were applied to the tryout center, an evaluation of that center also resulted from the study. This evaluation thus became a secondary, but none the less, important outcome.
Method of the Study

The design of this study is basically a descriptive empirical type of survey and follow-up research. The survey was conducted through questionnaires and personal interviews.

The sequence of activities for the completion of the study is described in this chapter.

Review of literature

The review of literature included an emphasis on the general evaluation of Manpower programs and relevant follow-up studies. The review was made specifically to determine the present status of evaluative methods being utilized in MDTA programs. Special concern was given to those studies which involved evaluation and follow-up of MDTA business programs.

A search of the literature for the past ten years was made. The major sources utilized for the literature review were as follows: Datrix, University Microfilms System; Current Index to Journals of Education (CIJE); Research in Education (RIE); and Business Education Index.

Authorization to conduct study

Several agencies are involved with the training of the unemployed and underemployed. The joint efforts by the
Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, with their respective counterparts, are combined in the MDTA program in order that the training objective may be realized. Recognizing the complexity of MDTA's organizational structure, the writer contacted the following individuals by letter (Appendix A) to secure authorization to conduct this study:

Mr. Cleve E. Loman, Virginia State Director of Manpower Training;

Mr. Greever E. Witten, Manager, Virginia Employment Commission, Bristol;

Mr. Frank E. Ryburn, Director, Abingdon Skill Center.

At the time the letters of authorization were submitted, the major goal of the study had not been fully determined. The model concept was added to the study subsequent to having obtained the letters of authorization. This accounts for the discrepancy that exists between the purpose of the study as stated in this report and that given in the letters seeking authorization.
Determining objectives
Model Component I

A major component of the model formulation was to seek answers to Question 1, "Is there a consistency between the objectives of the program as promulgated by proponents of the MDT Act and the objectives of the program as perceived by the state administration, center administration, teaching staff, and trainees?" The data for this phase of the study were obtained in the following manner:

1. Request to state directors regarding MDTA objectives attached to instruments to be validated (Appendix B);

2. Request to Abingdon Center administration and teaching staff through personal interviews;

3. Request to trainees regarding MDTA objectives included in the follow-up questionnaire (Appendix B).

Characteristics of trainees
Model Component II

A visitation was made to the Abingdon Skill Center and the Bristol VEC office to obtain the following: (1) names and addresses of the clerk-stenographer graduates for the academic years 1965-1971; and (2) information required for the profile of the MDTA clerk-stenographer
graduates as reported in Chapter V of this study. It was necessary to analyze the records of the graduates in order that the follow-up questionnaires could be submitted to those trainees who had completed MDTA contractual programs.

The profile was completed to reveal answers to Question 2 of the model, "Is the program reaching those trainees which the MDTA was designed to serve, and has the training achieved the objectives as identified in the Act?"

This phase of the study provides the data necessary to compare the status of the trainees prior to training with that at a point after the termination of training.

The data for the profile were compiled manually. The statistical analysis for this phase of the study involved mean, median, and percentages.

**Graduates evaluation of training**

**Model Component III**

A search of the literature was made for evaluation instruments which had been developed for determining program effectiveness. This search resulted in an instrument which had been developed by the Center for Vocational and Technical Education at The Ohio State University being modified for use in the present study. The questionnaire, "A Follow-Up Survey of Former MDTA Graduates," is shown in
its revised form in Appendix B. Eight questions (numbers 28 through 35) were added to acquire additional insight regarding perceptions of training from graduates.

The questionnaire was designed to answer Question 3 of the model, "How do graduates assess major aspects of MDTA clerk-stenographer programs pertaining to training received?" The instrument described was designed to obtain data pertaining to such facets of training as adequacy of preparation for jobs, earnings since terminating training, and assessment of personnel involved in training.

**Employers' evaluation of training**

**Model Component IV**

To secure employer opinions of the MDTA clerk-stenographer programs, an instrument developed for the London project was modified for use with the present study. As described in Chapter II, the London study gathered information regarding employer perceptions of such facets of training as the following: interest in work, quality of work, overall promise as an employee, and favorable and unfavorable characteristics observed in MDTA graduates.

Since the present study was also concerned with employers' evaluation of a vocational education program, the instrument developed for the London project proved to
be useful in gathering data for the present study. However, the instrument was modified to conform to its workability for MDTA clerk-stenographer programs in the ten-state Appalachian region. Permission was granted by Dr. H. H. London at the University of Missouri and by the Department of Labor (Appendix A) for the inclusion of the interview form in the present study. The modified instrument "Employee Rating Form for Use in Evaluating MDTA Graduates" appears in Appendix B. The questionnaire was designed to answer Question 4 of the model, "How do employers of MDTA graduates assess the quality of training received through the clerk-stenographer programs?"

Validating committees

The MDTA graduate questionnaire and the employer interview form were submitted to the state directors of the MDTA ten-state Appalachian region for validation purposes. This jury of experts was chosen because the evaluation process is inherent within the scope of their overall objective as administrators of the various state programs; also, their aid in validating the instruments assured the compatibility of these components of the model. The names and exact titles of the directors were taken from the
Educational Directory. A letter (sample, Appendix C) was mailed to each of the ten state directors on June 26, 1972, requesting their participation in the study. The follow-up questionnaire and the interview form (Appendix B) accompanied the letter. Directors were asked to make a determination as to which questions should be included in an evaluation model by using a Likert-type rating scale. The key for this purpose was as follows:

5—Of particular importance to the evaluation process
4—Of "above average" significance
3—Of "fair" value
2—Of some use to the evaluation process
1—Of no importance to evaluation process; should be eliminated from statements

Each question or part was analyzed according to the state directors' responses. The average of the respective questions or parts was determined. According to the compilation, no average was below 3; therefore, no question or part was eliminated. One state director did suggest that a distinction be made in question 34 of the follow-up form as to whether the question should refer to the state employment counselor or the MDTA school counselor. An attachment was made to the above instruments regarding characteristics of trainees prior to training. (Appendix B) The state directors were asked to check whether such information
should be included in a model for evaluation. The characteristics phase of the model was retained as determined by a majority of the validating committee.

The MDTA directors in Georgia and Tennessee had returned the validated instruments by July 17, 1972. Correspondence was received from the Virginia director on June 30 requesting extended time to complete the validation process. Personal telephone calls were made on July 18 to those state directors who had not returned the instruments. This resulted in an 80 percent return.

**Pre-testing instruments**

After the validated instruments were analyzed, the questionnaires were refined and became components of the preliminary model. The follow-up questionnaire was then submitted to ten graduates of the Gate City, Virginia, clerk-stenographer program. Mr. Walter M. Stata, Director, Scott County Vocational Center, Gate City, gave verbal approval for his graduates to assist in the pre-testing. These graduates, whose names and employers appear in Appendix D, were visited personally and were asked to complete the questionnaire as a pre-test for interpretation purposes. Revisions for clarity were made on the basis of their reactions.
The employer interview form was submitted to representatives of two Columbus, Ohio, businesses to pre-test the instrument for interpretation. The names, titles, and companies represented appear in Appendix D. Revisions were made according to their reactions.

On the basis of pre-testing the instruments through graduates of the Gate City program and representatives from Columbus businesses, the instruments were refined to become two major parts of the preliminary model for evaluation. These are shown in final form in Chapter VII of this study.

Mailing of graduates' questionnaires

The revised follow-up questionnaires were mailed to Abingdon, Virginia, clerk-stenographer graduates on August 3, 1972, accompanied by a letter to explain the purpose of the survey. The letter appears in Appendix E. This phase of the study included 118 graduates who had been certified as clerk-stenographers by the Abingdon Center for the academic years 1965-71. The Watts telephone system at the Virginia Employment Commission was used to contact those graduates who failed to return the questionnaire.

A total of 74 responses (63 per cent of 118) were returned. The data from these returns are analyzed in Chapter V.
Interviewing MDTA employers

Twenty-five employers of MDTA graduates were interviewed. These employers were chosen from lists compiled by the VEC and the Abingdon Center on the basis of the diversified employment opportunities offered to MDTA graduates. The employers were representative of diverse facets of the business world to include educational, professional, manufacturing, and other concerns. Interviews were conducted within a 100-mile radius of the Abingdon Center. A listing of the employers is included in Appendix F.

The data for the personal interviews are analyzed in Chapter V. The personal interviews were made to gain employers' perceptions of the Abingdon clerk-stenographer training programs and to try out one of the major components of the model.

Analysis of the data

The completed follow-up questionnaires and interview forms were classified according to the trainees' year of graduation. The data were coded and compiled manually by the researcher.
The objectives were analyzed by taking the free responses and correlating them with the objectives mandated by the MDTA legislation.

The statistical techniques applied to the data were frequency distributions and medians. The presentation and interpretation of the data are given in Chapter V.

The findings, conclusions, and recommendations are presented in Chapter VI. A summarization of the model concept and compilation of the instruments which constitute an "Evaluation Packet for MDTA Clerk-Stenographer Programs in Appalachia" is included in Chapter VII.
CHAPTER IV

SETTING FOR PRELIMINARY TRYOUT OF MODEL

This chapter presents the rationale for Manpower training, location and MDTA offerings of the tryout center, and the clerk-stenographer curriculum and standards of the tryout center.

Rationale for Manpower Training

Writers of the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) suggest that the more rapidly our economy advances, the more rapidly skills become obsolete. Even though training is already being carried on by public educational authorities, assisted by the federal government's vocational education program and by private schools, legislators feel that combined federal, state, and local efforts fall far short of the total need. Without some form of additional intensive nationwide program to provide the opportunities for training, thousands of worthy men and women will never be able to obtain skills which will enable
them to support themselves and contribute to the nation's productivity.¹

The MDTA has established a program to fill this need. Title I--Manpower Requirements, Development, and Utilization, Sec. 101 states:

The Congress finds that there is critical need for more and better trained personnel in many vital occupational categories, including professional, scientific, technical, and apprenticeable categories; that even in periods of high unemployment, many employment opportunities remain unfilled because of the shortages of qualified personnel; and that it is in the national interest that current and prospective manpower shortages be identified and that persons who can be qualified for these positions through education and training be sought out and trained in order that the Nation may meet the staffing requirements of the struggle for freedom . . . that many persons now unemployed or underemployed, in order to become qualified for reemployment or full employment, must be assisted in providing themselves with skills which are or will be in demand in the national interest . . . that the opportunity to acquire new skills be afforded to these people in order to alleviate the hardships of unemployment compensation and public assistance, and to increase the nation's productivity and its capacity to meet the requirements of the space age.²


On the basis of the preceding rationale, the justification for MDTA Centers was realized.

Location and MDTA Offerings of Tryout Center

The Abingdon Manpower Training Skill Center is located on U. S. Route 11 at the east limit of the town of Abingdon, Virginia, in the extreme southwest section of the state. Situated in the heart of Appalachia and bordered by the states of Kentucky and Tennessee, the Center has provided a stimulant, through education, for a large number of the area's inhabitants. The providing of Manpower training at Abingdon for those who were unemployed and underemployed is assumed to have greatly enhanced the economic status of its trainees, and, in addition, to have achieved certain intangible social outcomes.

The MDTA offerings of the Center include twelve vocational areas: auto mechanics, basic education, building maintenance, certified medical laboratory assistant, clerk-stenographer, clerk-typist, cook, diesel mechanics, machine shop, office machine repair, offset printing, and welding.

The local Bristol VEC office is responsible for the screening and selection of trainees for the Abingdon center. Table 2 provides basic descriptive data on MDTA training for
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. Training Projects Started</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Training Positions Authorized</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>3147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Trainees Enrolled</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>3069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Training Positions Unused (Lost)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% &quot;Lost&quot; Positions</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Trainees Completing Training Objective</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>2198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Dropouts</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Dropouts to Authorized Positions</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Dropouts to Enrollment</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Efficiency in Meeting Planned Objective (Completions Vs. Authorized Positions)</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Preliminary Figures

the period 1963-1969 and for which the Bristol local office had jurisdiction. The table summarizes the total program effort administered by Bristol personnel and reflects data for the Abingdon Center, as well as two other satellite programs.

Table 3 reports data regarding "MDTA Activity in Virginia by Fiscal Year 1963 - 1969." The table reports, as one of the major categories, the number of training projects started statewide for those years. The data are reflective of the typical MDTA total program effort of each of the ten states in the Appalachian region. The information contained in these two tables was furnished by the VEC Research, Statistics, and Information Division of the Virginia Employment Commission, Richmond.

**Clerk-Stenographer Curriculum and Standards**

The MDTA trainees who were enrolled in the Abingdon, Virginia, clerk-stenographer program were generally required to complete the curriculum described below. The respective number of hours designate the total hours offered to the MDTA trainee as a prerequisite to certification from the Center.
TABLE 3

MDTA Activity in Virginia by Fiscal Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. Training Projects Started</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Training Positions Authorized</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>1387</td>
<td>2269</td>
<td>2606</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>1601</td>
<td>2513</td>
<td>13005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Trainees Enrolled</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>1302</td>
<td>2243</td>
<td>2439</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>2765</td>
<td>12893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Training Positions Unused (Lost)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% &quot;Lost&quot; Positions</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Trainees Completing Training Objective</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>1583</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td>2057</td>
<td>9412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Dropouts</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>3481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Dropouts to Authorized Positions</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Dropouts to Enrollment</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Efficiency In Meeting Planned Objective (Completions Vs. Authorized Positions)</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Level<sup>b</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obligated State Funds by Fiscal Year</td>
<td>$506,713</td>
<td>$1,431,529</td>
<td>$3,066,724</td>
<td>$3,594,857</td>
<td>$2,589,202</td>
<td>$2,385,158</td>
<td>$2,518,611</td>
<td>$16,092,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Obtained from Unallocated Account</td>
<td>135,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59,200</td>
<td>74,500</td>
<td>54,827</td>
<td>251,203</td>
<td>305,875</td>
<td>880,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Obtained from Supplement Requests</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,399</td>
<td>87,865</td>
<td>614,911</td>
<td>716,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Funds Committed to Virginia</td>
<td>$641,913</td>
<td>$1,431,529</td>
<td>$3,125,924</td>
<td>$3,669,357</td>
<td>$2,657,428</td>
<td>$2,724,226</td>
<td>$3,439,397</td>
<td>$17,689,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per Trainee Enrolled</td>
<td>$964</td>
<td>$1,099</td>
<td>$1,394</td>
<td>$1,504</td>
<td>$1,455</td>
<td>$1,650</td>
<td>$1,244</td>
<td>$1,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per Trainee Completing Training Objective</td>
<td>$1,313</td>
<td>$1,561</td>
<td>$1,975</td>
<td>$2,079</td>
<td>$1,997</td>
<td>$2,162</td>
<td>$1,664</td>
<td>$1,879</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Preliminary

<sup>b</sup>Does not include CEF, OIC or coupled programs. Includes allowances and training costs.

30 hours Orientation--Included background of the MDTA program, expectations of trainees, how to progress in training program, and getting along with others

300 hours Typewriting

155 hours Business English and Word Studies

300 hours Shorthand and Transcription

20 hours Secretarial Practice

5 hours Job Orientation

10 hours Keeping Financial Records

20 hours Arithmetic Refresher

80 hours Office Machines--Included 10-key adding machine, rotary calculator, full-key adding machine, office duplication, Dictaphone, and introduction to automation or pegboard method of keeping payroll

Optimum standards of performance for the several phases of the course were as follows:

**Shorthand and Transcription.**—Ability to take normal office dictation at the rate of 100 to 120 words a minute for 3 minutes--ability to transcribe shorthand notes at 20 to 25 words a minute for 30 minutes with mailable copy.

**Typewriting.**—Ability to type from printed or legible handwritten copy at an average production rate of 45 to 60 standard 5-stroke words per minute or 150 to 200, 70-space lines an hour with no more than 15 to 20 acceptable corrected errors--ability to transcribe usable copy from recorded dictation at the rate of 30 words a minute--the ability to prepare three to five duplication media an hour and to operate stencil and spirit process duplicators with reasonable proficiency.
Occupational. -- Other clerical skills at competence level include ten-key and full-key adding listing machines; use of telephone; computational skills; account keeping; office reception; pegboard method of payroll preparation; correspondence filing and office records; preparation of business statements; and competency in human relations.  

The next chapter presents the data obtained from applying the survey models to the Abingdon Center--the try-out center.

---

3 Data supplied by the Manpower Training Service, State Department of Vocational Education, Richmond, Virginia.
APPLICATION OF PRELIMINARY MODEL TO TRYOUT CENTER

To evaluate and refine the model, it was necessary to apply the model components to a specific training center. As a result of this tryout, the study achieved a secondary outcome—determining whether the Abingdon, Virginia, MDTA clerk-stenographer programs provided training commensurate with qualifications for employment.

The four major questions to be answered appear in this chapter, with a presentation of the data obtained for each segment of the model when applied to the trial center.

Objectives—Model Component I

The first component of the model sought to answer the following question, "Is there a consistency between the objectives of the program as promulgated by proponents of the MDT Act and the objectives of the program as perceived by the state administration, center administration, teaching staff, and trainees?" The data for this phase of the study were gathered from the eight state directors through
correspondence and from the two center administrators and two teachers through personal interviews. Data concerning objectives as perceived by the 74 graduates were obtained through a follow-up questionnaire.

A synthesis of the open-type responses is presented.

State Administration

Georgia

1. To provide entry-level vocational training to unemployed and underemployed persons from disadvantaged backgrounds.

2. To provide training services to meet the total needs of the disadvantaged.

3. To provide the trainee with a marketable or saleable skill.

Kentucky

1. To provide workers with new skills where needed, to upgrade their present skills and to meet the job needs of workers displaced by automation, technological changes, geographic relocation of industry, and shifts in labor market demands.
North Carolina

1. To help the individual gain the attitudes, habits, knowledge, and skill necessary to become employed and advance on the job.

Ohio

1. To provide training, retraining, and basic education for persons referred to training by the employment service or other agencies representing the Secretary of Labor.

2. To deal with the problems of workers facing job displacement; the special problems of the hard-core unemployed; problems of other unemployed and underemployed; and the emergence of skill shortages in certain occupations.

Pennsylvania

None submitted

Tennessee

1. To take the disadvantaged person where he is and help him to analyze his abilities and interests and expose him to the information, guidance, and skill training that he needs to reach a self-determined life goal.
Virginia

1. To relieve unemployment caused by automation, shifts in market demands, employment trends and other economic changes, and to provide training opportunities for the disadvantaged persons in Virginia.

West Virginia

1. To teach enrollees the basic skills.

2. To teach enrollees the knowledge or abilities requisite to satisfactory job performance in the occupation for which training is given.

Center Administration

1. To train the unemployed and underemployed for entry-level jobs in their respective chosen vocational areas. The program seems to be a wise investment of government monies.

2. To assist those who cannot further their education through their own support and to relieve demands made on the labor market for skilled personnel.
Abingdon Teaching Staff

The teaching staff for the clerical programs at the Abingdon, Virginia, MDTA Training Skill Center perceived the major objectives of Manpower Training as being fourfold. The following objectives were provided by the teaching staff:

1. To provide an opportunity for an education for underprivileged persons who normally can't afford to attend school.

2. To assist students in their development of a particular interest or field.

3. To prove to students that they can be leaders, and that they can and must get along with co-workers.

4. To show the student that there is a place in the world for him and that he can contribute to this world.

Clerk-Stenographer Graduates

The Abingdon, Virginia, MDTA clerk-stenographer graduates submitted numerous statements with regard to their perceptions of the objectives of Manpower training. Among these were the following:

1. To prepare young and old alike for employment.

2. To improve self-confidence.
3. To give the student a better knowledge and understanding of the business world and the ability to find a better job.

4. To provide those students who cannot afford proper training for employment the opportunity to obtain a skill for seeking employment.

5. To qualify fully a person to obtain and keep a job.

6. To train self-motivated persons in order to achieve personal goals in business, whether it be money, or whatever, and to teach them to pace their ability to the highest degree practical.

7. To develop skills and to upgrade skills that presently exist.

8. To give training to those who cannot afford a college education and to decrease the unemployment rate.

9. To reach those who cannot obtain gainful employment to better equip them for today's job market.

10. To give willing and capable persons in a lower level income the chance to obtain technical experience and a lasting knowledge in vocational areas which will prepare that person for his chosen field.
11. To allow a person to achieve goals that will make him a more productive citizen.

12. To use the potential available in the many unemployed and underpaid employed people by training this particular group in fields that industry has many openings for. In training these people, they become working members of society, thereby improving their standard of living and providing our industries with badly needed well-trained workers.

13. To make the unemployed and underemployed more employable.

14. To educate students for jobs in their chosen vocation.

15. To train a person to be able to go out and make a decent living for his family—a good program that should be kept in existence.

16. To equip people with the education and confidence they must have to earn a living in this fast-moving world. Also, to help people from depending on the government for everything.

17. To prepare people for professional positions.

18. To help train for life in general.

19. To provide training for unskilled persons and to eliminate some of the poverty that now exists.
20. To train or retrain persons so that they will be qualified to seek competitive employment on a higher level than they were previously able to do before training.

Generalizations concerning the consistency of objectives as indicated by the various groups are presented in Chapter VI.

**Trainee Profile: Model Component II**

The inclusion of Component II served two purposes. The first purpose was to provide data to permit an answer to the question "Is the program reaching those trainees for which the MDTA was designed?" The second purpose was to gather data on the status of the trainees at the time they entered the program so as to make it possible, at a later point in the study, to attempt to answer the question "has the training achieved the objectives as identified in the Act?"

**Age**

The age distribution of the Abingdon, Virginia, clerk-stenographer trainees at the beginning of their program is reported in Table 4. The three age group classifications show that 81.3 per cent of the trainees were in the younger
group. The median age was 19, and the range was from 17 to 44.

Of the 118 graduates who were included in the study and for whom records were available at the VEC and the Center, 117 were female.

**TABLE 4**

**AGE DISTRIBUTION OF 118 ABINGDON, VIRGINIA, MDTA CLERK-STENOGRAPHERS AT BEGINNING OF TRAINING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 - 25</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>The median age of clerk-stenographer trainees was 19.

**Primary wage earners**

The data given in Table 5 indicates that 63 MDTA clerk-stenographer graduates, 53.4 per cent of the 118, could be classified as primary wage earners prior to MDTA training.
According to the Ohio Employment Commission, a primary wage earner is one who is responsible for earning the livelihood of his family.

### TABLE 5

**NUMBER OF MDTA CLERK-STENOGRAPHER TRAINEES BY AGE DISTRIBUTION WHO WERE PRIMARY WAGE EARNERS PRIOR TO TRAINING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>17 - 25</th>
<th>26 - 34</th>
<th>35 - 44</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number in age group</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number primary wage earners</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent primary wage earners</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below poverty level

Table 6 was designed to show the number of graduates who were classified by the VEC as being in the "below poverty level" category. The data is shown for each of the nine clerk-stenographer contracts funded for the Abingdon Center from 1965 through 1971. The number of trainees in each respective section is included with a "Yes" or "No" indication regarding the below poverty level status.
The data reveal that approximately the same percentage were included in the below poverty level classification as were not. There were no records available at the VEC or the Abingdon Skill Center for this phase of the profile for 32 clerk-stenographer trainees.

**TABLE 6**

**NUMBER OF MDTA CLERK-STENOGRAPHER TRAINEES WHO WERE BELOW POVERTY LEVEL BY FUNDED CONTRACT SECTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funded Contract Section</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Below Poverty Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5047</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7014</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8006 - I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8006 - II</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9026</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0009</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008.006</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total per cent</strong></td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Educational background**

Table 7 reports the educational level attained by the 118 graduates of the Abingdon MDTA clerk-stenographer program prior to their MDTA training. The table shows that 9.3 percent had attended college two years or less, 89 percent had completed high school but terminated their education at that...
### TABLE 7

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF 118 MDTA CLERK-STENOGRAPHER TRAINEES PRIOR TO TRAINING
BY FUNDED CONTRACT SECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>Contract Sections</th>
<th>2008. Total</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I 5047</td>
<td>II 8006</td>
<td>006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th grade or less</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School graduate&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8 6 13 16 11 8 11 10</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years of college or less</td>
<td>3 2 1 2 2 1 11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>23 11 6 15 17 12</td>
<td>11 118</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Includes GED
point, and 1.7 per cent had not completed high school and had an 11th grade or less education.

Marital status

Table 8 reflects the marital status of the 118 MDTA clerk-stenographers as reported at the time they entered the Manpower training program at Abingdon. Since marital status and family income are factors in determining whether trainees meet the prescribed eligibility requirements for training allowances, it is possible that the responses stated are somewhat biased, and that more were married than so reported.

| MARITAL STATUS OF 118 ABINGDON, VIRGINIA, MDTA CLERK-STENOGRAPHERS PRIOR TO TRAINING |
|----------------------------------|--------|------|
| No. Per Cent                      |        |      |
| Married                          | 19     | 16.1 |
| Single                           | 74     | 62.7 |
| Widowed                          | 1      | .9   |
| Divorced                         | 15     | 12.7 |
| Separated                        | 9      | 7.6  |
| Total                            | 118    | 100.0 |
Dependents

The number of dependents of MDTA clerk-stenographer graduates from the Abingdon Center prior to training is indicated in Table 9. The graduates had an average of .5 dependents when their training was begun.

**TABLE 9**

**NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS OF 118 MDTA CLERK-STENOGRAPHERS PRIOR TO TRAINING BY FUNDED CONTRACT SECTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funded Contract Section</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Number of Dependents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5047</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7014</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8006 - I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8006 - II</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9026</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0009</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008.006</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>118</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Earnings of clerk-stenographer graduates prior to entering MDTA training at Abingdon

Table 10 shows the highest wages earned per hour by 40 MDTA clerk-stenographer graduates prior to training. These wages were reported to the VEC by the trainees when
their initial training was started. The earnings ranged from 50 cents per hour to $2.50 per hour, with an equal representation in the category 61 cents to $1.00 per hour and the category $1.51 to $1.75 per hour.

Unfortunately, pre-training wage data could not be obtained on a larger number of graduates. The absence of wage data on 78 trainees may be due to such reasons as (1) many of the graduates, especially in the younger age classification, had never been employed; (2) the VEC representative failed to indicate such information on the "characteristics of trainees" form when the trainee was enrolled; or (3) the trainees unwillingness to reveal this information. Since the data did not report any trainees as having never earned wages, it is conceivable that there were some in this category; thus, the wage picture prior to training was more depressed than the table shows.

The wage sample includes only one-third of the total number of graduates. However, as far as the researcher was able to determine, there was no reason to suspect that if similar data had been received on a larger number of graduates that the wage pattern reported would have been changed materially for those that had been employed.
TABLE 10

WAGES EARNED ON FULL-TIME JOBS HELD BY ABINGDON MDTA CLERK-STENOGRAPHERS PRIOR TO TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Wage Received (Per Hour)</th>
<th>Number Receiving Wage</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under .60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.61 - 1.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.01 - 1.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.26 - 1.50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.51 - 1.75</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.76 - 2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.01 - 2.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.26 - 2.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 40a</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aNo data available for 78 graduates

Recipients of training allowances

A classification of the number of graduates who received regular, transportation, and subsistence allowances during training is given in Table 11. The allowances varied, and amounts were dependent upon such factors as age, marital status, number of dependents, whether aid to dependent children was being received, and distance lived from the training
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funded Contract Section</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Regular Allowance</th>
<th>Transportation Allowance</th>
<th>Subsistence Allowance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5047</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7014</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8006 - I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8006 - II</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9026</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0009</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008.006</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>118</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per Cent of Total Graduates: 93.2  88.9  9.32
center. The minimum amount paid for a regular training allowance was $20 per week.

Of the 118 graduates included in the study, 93.2 per cent received a regular training allowance; 88.9 per cent received a transportation allowance; and 9.3 per cent received a subsistence allowance.

**Supplementary profile data**

Of the 118 graduates included in this study, none was physically handicapped at the time of training; only two were drawing any type of public assistance; and the work experience of MDTA graduates prior to training was concentrated in the areas of clerical, sales, and semi-skilled occupations.

The clerk-stenographer trainees had experienced multiple employment barriers. Such factors as the following had contributed to their being unemployed: age (too young or too old); lack of skill, experience, or obsolete skill; health problems; transportation problems, child care problems, personal problems; and others.
Trainee Evaluation: Model Component III

The third component of the model sought to answer several questions: How do graduates assess major aspects of the clerk-stenographer program pertaining to the training they received? What has been their employment experience since receiving training? What are their future educational expectations? The data from the tryout survey of Abingdon, Virginia, MDTA clerk-stenographer graduates are presented in this section.

As described on page 46 of the study, 118 MDTA graduate questionnaires were distributed. There were 74 returns, or 63 per cent; the data presented in the succeeding pages reflect the responses of these 74 graduates. See page 176 for copy of questionnaire.

Table 12 summarizes the responses given by the graduates to seven questions related to their perceptions of specific facets of training received at the Abingdon Center. The data are a compilation of the graduates' reactions to these questions. These reactions were obtained from response to questions 8, 18, 20, 31, 32, 33, and 34 of the follow-up survey.

Table 12 shows that of those graduates who had held full-time jobs since leaving MDTA 92 per cent believed that
TABLE 12
GRADUATES PERCEPTIONS REGARDING DIVERSE FACETS OF TRAINING RECEIVED AT ABINGDON CENTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions regarding perceptions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did this MDTA program prepare you adequately for your first full-time job after leaving the MDTA program? (N=63)</td>
<td>58 92</td>
<td>5 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were you satisfied with the vocational training you have received in the MDTA program? (N=74)</td>
<td>74 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you recommend the Clerk-Stenographer program to others? (N=74)</td>
<td>73 99</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the standards of the MDTA program too high? (N=74)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the MDTA business equipment adequate to prepare you for office employment? (N=74)</td>
<td>74 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel that your MDTA school counselor(s) were effective in working with you as a trainee? (N=74)</td>
<td>64 86</td>
<td>10 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel that the MDTA business teachers were qualified instructors? (N=74)</td>
<td>72 97</td>
<td>2 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N different since only 63 graduates had held full-time jobs.
the clerk-stenographer program had adequately trained them for their first full-time job. The graduates were unanimous in their satisfaction received in the MDTA course, the adequacy of the MDTA business equipment to train them for office employment, and in their belief that the standards of the program were not too high. Only one per cent of the graduates indicated that they would not recommend the clerk-stenographer program to others. The MDTA school counselors, as reported by 86 per cent of the graduates, were effective in working with them as trainees. Also, 97 per cent of the graduates felt that the MDTA business teachers were qualified instructors.

Employment status of graduates after completion of training

Since leaving the MDTA clerk-stenographer program, (question 1 of follow-up survey), 93 per cent of the graduates indicated that they have sought full-time employment (30 or more hours per week). Only 3 per cent of the graduates did not seek full-time employment. Those graduates who did not attempt to locate full-time work at the termination of training (question 2) indicated the following reasons:

a. Expected to enter another school
b. Housewife or about to be married
c. Wanted to work only part time
Eight per cent of the graduates (question 3) indicated they sought part-time employment (less than 30 hours per week) when the program was terminated. These graduates, as indicated in question 4, wanted part-time employment for the following reasons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Housewife or about to be married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Unable to find a full-time job</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 5 asked the graduate how many full-time jobs he had held since leaving the MDTA program. Data from the 74 graduates responding to the question are presented in Table 13.

**TABLE 13**

**NUMBER OF FULL-TIME JOBS HELD BY MDTA CLERK-STENOGRAPHER GRADUATES AFTER TRAINING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jobs Held</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 full-time job</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 full-time jobs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5 full-time jobs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 6 asked the graduate what his full-time job was after leaving the program. Table 14 shows a composite of responses submitted by MDTA graduates.

TABLE 14

TYPE OF FULL-TIME JOBS HELD BY MDTA GRADUATES AFTER TRAINING
(N=63)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Position</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk-Stenographer</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Clerk</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk-Typist</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Office</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keypunch Operator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashier</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptionist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Aide</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Teller</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Accounts Clerk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Clerk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garment Factory Worker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Emergency Room Clerk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory Control Clerk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Secretary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Clerk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graduates were asked in question 7 how closely their first full-time job after leaving the MDTA program related to the training they had received. The relation of the first post-training job is indicated in Table 15.
Sixty-two per cent of the graduates found employment upon completion of training in the occupation for which they were trained as reported by them; 20 per cent found employment in a related occupation; and 3 per cent were employed in unrelated occupations. Approximately 15 per cent were unemployed immediately following the training.

**TABLE 15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduates Employed In</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupation for which trained</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related occupation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrelated occupation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 13 asked those graduates who had held two or more jobs since completing training if their last job was related to the MDTA training. Of those who had held two or more jobs, 28 graduates indicated that their last job was related; 7 graduates indicated that their last job was not at all related to the training received.
Questions 9, 12, and 17 dealt with post-training wages earned by MDTA clerk-stenographer graduates. The graduates were asked their beginning hourly wage earned on their first full-time job, the most they had earned on a full-time job, and their present earning since leaving MDTA training. Table 16 indicates the summary of beginning wages and present earnings as reported by the graduates from the nine MDTA contractual programs at the Abingdon Center.

An examination of Table 16 reveals that the beginning wage for 52 per cent of the graduates was in the range of $1.60 to $1.99 per hour. This is in comparison to the present wage, where the largest number (46 per cent) of the graduates were earning $2.00 to $2.49 per hour.

How graduates secured employment

The graduates were asked in question 10 how they got their first full-time job after leaving the MDTA program. The responses were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary means for securing employment</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Through own initiative</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family or friends</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School placement service</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State employment service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private employment agency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDTA instructors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 16**

BEGINNING HOURLY WAGES AND PRESENT EARNINGS OF ABINGDON CLERK-STENOGRAPHER GRADUATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wages</th>
<th>Beginning No. Graduates (N=63)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Present No. Graduates (N=57)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.59 or less per hour</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.60 to 1.99 per hour</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 to 2.49 per hour</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50 to 2.99 per hour</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 to 3.99 per hour</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00 or more per hour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In question 19, the graduates were asked to check the type of placement services provided to them by the MDTA Center. A tabulation of the responses revealed the following number of checks by graduates. More than one category could be checked by each person.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement services provided by MDTA Center</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MDTA instructors helped place students in jobs by making referrals</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School had no placement service</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School placement service coordinated with the state employment service</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance counselor(s) helped students find jobs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graduates, 95 per cent, responded in question 11 that they had never again used any of the services provided by the school or MDTA program since getting their first full-time job. Four graduates indicated that they had used the services again.

The graduates were asked in question 14 to indicate the location of their present or most recent full-time employment. Five graduates had relocated to Washington, D. C., Virginia Beach, Newport News, and Richmond, Virginia. All other graduates remained within a 75-mile radius of the Abingdon training center.
The current employment status (question 15) of the Abingdon trainees is depicted in Table 17. Seventy-three per cent of the graduates are employed full time.

**TABLE 17**

**CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF ABINGDON MDTA CLERK-STENOGRAPHER GRADUATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed full-time</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed part-time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed, but looking for work</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed, but not looking for work</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Future educational plans**

It is generally agreed that further education enhances an individual's ability to progress in a work situation. The MDTA graduates were asked several questions relating to their aspirations for further schooling. Table 18 presents a composite and analyses of questions 21 through 26, which relate to this phase of the study. Eighteen graduates had enrolled in additional training; five graduates had earned various certificates; three graduates had received
### Table 19

**Additional Training Interests**

*For 32 Graduates*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of training</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business teaching</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business management and public relations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal secretarial training</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refresher courses in shorthand and English</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic training</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical secretarial training</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office machines training</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical nursing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public speaking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate broker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social work</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the Associate degree; and three graduates had earned a four-year degree. The additional training was received in a public or private educational institution or in a business or industry training program.

TABLE 18

FURTHER EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATIONS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF 74 MDTA CLERK- STENOGRAPHER GRADUATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Since you left the MDTA program, have you enrolled in any additional program?</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you now enrolled in a vocational program?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you now enrolled in any program(s) other than vocational?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you interested in getting more vocational training?</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you interested in getting more general education?</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graduates of the Abingdon Center were asked if they were interested in getting more training of any kind to indicate the type in which they were interested. Table 19 shows a diversity of interests for further training.
Curricula assessment

The graduates were asked in questions 28, 29, and 30 to check the subjects contained in their curriculum as to (a) whether they were of value in relation to their employment, and whether they should be given (b) more emphasis or (c) less emphasis. Table 20 gives a summary of responses submitted by clerk-stenographer graduates. All subjects, with the exception of Business Mathematics and Business Correspondence, were reported by 68 to 88 per cent of the graduates to have been of value.

No one subject or group of subjects was especially identified by the graduates as requiring more emphasis or should receive less emphasis. Twenty per cent of the graduates, however, did say that office machines should receive more emphasis, and 19 per cent said the same thing about Business English. The reader should recognize that in both cases the percentage is relatively small. Secretarial Practice was identified by more graduates than any other subject as requiring less emphasis.

The graduates were asked in question 35 to indicate the business subjects they had studied prior to entering MDTA training. A statement that seems to be prevalent among MDTA clerical trainees is that beginning students are expected to
TABLE 20

COURSES CONSIDERED OF VALUE BY 74 GRADUATES AND THE NEED FOR MORE OR LESS EMPHASIS FOR EACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Of Value</th>
<th>More Emphasis Needed</th>
<th>Less Emphasis Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typewriting</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Machines</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filing</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business English</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial Practice</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Studies</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorthand</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Mathematics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Correspondence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a In responding to the questions summarized in this table, graduates had the option of checking more than one category. In many instances, graduates made no response, especially in the courses which should receive more or less emphasis. Therefore, percentages would not total 100.
perform as well as those who have had prior training. Terminations from the program because of lack of progress in training are quite frequent. Table 21 shows the number of trainees who reported training prior to entering the Abingdon MDTA clerk-stenographer program.

**TABLE 21**

**BUSINESS SUBJECTS TAKEN BY ABINGDON CLERK-STENOGRAPHER GRADUATES PRIOR TO MDTA TRAINING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>No. Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Typing I</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorthand I</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typing II</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookkeeping I</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Business</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Arithmetic</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorthand II</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Machines</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typing--Personal</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Economics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookkeeping II</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Law</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The graduates of the Abingdon MDTA clerk-stenographer programs believe that improvements can be made in training. As revealed in question 36 of the follow-up survey, the responses shown below indicate their perceptions regarding possible improvements. The number of graduates who responded to each statement is indicated in parentheses.

1. More filing and office procedures (12)
2. More emphasis on clerical practice (11)
3. More time in basics of shorthand (8)
4. Institute course where public relations may be practiced (6)
5. Create office atmosphere in classroom (5)
6. Include the duties of a receptionist (5)
7. More electric typewriters; office machines should be more up to date (4)
8. More emphasis on dress code (4)
9. More time for business math; institute course in bookkeeping (3)
10. More up-to-date methods of teaching shorthand (2)
11. Lengthen program to include more time in office machines, English, and word studies (2)
12. Teach professional attitude (2)
13. More concentration on the basic skills used in everyday work situations; less emphasis on the theoretical side; and more instruction on how to apply for a job, perhaps using local employers as a guide for this phase of study (1)

14. Offer courses at night for convenience purposes (1)

15. Screen out those who take the training only for the money (1)

16. Institute selection procedures to determine who is best suited for clerk-stenographer and clerk-typist program (1)

17. Teach within the English class oral reports in order that student may become more self-confident (1)

18. Place emphasis on reading positive thinking materials (1)

**Employer Evaluation: Model Component IV**

The fourth component of the model sought to answer the question, "How do employers of MDTA graduates assess the quality of training received through the clerk-stenographer programs?" The data were obtained via personal interviews with 25 employers of Abingdon clerk-stenographer graduates. (See Chapter III.) A summary of the interview data is
presented in this concluding section of this chapter.

Wages

Table 22 shows the beginning base wages and the highest wages paid to Abingdon clerk-stenographer graduates by those employers who were personally interviewed. The mean beginning wage reported was $1.83. The mean highest wage reported was $2.52.

**TABLE 22**

BEGINNING BASE WAGE AND HIGHEST WAGE PAID TO MDTA CLERK-STENOGRAPHER GRADUATES AS REPORTED BY EMPLOYERS (N=25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wages (per hour)</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Highest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.01 - 1.25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.26 - 1.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.51 - 1.75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.76 - 2.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.01 - 2.25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.26 - 2.50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51 - 3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.01 - 3.50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Occupational success of graduates as rated by their employers

The 25 employers were asked in the interviews to rate the Abingdon clerk-stenographer graduates on ten personal and work characteristics. The ratings were to be based on a comparison with other workers of about the same age and who were doing similar work. A summary of the employers' ratings on a five-point scale is given in Table 23.

Some differences exist in the ratings given on the various items. The majority were rated average or above on the ten items. More clerk-stenographer graduates were rated as superior workers than inferior. Work characteristics rated below average were minimal.

Favorable and unfavorable characteristics

The employers were asked to indicate the favorable and unfavorable work characteristics they observed with the MDTA graduates under their supervision. A summary of their responses is shown below. The number of employers who responded to each statement is indicated in parentheses.

Favorable characteristics

1. She is dependable and cooperative. (11)
2. She is willing to assume responsibility. (8)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Superior</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Definitely Inferior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest in work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eager to learn more about job</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to assume responsibility</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership ability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation with others</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward job</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularity of attendance at work</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of work</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity of work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall promise as an employee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. She does quality work. (6)

4. She is eager to learn. (5)

5. She has the ability to approach a difficult job calmly. (5)

6. She has the ability to get job done without close supervision. (4)

7. She meets the public well. (4)

8. She has a good attitude toward her job. (3)

9. She exhibits an interest in learning new skills and procedures to learn and increase contributions to the firm.

10. She follows through with her assignments. (2)

11. She is very creative. (2)

Unfavorable characteristics

1. She doesn't have the ability to be objective. (2)

2. She cannot acknowledge her own errors and limitations. (2)

3. She doesn't get along with other staff members. (2)

4. She cannot seem to work without bringing in her personal problems. (1)
5. She will not express her opinion in group meetings in matters relating to work. (1)

The employers were asked to give the term of employment for those graduates referenced in the interviews. The mean years worked by the referenced graduate was 2 years, 11 months.

Suggestions for improvement

Employers were also asked to give their perceptions regarding how the MDTA program could be improved. The following suggestions were given by the number of respective employers indicated in parentheses:

Place more emphasis on human relations training. (4)

Attempt to assist prospective secretaries with overcoming deficiencies in vocabulary, grammar, and punctuation. Usually, their mechanical skills are good. (3)

Teach a further in-depth study of office procedures. (2)

Train for both bookkeeping and stenographic skills which are needed for complete well-rounded secretary. (1)

Work on developing maturity. (1)

Institute on-the-job training as a part of the clerk-stenographer program. (1)
Summary

This completes the discussion of the application of the preliminary model to the tryout center. The next chapter will present the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the model application.
CHAPTER VI

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS
OF MODEL APPLICATION

The purpose of this chapter is to present the findings and conclusions, along with recommendations, resulting from the application of the model to the tryout center--the Abingdon clerk-stenographer program. Its function is to determine whether or not meaningful findings are derived and significant conclusions can be reached when the model is applied. Since the purpose of the study was to plan and construct an evaluation model, the pragmatic test of that model is whether, when applied, it does facilitate evaluation.

A complementary purpose of this chapter is to reveal the presence of data that the trial model generated that was not meaningful in evaluating the program. Such information is necessary in revising the model.

Findings

The findings are categorized according to the four model components used within this study. They are summarized
in the first part of this chapter.

Objectives--Model Component I

The basic purpose of the MDTA program, as promulgated by proponents of the Act, would encompass the following statements:

... that many persons now unemployed or underemployed, in order to become qualified for reemployment or full employment, must be assisted in providing themselves with skills which are or will be in demand in the national interest ... that the opportunity to acquire new skills be afforded to these people in order to alleviate the hardships of unemployment compensation and public assistance, and to increase the nation's productivity and its capacity to meet the requirements of the space age.¹

In the words of the President, Manpower training means:

(1) making it possible for those who are unemployed or on the fringes of the labor force to become permanent, full-time workers; (2) giving those who are now employed at low income the training and the opportunity they need to become more productive and more successful; (3) discovering the potential in those people who are now considered unemployable, removing many of the barriers now blocking their way.²

¹United States Congress, Public Law 87-415, op. cit.

The Manpower Development and Training Act's Statement of Findings and Purpose in 1962 listed goals ranging from insuring against the burdens of automation to "staffing freedom." Garth L. Mangum has written that, "as the combined result of original intent and subsequent experience, MDT has come to have six potential and identifiable objectives:"

(1) Facilitating employment of the unemployed
(2) Reducing poverty
(3) Lessening inflationary pressures
(4) Meeting labor shortages
(5) Upgrading the labor force
(6) Revamping traditional institutions

Through a review of literature, four additional objectives have been stated as indicated in Table 24, page 103.

Generalizations concerning objectives

Is there a consistency in the objectives of the program as perceived by the state administration, center administration, teaching staff, and trainees; and are the objectives consistent with the expressed purpose of the MDT Act?

---

Table 24 shows the legislated objectives and a summary of the perceived objectives as submitted by the administration of MDTA in seven Appalachian states, the Abingdon administration and teaching staff, and the graduates of the Abingdon clerk-stenographer program.

The objectives of the MDTA program, as perceived by the state directors, reflect a consistency of purpose in that 43 per cent of the state administrators indicated the need to provide skill or job training to persons unemployed. Eighty-six per cent of the state administrators perceived the upgrading of the labor force as a major objective of MDTA. Also, 57 per cent of the state administrators recognized the reduction of poverty as one of the major objectives. The problems of the underemployed were not explicitly stated by all state directors; however, they were implicit.

The Center administration was unanimous in recognizing the providing of training for the unemployed and the reduction of poverty as their basic interpretation of the objectives. They also indicated that the providing of training for the underemployed and the meeting of labor shortages were important objectives.
The Center teaching staff perceived the objectives of MDTA as being twofold: (1) the increasing of the Nation's productivity, and (2) the reduction of poverty.

A review of the graduates' perceptions indicate that the objective of providing training for the unemployed and underemployed is recognized by them also. This is based upon the graduates' response by 54 and 57 per cent, respectively. Thirty-five per cent recognized the reduction of poverty as a major objective. The graduates recognized all expressed objectives, as reflected in Table 24, with the exception of lessening inflationary pressures and revamping of traditional institutions. None of the groups who submitted objectives indicated the latter two.

When comparing the perceived objectives of MDTA programs as held by one group to those perceived objectives held by another group, a problem of interpretation is encountered on the part of the researcher. Where the objectives of the Act specifically state that the purpose of MDTA programs is to meet the needs of the unemployed and underemployed, certain individuals within each of the four groups refer to this objective somewhat indirectly; i. e., one state director referred to the need to provide training for the
TABLE 24
EXPRESSED OBJECTIVES OF MDTA LEGISLATION CORRELATED WITH
PERCEIVED OBJECTIVES AS STATED BY FOUR GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislated Objectives</th>
<th>State Admin. Perceptions (n=7)</th>
<th>Center Admin. Perceptions (n=2)</th>
<th>Center teaching staff perceptions (n=2)</th>
<th>Graduates Perceptions (n=37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide training for unemployed*</td>
<td>3 43</td>
<td>2 100</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide training for underemployed</td>
<td>2 29</td>
<td>1 50</td>
<td></td>
<td>21 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To alleviate hardships of unemployment compensation and public assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase the Nation's productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 100</td>
<td>4 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reduce poverty*</td>
<td>4 57</td>
<td>2 100</td>
<td>100 35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To lessen inflationary pressures*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To meet labor shortages*</td>
<td>3 43</td>
<td>1 50</td>
<td>7 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To upgrade the labor force*</td>
<td>6 86</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To revamp traditional institutions*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To discover potential of unemployable and to remove employment barriers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Specific objectives mandated by MDTA legislation
disadvantaged instead of stating directly that the objective was to provide job training for the unemployed or underemployed. Likewise, when considered as a group, all state directors conveyed the concern for those in need of job training without explicitly referring to those who would be defined as unemployed or underemployed. Thus, comparing the consensus of the state directors to the consensus of the teaching staff who did not explicitly refer to the unemployed or underemployed, it is necessary to go beyond the written word to the intended meaning of the stated objectives. While the teaching staff did not use the terms unemployed or underemployed, this philosophy seems to be inherent in the objectives submitted by the teaching staff. Recognizing the problem of determining whether there is a relationship between stated objectives of one group to that of another, it appears that there is a consistency between groups regarding MDTA objectives. It also appears that there is a consistency of purpose as expressed by program administrators, by teaching staff, by students, and as expressed in the MDT Act.

The preceding statements magnify the difficulties involved with interpreting the designated objectives of the
MDT Act. Authorities in the field seem to encounter interpretative provisions as well. A summary quote by Mangum accentuates this belief:

Despite the verbiage, it is clear that the training program was designed to reach experienced adult family heads displaced from established jobs by technological and economic change. As the employment picture brightened, its targets changed first to youth and then to other groups facing disadvantages in competing for existing jobs. In doing so MDT became a tool in the anti-poverty effort in addition to its primary objective of solving unemployment. Tightening labor markets and inflationary pressures brought announcement in 1966 that one of its purposes would be alleviation of labor shortages. In the meantime, though it was never explicitly designed for the purpose, MDT had become a lever for imposing change on traditional Manpower and educational institutions. Yet in retrospect, all of these changing objectives can be rationalized within the original language. One more goal cited by the original language, the general upgrading of the labor force, has never become an explicit objective in practice.\(^4\)

Trainee Profile or Characteristics

Model Component II

Age and Sex of Population Studied.—An analysis of the age distribution of the Abingdon, Virginia, MDTA clerk-stenographer trainees at the beginning of training revealed that 81.3 per cent were in the 17-25 age group; 16 per cent

\(^4\)Ibid.
were in the 26-34 age group; and 3 per cent were in the 35-44 age group. The median age was 19, and the range was from 17 to 44. Of the 118 graduates studied, 117 were female. The findings indicate that the program is serving primarily the immediate post-secondary school youth.

**Primary Wage Earners.**—Slightly more than half, 53 per cent of the trainees, were classified as primary wage earners prior to MDTA training. Of this group, 74 per cent of the primary wage earners were in the 26-34 age classification.

**Below Poverty Level.**—Approximately the same percentage of trainees were in the below poverty level classification as were above the poverty level.

**Educational Attainment.**—The educational attainment of the group ranged from 11th grade through two years of college. Nine per cent of the graduates had entered college and had achieved two years or less; 89 per cent of the trainees were high school graduates.

**Marital Status.**—Sixteen per cent of the graduates were married at the time they began training. The others were either separated, divorced, widowed, or single, with 63 per cent falling in the latter category.
Dependents.--The number of dependents of MDTA clerk-stenographer graduates from the Abingdon Center averaged .5 when their training was begun.

Earnings of MDTA Clerk-Stenographer Graduates Prior to Entering Training.--The median highest wage earned by MDTA clerk-stenographer graduates prior to training was in the classification $1.26 to $1.50 per hour. The range was from 60 cents to $2.50 per hour. The data were available for only one-third of the graduates.

Recipients of Training Allowances.--The minimum amount paid for training allowances was $20 per week. Of the 118 graduates included in the study, 93 per cent received a regular training allowance; 89 per cent received a transportation allowance; and 9 per cent received a subsistence allowance.

Supplementary Profile Data.--(a) Of the graduates studied, none was physically handicapped; (b) the work experience of MDTA trainees prior to training was concentrated in the areas of clerical, sales, and semi-skilled occupations; (c) the clerk-stenographer trainees had experienced multiple employment barriers such as age (too young or too old), lack of skill, experience, child care problems, obsolete skill,
health problems, transportation problems, personal problems, and others.

Trainee Evaluation—Model Component III

Graduates Positive Perceptions of Specific Facets of Training Received at Abingdon Center.—Ninety-two per cent of the graduates perceived the MDTA program as having helped them to train adequately for their first full-time job; the graduates unanimously felt that the business equipment used in training was adequate to train them for office employment; and the graduates were also unanimous in indicating that they were satisfied with the training received.

Ninety-nine per cent of the graduates said they would recommend the clerk-stenographer program to others; 86 per cent of the graduates reported that the MDTA school counselor was effective in working with them as a trainee; and 97 per cent felt that the MDTA business teachers were qualified instructors.

Types of Full-Time Post-Graduation Jobs Held by Clerk-Stenographer Graduates.—Graduates were employed in related occupations in the following job classifications: clerk-stenographer, clerk-typist, secretary, bank teller, general office, receptionist, accounting clerk, keypunch operator,
inventory control clerk, legal secretary, personnel clerk, hospital emergency room clerk, file clerk, and customer accounts representative.

The unrelated job classifications included teacher aide, cashier, and garment factory worker.

Wages Earned by Abingdon MDTA Clerk-Stenographer Graduates.--The beginning wage received on their first job after graduation, as reported by 52 per cent of the graduates, was $1.60 to $1.99 per hour. The present earnings of the Abingdon MDTA clerk-stenographer graduate reveal that 46 per cent are earning $2.00 to $2.49 per hour, and 21 per cent are in the category $2.50 to $2.99 per hour.

How Graduates Secured Employment After Training.--The primary means for securing employment, as reported by 52 per cent of the graduates, was through their own initiative. Only 10 per cent of the graduates attributed their employment to the assistance given by the state employment service. Since getting their first job, the service provided by the school or the MDTA program had never been used again, according to 95 per cent of the graduates.

Current Employment Status of Abingdon Graduates.--At the time the questionnaires were submitted, 73 per cent of
the graduates were employed full time; 4 per cent were employed part time; 9 per cent were unemployed but looking for work; 14 per cent were unemployed and were not looking for work.

Further Educational Aspirations and Accomplishments of Abingdon MDTA Clerk-Stenographer Graduates.---Since being certified by the Abingdon Center, eighteen graduates had enrolled in additional training. The training consisted mainly of courses sponsored by business and industry, although three graduates each had earned the Associate degree and the Bachelor's degree. Thirty-two graduates indicated that they would like to pursue additional training. Secretarial, accounting, and business teaching were the main interests given by the graduates.

Curricula assessment.---The Abingdon clerk-stenographer graduates perceived the total curricula as being adequate in that all subjects except Business Mathematics and Business Correspondence were reported of value by 68 to 88 per cent of the graduates.

Prior to entering MDTA training, a majority of the students had taken business subjects in high school. There were 61 graduates who stated that they had taken Typewriting I, and 35 graduates had taken Shorthand I.
Graduates Perceptions Regarding MDTA Program Improvement.--Twelve graduates suggested that filing and office procedures should be given greater emphasis; eight graduates suggested that more time should be devoted to the teaching of the basics of shorthand; six graduates suggested the initiation of a course in public relations; and five graduates suggested that the incorporation of the duties of a receptionist be instituted.

Employer Evaluation--Model Component IV

Employer Reports Regarding Beginning and Highest Wage Paid to MDTA Clerk-Stenographer Graduates.--The mean beginning wage reported by 25 employers was $1.83 per hour. The mean highest wage reported was $2.52 per hour. Eleven graduates were in the category $2.26 to $2.50 per hour for the highest wage paid; also, five graduates had attained a wage of $3.01 to $3.50 per hour for their highest wage paid.

Occupational Success of Graduates as Rated by Their Employers.--The majority of the graduates were rated average or above by 25 employers on ten items relating to work. More clerk-stenographer graduates were rated superior than inferior. Work characteristics rated below average were minimal. With reference to the item "Overall Promise as an Employee," four
graduates were rated superior, eleven graduates were rated above average, and ten graduates were rated average.

Favorable Work Characteristics of MDTA Clerk-Stenographer Graduates.--Five employers indicated that their MDTA graduate employee was most eager to learn; six employers indicated that their MDTA graduate performed quality work; eight employers pointed out that their graduates were willing to assume responsibility; and eleven employers noted dependability and cooperativeness as assets of their MDTA employees.

Unfavorable Work Characteristics of MDTA Clerk-Stenographer Graduates.--The unfavorable characteristics mentioned by employers were very limited. The following were responses given by at least two employers for each statement: (a) the employee doesn't have the ability to be objective; (b) the employee has difficulty in recognizing her own limitations and errors; and (3) the employee and other staff members do not get along.

Dates of Employment of 25 MDTA Clerk-Stenographer Graduates.--Employers reported that the mean years worked for the 25 graduates whose supervisors were interviewed was 2 years, 11 months.
Employers' Suggestions for Improvement of MDTA Clerk-Stenographer Program.--Four employers suggested that the MDTA program should place a greater emphasis on human relations training. Three employers indicated that MDTA personnel should strive to have trainees overcome their lack of training in punctuation, grammar, and vocabulary.

Of the ten work characteristics rated by 25 employers, two supervisors said that regularity of attendance at work was definitely inferior.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were reached on the basis of the model application to the Abingdon, Virginia, MDTA tryout Center.

1. The objectives of the MDT Act are being met.

This conclusion is supported by the following findings:

(a) Thirty-six per cent of the trainees who entered the Abingdon clerk-stenographer program were classified by the VEC as being below the poverty level. One of the major objectives of the training is to reduce poverty. The trainees who have been admitted to the MDTA clerk-stenographer program were persons who badly need the training, and thus the admissions policy was in conformity with
the objectives of the Act.

(b) As a result of the training, the clerk-stenographer graduates have been elevated to a higher level of productivity. The median highest wage earned by the trainee prior to training ranged from $1.26 to $1.50 per hour, which accentuates the underemployment status of the individuals before training. The present wages reveal that 46 per cent of the graduates are earning $2.00 to $2.49 per hour, and 21 per cent are earning $2.50 to $2.99 per hour.

2. There seems to be a consistency in the objectives of the program as perceived by state administrators, Center administrators, teaching staff, and trainees with the expressed objectives of the MDT Act. This conclusion is based on the following findings:

(a) The providing of training for the unemployed was perceived as a major objective by 43 per cent of the state administrators, by 54 per cent of the trainees, and by both Center administrators.

(b) The providing of training for the unemployed was recognized by 29 per cent of the state administrators, 57 per cent of the trainees, and one Center administrator.

(c) The reduction of poverty was a major objective of the MDTA as reported by 57 per cent of the state
administrators, 35 per cent of the graduates, and by all Center administrators and teaching staff.

(d) The meeting of labor shortages was recognized by 42 per cent of the state administrators, 19 per cent of the graduates, and one Center administrator.

Table 24 on page 103 gives the supporting evidence for the preceding conclusion.

3. The educational attainment of the Abingdon, Virginia, MDTA clerk-stenographer trainee was quite high in that 89 per cent of the trainees were high school graduates. Also, 9 per cent of the graduates had entered college and had achieved two years or less. The high educational level could be interpreted as meaning that the program was not reaching down and meeting the needs of the dropout.

4. MDTA experienced success with the clerk-stenographers at Abingdon for the nine contractual programs studied. This is attested to by the 62 per cent who found employment in the occupation for which they were trained and 20 per cent who found employment in related occupations. On the average, completion of the program resulted in definite upgrading in jobs held and wages earned.
5. The graduates of this study are capably performing their work assignments, and their potential for overall promise as employees rate high. This is supported on the basis of employer evaluations regarding specific aspects of job performance for 25 graduates. Eleven graduates were rated above average on ten work characteristics, and ten graduates were rated average. The employers reported satisfaction with the trained MDTA graduate.

6. The components of the model used within this study are adequate for assessing and determining the effectiveness of the MDTA clerk-stenographer program as proven by the Abingdon tryout. The perceived objectives of the Act, the profile, trainee and employer evaluations permit administrators, teacher educators, and supervisors to appraise major segments of the total MDTA concept. The model provides the framework for evaluating a program from its initial stages through the developmental processes to the culminating aspects.

Recommendations

Based on the application of the model concept to the tryout Center and in view of the findings of the study and
conclusions previously stated, the following recommendations are made:

1. A more effective program of guidance and counseling should be instituted. An emphasis on placement and follow-up should be integral parts of the guidance function.

2. The curriculum of the clerk-stenographer program at Abingdon seems to be satisfactory, although some thought should be given to the transition from the traditional approach to teaching to more up-to-date methods. The creation of an office atmosphere through simulation may be one possible source for at least a part of the total program effort.

3. Greater emphasis should be given to the development of human relations in the MDTA clerk-stenographer programs.

4. The suggestions presented in the study for program improvement as perceived by employers and graduates should be examined carefully. Much thought should be given on the part of the appropriate authorities to the inclusion of many of these ideas in order that the training program may experience even greater accomplishments.
CHANGES IN THE MODEL COMPONENTS AS A
RESULT OF THETRYOUT

As stated on page 98, a complementary purpose of this chapter is to report the presence of data that the tryout model generated that was not meaningful in evaluating the program. Information about unsuccessful data is necessary in revising the model.

Trainee Profile or Characteristics

Model Component II

1. Marital status.—This segment has been eliminated from the final model. The determination of whether the individual trainee could be classified as the "head of household" would be of much more significance to the characteristics phase of the study.

2. Eligibility for transportation allowances.—This has been eliminated from the final evaluation model. There is no justification for gathering data regarding transportation allowances. All trainees, with the exception of those who live within walking distance of the center, are paid transportation allowances.

3. Dependents.—The determination of the number of dependents of MDTA trainees, with relation to program
evaluation, is questionable. This merely relates an additional characteristic of the trainee and has no relevance to assessing program effectiveness. This segment of the model has been eliminated in the final components.

Trainee Evaluation--Model Component III

1. Maximum wages.--Since the model seeks information concerning beginning post-training wages and present earnings, maximum wages have been eliminated from the final model.

2. Location of present job.--This statement has been eliminated from the final model. Relocation to areas outside the immediate training vicinity is not prevalent. This item serves minimal usefulness to a model for evaluation.

Employer Evaluation--Model Component IV

1. Job description and job duties.--The quantification of detailed job descriptions is somewhat difficult to compile. Rather than requesting employers to provide job descriptions, the final model will report only the job title. The Dictionary of Occupational Titles may then be used to determine responsibilities of each respective job description.
2. **Reason for leaving firm.**—No use was made from data collected in the present study regarding "For what reason did this person leave your firm?" This has been eliminated from the final model. Since the surveyor will interview only those employers who are indicated by the graduates on the follow-up component, this data would not be applicable.

**Suggested changes in data-gathering procedures and model additions after tryout at the Abingdon Center**

Based on the model tryout of the Abingdon, Virginia, clerk-stenographer program and the methods of collecting data for the present investigation, the following changes in procedures are suggested:

1. **Objectives.**—The objectives of MDTA, as perceived by the four groups studied, are beneficial; however, the method for gathering the data can be improved. The open-type response used within this study has certain limitations. The massive data collected in an "essay-type approach" presents a problem when attempting to quantify verbalized interpretations and leads to subjectivity on the part of the researcher.
The eliciting of specific objectives from the MDT
Act and from authorities in the field has been stated in the
revised model as indicated in Chapter VII. Those groups or
individuals who will respond to their perceived objectives
of the legislation will simply place a check by the objectives
in which they are in agreement. Thus, quantification can be
accomplished in the research effort.

2. Trainee profile.--(a) The determination as to
whether the trainee is the "head of household" when entering
training has been added to this component. Usually, those
individuals who have families and are unemployed may be
classified as "heads of household." They may receive con-
siderable government support in the form of unemployment com-
pensation or public assistance. By adding this segment to
the trainee profile, the evaluator is presented with another
avenue to correlate the specific objectives of the Act
relative to its intended meaning, and whether or not the
training is reaching those who need it most.

(b) An addition has been made to this phase of
the model to indicate whether the trainee was employed full
time prior to training and his earnings per hour. This is
necessary in helping to determine whether the training has
improved the earning status of the trainee and moved him from unemployment and underemployment to full employment.

3. **Trainee evaluation.**—(a) The trainees were asked in the present study whether the MDTA program adequately prepared them for their first full-time job after leaving training. They were asked to reply "Yes" or "No." An addition to this question in the final model will be made. If the trainee replies "No," he will be asked to give the reasons why he feels the program did not adequately prepare him. As a result, more data may be obtained by the evaluator concerning deficiencies in training; and, therefore, ways can be devised to eliminate such deficiencies.

(b) The wording has been changed for question 11 in the trainee evaluation instrument. Rather than "job placement services provided by the school or the MDTA program", the question will state "job placement services provided by the school or the employment service."

4. **Employer evaluation.**—Rather than asking employers to describe beginning and present job duties of graduates, a listing of different occupations in the clerical field has been stated in this phase of the model. The interviewer can ask the employer to indicate which job classification more nearly resembles the position held by the graduate.
CHAPTER VII

A MODEL FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE MDTA
CLERK-STEНОGRAPHER PROGRAM

This plan was developed as a packet for use in evaluating MDTA clerk-stenographer programs in the ten-state Appalachian region. The initial plan was used in the evaluation of the clerk-stenographer program in Abingdon, Virginia. The procedures and forms have been revised based on the findings of the Abingdon evaluation.

Although the plan was constructed for use in evaluating the clerk-stenographer program, it may be feasible to utilize the model concept to determine the effectiveness of programs other than clerk-stenographer; however, slight modifications would have to be made. The plan should be easily adaptable to any type of MDTA clerical or closely related program and may also be applicable to any section of the country.
The evaluation plan for assessing program effectiveness consists of four components:

Model Component I - Objectives of MDTA
Model Component II - Trainee profile or characteristics
Model Component III - Trainee evaluation
Model Component IV - Employer evaluation

The presentation of these components contains three major parts as indicated below:

1. A brief explanation of the importance of the component in the total evaluation pattern
2. Specific directions on how to proceed to obtain the data relative to the component
3. Suggested data-gathering forms and aids

Evaluation suggestions are given at the end of Components I and IV. The evaluation suggestions which constitute the final three phases of the model are included at the end of Component IV.

MODEL COMPONENT I

OBJECTIVES

Importance

The Center administration and teaching staff reflect the objectives of MDTA training either through indoctrination orientation sessions with trainees or through various implications. It is necessary to compare the perceived objectives of the Center administration, the teaching staff, and the trainees with the stated or implied objectives of the MDT Act. This must be done in order that a corollary may be established to determine whether the local administration
and the graduates have similar perceptions regarding the mandates of the Act, and to determine whether the provisions of the Act are being fulfilled.

Unless some basic understanding is prevalent between those who are involved in MDTA, a philosophy may develop that can disseminate erroneous information concerning MDTA and its purposes.

A list of the objectives is provided within this component.

Directions

According to the legislated MDT Act of 1962, as amended, and other authorities, there are ten major objectives of Manpower training. These are indicated in the instrument for Model Component I "Major Objectives of MDTA." The instrument should be made available to the Center administration and teaching staff through personal contacts. The instrument can be mailed to graduates, or it may be administered to the trainee just prior to termination of training.

Further directions are stated in the instrument form.

Evaluation

The data obtained by the surveyor from the objectives component may be used in the following manner:

A. Identify the objectives of the MDTA program as perceived by the state director, Center administration, teaching staff, and trainees.

B. Compare the perceived objectives obtained from the above group. The comparison should reveal answers to the following questions:

1. Is the Center administration and local staff aware of the overall objectives of the MDTA program?
2. What are the most commonly perceived objectives of the different groups? Is there a definite consistency of perceived objectives between the various groups?

3. Are there differences in the perceived objectives between the Center administration and the local staff? If so, are the differences sufficient to interfere with the development of the program?

4. Are there differences between the perceived objectives between the teaching staff and the trainees? If so, are the differences sufficient to interfere with the development of the program?

Instrument

MAJOR OBJECTIVES OF MDTA

The following is a listing of possible objectives of Manpower training. In the space provided, please place an X if you believe that the statements represent an objective of your program.

1. To provide training for the unemployed

2. To provide training for the underemployed

3. To alleviate hardships of unemployment compensation and public assistance

4. To increase the Nation's productivity

5. To reduce poverty

6. To lessen inflationary pressures

7. To meet labor shortages

8. To upgrade the labor force
9. To revamp traditional institutions through making training more realistic and more relevant

10. To discover potential of unemployable and to relieve employment barriers*

Other ____________________________

*Employment barriers include factors that contribute to a person's unemployment such as the following: age (too young or too old); lack of skill, experience, or obsolete skill; health problems, transportation problems, child care problems, and others.

MODEL COMPONENT II

TRaineE PROFILE

Importance

The plan encompasses a trainee profile in order that a determination can be made as to whether the MDTA program is reaching those for whom it was designed. The profile provides data that will result in contrasting characteristics of trainees prior to training and after the training has terminated. This section has a definite relationship to Model Component I in that the Act was designed to assist certain types of people.

Directions

Data for this segment of the model should be compiled from available records of MDTA trainees at the State Employment Service. Such data can be compiled manually from the MA-101 form that is completed by a state employment representative when the trainee begins his initial training.

The surveyor should have a sufficient quantity of the instrument duplicated to insure that the data can be obtained for each respective graduate. The compilation may be completed collectively after the individual data have been gathered.
Instrument for Model Component II

CHARACTERISTICS OF MDTA CLERK-STENOGRAPHER TRAINEES

Graduate’s Name ___________________________________________________ (Last) (First) (Initial)

Last Known Address _____________________________________________ (Street) (City) (State)

Telephone Number ________________________

Occupation for which person was trained under MDTA:
Classification No. ____________________________ (Occupation Title)

Project No. ____________________________

Length of training in weeks

MDTA training started: ____________________ (Month) (Year)

MDTA training completed: ____________________ (Month) (Year)

Birthdate: Month _________ Year _________

Primary wage earner prior to training: Yes ____ No ____

Family below poverty level: Yes ____ No ____

Physically Handicapped: Yes ____ No ____

Public Assistance recipient at time of training: Yes ____ No ____

Head of Household: Yes ____ No ____

Employed full-time prior to training: Yes ____ No ____

If employed full-time prior to training, what was trainee’s earnings per hour? ________

Highest grade completed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade School</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>8 9 10 11 12</td>
<td>13 14 15 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MODEL COMPONENT III

GRADUATE FOLLOW-UP

Importance

The success of any program is determined by the graduates of that program. In order to determine whether the graduates are able to secure and maintain employment and their reactions to the adequacy of their training after institutional certification, a follow-up instrument has been designed to assist the local MDTA personnel with the assessment of this facet of training.

The follow-up provides essential data relative to the employment status of graduates after completion of training and provides the surveyor with a method of correlating employment success with employment history prior to training. The instrument also provides numerous questions concerning graduates' perceptions of training. Serious consideration should be given to improvement suggestions submitted by graduates, for they are the product of the MDTA program and are in a position to evaluate effectively the diversity of the total training effort.

Directions

The graduate follow-up survey may be conducted through mailed questionnaires. A letter stating the purpose of the evaluation should accompany the questionnaire. It is imperative that the accompanying letter appeal to the "You" attitude in order that an adequate response is realized. The letter must relate the importance of the contributions being made by the MDTA graduate. A sample letter is enclosed in this section of the packet.

An addressed, stamped envelope must also be included with the questionnaire when it is mailed to the graduate. The questionnaire should be coded by assigning each graduate a respective number. This is necessary in order that the surveyor may identify each graduate who is involved in the evaluation process. A record of the numbers assigned for each person should be maintained until all data are compiled.
SAMPLE LETTER

Date

Dear Clerk-Stenographer Graduate:

The (Name) Manpower Training Skill Center is conducting research relating to the MDTA Clerk-Stenographer program. The project involves selected graduates who may assist with the improvement of our future clerk-stenographer programs.

You have a vital input as to suggested changes to be made in our training efforts. In order that you may state your perceptions of the program, it is necessary that you complete the enclosed follow-up survey. Individual responses will be kept strictly confidential. The data will be compiled jointly by combining the data of all graduates who participate in the survey.

We would like to ask your support of this project by completing the questionnaire which is enclosed. An addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience. The questionnaire should be returned to us by (date).

Won't you please give this your careful attention. Your cooperation will insure that others may profit from the MDTA clerk-stenographer program as you have.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Name of Surveyor
Title

Reference Initials

Enclosures
Instrument for Model Component III

A FOLLOW-UP SURVEY OF FORMER MDTA GRADUATES

No. __

1. Since you left the MDTA program, did you seek full-time employment? (30 or more hours per week) ( ) Yes ( ) No

2. If you did not seek full-time employment when you left the MDTA program, indicate the reason. (Check only one box)

( ) Expected to enter another school
( ) Housewife or about to be married
( ) Physical or other hardship
( ) Not interested in a job
( ) Expected to enter military service
( ) Only wanted to work part-time
( ) Other (Specify)

3. Did you seek part-time employment when you left this program? (less than 30 hours per week) ( ) Yes ( ) No

4. If you sought part-time employment instead of full-time employment when you left the MDTA program, indicate the reason. (Check only one box)

( ) Expected to enter another school
( ) Housewife or about to be married
( ) Physical or other hardship
( ) Not interested in a full-time job
( ) Expected to enter military service
( ) Unable to find a full-time job
( ) Other (specify)

5. How many full-time jobs have you held since you left the MDTA program?

( ) None
( ) 1 full-time job
( ) 2 full-time jobs
( ) 3 to 5 full-time jobs
( ) 6 or more full-time jobs

NOTE: If your answer to question 5 was NONE, skip to question 15.
6. If you got a full-time job when you left the MDTA vocational program, what was your job? __________

7. How closely did your first full-time job after leaving the MDTA program relate to the training you received? (Check only one box)
   ( ) I was employed in the occupation for which I was trained
   ( ) I was employed in a related occupation
   ( ) I was employed in a completely different occupation

8. Did this MDTA program adequately prepare you for your first full-time job after leaving this training? ( ) Yes ( ) No
   If no, state the reason(s) why you feel the program did not adequately prepare you for your first job. __________

9. What was your beginning hourly wage on your first full-time job since leaving the MDTA program? (Check only one box)
   ( ) $1.59 or less per hour
   ( ) $1.60 to $1.99 per hour
   ( ) $2.00 to $2.49 per hour
   ( ) $2.50 to $2.99 per hour
   ( ) $3.00 to $3.99 per hour
   ( ) $4.00 or more per hour

10. How did you get your first full-time job after leaving the MDTA program? (Check appropriate box or boxes)
    ( ) I got the job myself.
    ( ) My family or friends helped me get the job.
    ( ) The job placement services provided by the school helped me get the job.
    ( ) The state employment service helped me get the job.
    ( ) A private employment agency helped me get the job.
    ( ) Other (specify)
11. After you got your first full-time job, have you ever again used any of the job placement services provided by the school or the employment service? ( ) Yes ( ) No

(If Yes, check the service(s) you have used since getting your first job)

( ) Service provided by school
( ) Service by state employment bureau
( ) Vocational teacher's assistance
( ) Guidance counselor's assistance
( ) Other (specify)

12. If you held two or more full-time jobs since you ended MDTA training, check one box below.

( ) My last job was related to the MDTA training
( ) My last job was not related to the MDTA training

13. What is your current employment status? (Check the appropriate box or boxes below)

( ) I am employed
( ) full-time
( ) part-time

( ) I am unemployed,
( ) but looking for work
( ) and not looking for work

( ) I am in the military service

14. If you are presently working, what is your job?

15. What wages are you presently earning?

( ) $1.59 or less per hour
( ) $1.60 to $1.99 per hour
( ) $2.00 to $2.49 per hour
( ) $2.50 to $2.99 per hour
( ) $3.00 to $3.99 per hour
( ) $4.00 or more per hour
16. Were you satisfied with the vocational training you received in the MDTA program? ( ) Yes ( ) No

17. As best you know, what type(s) of job placement services were provided by the MDTA Center and the vocational program in which you were enrolled?

( ) School had no placement services
( ) A school placement service coordinated with the State Employment Service
( ) MDTA instructors helped place students in jobs by making referrals
( ) Guidance counselors helped students find jobs
( ) Other (specify)

18. Would you recommend the Clerk-Stenographer program to other prospective trainees? ( ) Yes ( ) No

19. Since you left the MDTA program, have you enrolled in any additional education program(s)? ( ) Yes ( ) No

If Yes, check type(s) and purpose(s) below:

( ) General education program(s)
   ( ) to raise my general education level
   ( ) Informal, noncredit course(s)

( ) Vocational program(s)
   ( ) To upgrade the vocational skills previously learned in the MDTA program
   ( ) To learn a new occupation

What type(s) of vocational training program(s) did you attend?

( ) Private school(s)
( ) Public school(s)
( ) Business or industry
20. If you did enroll for additional education after leaving the MDTA program, have you received (or expect to receive) one or more of the following: ( ) Yes ( ) No

( ) A certificate (type) _____________
( ) A diploma (type) _____________
( ) A 2-year Associate degree (Major) _____________
( ) A 4-year college degree (Major) _____________
( ) Other (specify)

21. Are you now enrolled in a vocational program? ( ) Yes ( ) No

22. Are you now enrolled in any educational program(s) other than vocational? ( ) Yes ( ) No

23. Are you interested in getting more vocational training? ( ) Yes ( ) No

24. Are you interested in getting more general education? ( ) Yes ( ) No

25. If you are interested in getting more training of any kind, indicate the type in which you are interested:

__________________________________________________________

26. Please place a checkmark in the appropriate spaces for the following:

In relation to my employment since completing MDTA training, the subjects checked in the first column were of value, the subjects checked in the second column should receive more emphasis, the subjects checked in the third column should receive the same emphasis, and the subjects checked in the fourth column should receive less emphasis.
27. Were the standards of the MDTA business courses too high?  ( ) Yes ( ) No

28. Was the MDTA business equipment adequate to prepare you for office employment?  ( ) Yes ( ) No

29. Do you feel that the MDTA business instructors were qualified teachers?  ( ) Yes ( ) No

30. Do you feel that your MDTA school guidance counselor(s) were effective in working with you as a trainee?  ( ) Yes ( ) No

31. Do you feel that your state employment counselor(s) were effective in working with you as a trainee?  ( ) Yes ( ) No

32. Please check the business subjects you had taken, if any, prior to entering Manpower training:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Of Value</th>
<th>More Emphasis</th>
<th>Same Emphasis</th>
<th>Less Emphasis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Typewriting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorthand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Machines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Typing - Personal         |               |               |               |
| Typing I                  |               |               |               |
| Typing II                 |               |               |               |
| Bookkeeping I             |               |               |               |
| Bookkeeping II            |               |               |               |
| Retailing I               |               |               |               |
| Retailing II              |               |               |               |
| Notehand                  |               |               |               |

| Business Machines         |               |               |               |
| Business Arithmetic       |               |               |               |
| Business Law              |               |               |               |
| Consumer Economics        |               |               |               |
| General Business          |               |               |               |
| Shorthand I               |               |               |               |
| Shorthand II              |               |               |               |
| Other (specify)           |               |               |               |
33. Please use the space below for comments you have on how the MDTA Clerk-Stenographer program can be improved.

MODEL COMPONENT IV
EMPLOYER EVALUATION

Importance

Employers can make major contributions to training through the evaluation of graduates' competencies on the job. The employer assessment provides information regarding beginning base wage paid, highest base wage paid, and job titles of MDTA clerk-stenographer graduates. This data should be used to correlate job success as perceived by the employer with that perceived by the graduate. The ratings given by employers for ten work characteristics may offer suggested revisions in curricula.

The statements given by employers concerning chief difficulties with the MDTA graduate can provide assessment techniques that can help to eliminate certain deficiencies in training. The employer evaluation approach not only permits educational representatives contact with industry personnel, but it also gives the evaluator an opportunity to relate more fully the goals of Manpower training to the community at large.

Directions

1. Select employers of MDTA graduates from educational, professional, manufacturing, sales, and other types of businesses.

2. Interview the employers personally using the attached instrument.

3. Record the information requested on the instrument as the employer relates answers to the specific questions.
4. Compile the data to assess employers' evaluation of MDTA graduates.

Instrument

See Model Component IV, "Employee Rating Form for Use in Evaluating MDTA Graduates."

Model Component IV

EMPLOYEE RATING FORM
For Use In
EVALUATING MDTA GRADUATES

Graduate's Name ____________________________
(Last) (First) (Initial)

Employer: ________________________________
(Name of Person or Firm)

Employer's Address: ________________________________
(Number & Street) (City) (State)

Job Title of PersonSupplying Information: ________________

1. Is this person still working for you? ( ) Yes ( ) No

2. Do you know where this person is now employed? ( ) Yes ( ) No
   If Yes, give name and address of firm

3. As an employee of your firm, what is (or was) this person's:

   A. Dates of employment:
      ______________________ to ______________________
      (mo. - yr.) (mo. - yr.)

   B. Beginning base wage: $____ per hour ___ hours per week

   C. Highest base wage paid: $____ per hour ___ hours per week
D. Beginning job title (Which of the following job titles more nearly relate to the beginning job title of the MDTA graduate?) (Check one)

- Accounting clerk
- Bank teller
- Cashier
- Clerk-Stenographer
- Clerk-Typist
- File Clerk
- General Office
- Inventory Control Clerk
- Keypunch operator
- Legal secretary
- Personnel clerk
- Receptionist
- Secretary
- Other (specify)

E. Job title at present time (Check one)

- Accounting clerk
- Bank teller
- Cashier
- Clerk-Stenographer
- Clerk-Typist
- File Clerk
- General Office
- Inventory Control Clerk
- Keypunch operator
- Legal secretary
- Personnel clerk
- Receptionist
- Secretary
- Other (specify)

4. In comparison with other workers of about the same age and who have been on the same job, or a similar one for approximately the same length of time, how would you rate this employee on:

1--Definitely Inferior
2--Below Average
3--Average
4--Above Average
5--Superior

A. Interest in work 1 2 3 4 5
B. Eagerness to learn more about job 1 2 3 4 5
C. Willingness to assume responsibility 1 2 3 4 5
D. Leadership ability 1 2 3 4 5
E. Cooperation with others 1 2 3 4 5
F. Attitude toward job 1 2 3 4 5
G. Regularity of attendance at work 1 2 3 4 5
H. Quality of work 1 2 3 4 5
I. Quantity of work 1 2 3 4 5
J. Overall promise as an employee 1 2 3 4 5
5. What is (or was) the **one most favorable** characteristic you observed in this employee?

6. What seems to be the **chief difficulty** this employee has (or had) with his job?

7. In view of the way this employee has performed in your establishment, what suggestions have you for improving the training of people under the MDTA clerk-stenographer programs?

**Evaluation**

Model Component I provides the surveyor with data regarding the objectives of MDTA. Model Components II, III, and IV provide the surveyor with the necessary data to evaluate the basic objectives of the MDT Act. From the components within the packet, the surveyor may evaluate the multi-facets of the total training effort.

Through the use of the model components, the following major evaluative questions and sub-informational questions can be answered:

1. Is the training program providing training to the type of trainee for which the Act was intended? (Example: unemployed, underemployed, below poverty level) Refer to MDTA objectives, Model Component I

2. Did the training result in removing the individual from the public assistance role?

3. Did the training result in raising the trainee's production potential?

4. Did the training succeed in removing the trainee from the poverty level?

5. Has the trainee increased the earning power of the trainee?
a. What was he earning before training?
b. What was he earning on his first post-training job?
c. What is his present wage?

6. What effect did the program have on the employment status of the trainee?

a. Was he employed before training?
b. Was he employed after training?
c. How many sought full-time employment after termination of training?
d. How many sought part-time employment after termination of training?

7. What evidence exists as to whether the graduate is satisfied or dissatisfied with his training?

a. How does the graduate appraise various aspects of the MDTA curriculum?
b. What is the graduate's perceptions regarding standards of courses offered in the program?
c. How does the graduate appraise the business equipment used in training?
d. How does the graduate appraise the services of the Employment Commission?

8. Are employers satisfied with the MDTA clerk-stenographer graduates?

a. How does the employer rate the graduate on interest in work?
b. How does the employer rate the graduate on job attitude?
c. How does he rate the graduate on quantity of work?
d. How does he rate the graduate on quality of work?
e. What are the chief difficulties with MDTA graduates as perceived by employers?

9. Has MDTA provided training for an individual who because of economic status could not have gotten the training under other existing programs?
10. Has MDTA helped an individual to work at a level more commensurate with his ability?

11. Has MDTA helped to place an individual on a job he can hold?

12. Has the MDTA trainee moved into a job of the type for which he was trained?

13. What can you learn from trainees and employers that will improve the program?
APPENDIX A

LETTERS OF AUTHORIZATION FOR CONDUCTING STUDY
September 5, 1971

Mr. Clove E. Loman
State Supervisor
Manpower Training Service
State Department of Education
Richmond, Virginia 23216

Dear Mr. Loman:

A tentative outline has been submitted to a seminar class at The Ohio State University relating to a proposed research project for my dissertation. Since my most recent experience has been that of teaching and supervising in manpower training, my major interest and concern is with the Virginia program.

The topic proposed for the study is entitled "An Evaluation of Abingdon, Virginia, NDTA Skill Center Clerk-Stenographer Programs by 1965-1970 Graduates with Implications for Change in the Business Curricula." The study would involve a follow-up of at least 100 graduates of the Clerk-Stenographer projects for the period indicated.

It is necessary that permission be granted by your office before a study of this type can be undertaken. After you have read the tentative outline which is enclosed, a letter confirming the request will be appreciated. Also, suggestions regarding any outline revisions will be welcomed.

Please be assured that the results of this study will be submitted to the Manpower Training Service, Virginia State Department of Education. The graduates' perceptions of specific Clerk-Stenographer programs may greatly assist in curricula revision for the betterment of future NDTA Clerk-Stenographer programs in the state of Virginia.

My best regards to your entire staff.

Sincerely,

John J. Stallard

Enclosure
Mr. John J. Stallard, Director
Scott County Vocational Center
Gate City, Virginia 24251

Dear Mr. Stallard:

This is in reply to your letter of September 15, 1971, relating to a proposed research project for your dissertation.

I have looked over your outline, and it seems complete and thorough. I have talked with Mr. Frank Ryburn at Abingdon, and he has discussed this with you and will gladly cooperate with you in this study.

You have the permission of the State Office of Manpower Training to proceed with this study. Any aid which we can provide, please get in touch with us; and we will comply as fully as possible. Looking forward to seeing you some time in the near future in the Abingdon area.

Remaining sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Steve E. Loman
State Director
Manpower Training Program

cc: Mr. Frank Ryburn
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September 5, 1971

Mr. Groover Witten
Manager
Virginia Employment Commission
Bristol, Virginia

Dear Mr. Witten:

A tentative outline has been submitted to a seminar class at The Ohio State University relating to a proposed research project for my dissertation. Since my most recent experience has been that of teaching and supervising in Manpower training, my major interest and concern is with the Virginia program.

The topic proposed for the study is entitled "An Evaluation of Abingdon, Virginia, MDTA Skill Center Clerk-Stenographer Programs by 1965-1970 Graduates with Implications for Change in the Business Curricula." The study would involve a follow-up of at least 100 graduates of the Clerk-Stenographer projects for the period indicated.

It is necessary that permission be granted by your office before a study of this type can be undertaken. After you have read the tentative outline which is enclosed, a letter confirming the request will be appreciated. Also, suggestions regarding any outline revisions will be welcomed.

Mr. Byburn of the Washington County Manpower Training Skill Center has verbally granted permission from the study. A letter has also been sent to Mr. Lozan, State Supervisor, requesting authorization.

The graduates' perceptions of specific Clerk-Stenographer programs may greatly assist in curricula revision for the betterment of future MDTA Clerk-Stenographer projects in the state of Virginia.

My best regards to the entire VEC staff.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

John J. Stallard

Enclosure
Mr. John J. Stallard  
4690 Merrifield Place  
Columbus, Ohio 43220

Dear Mr. Stallard:

Your correspondence dated September 5, 1971, addressed to our Bristol Manager, Mr. Greever Witten, was forwarded to this office for a reply.

We are happy that you have chosen the Clerical Projects at the Abingdon Skills Center to research. We feel that this Skills Center has done an outstanding job of training and job placement.

Permission for your research project is granted with the stipulation that you forward to this office three copies of your findings upon completion.

For possible assistance in your research efforts, we are enclosing a copy of MDTA in Virginia 1963 - 1970.

If we can be of any further assistance in this matter, please advise us.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Albert L. Moore  
Assistant Commissioner

Enclosure
September 5, 1971

Mr. Frank Ryburn
Manpower Training Supervisor
Washington County Manpower
Training Skill Center
Abingdon, Virginia 24210

Dear Mr. Ryburn:

A tentative outline has been submitted to a seminar class at The Ohio State University relating to a proposed research project for my dissertation. Since my most recent experience has been that of teaching and supervising in Manpower training, my major interest and concern is with the Virginia program. The Washington County Skill Center has been chosen because of the mutual association we have enjoyed for the past few years.

The topic proposed for the study is entitled "An Evaluation of Abingdon, Virginia, EDTA Skill Center Clerk-Stenographer Programs by 1965-1970 Graduates with Indications for Change in the Business Curricula." The study would involve a follow-up of at least 100 graduates of the Clerk-Stenographer projects for the period indicated.

It is necessary that permission be granted by your office before a study of this type can be undertaken. After you have read the tentative outline which is enclosed, a letter confirming the request will be appreciated. Also, suggestions regarding any outline revisions will be welcomed.

Please be assured that the results of this study will be submitted to you. The graduates' perceptions of specific Clerk-Stenographer programs may greatly assist in curricula revision for the Abingdon Center as well as contribute to the betterment of the entire state program.

Best regards to you and the entire staff.

Sincerely,

John J. Stallard

Enclosure
Mr. John J. Stallard  
4690 Merrifield Place  
Columbus, Ohio  43220

Dear Jack:

I have discussed your request concerning your dissertation with Dr. E. B. Stanley, our Division Superintendent. With his approval, I am granting permission for this Center to sponsor your proposed study as outlined with your correspondence.

We believe that the results of this study will be very beneficial in evaluating our own programs and suggesting proposed revisions for other programs within our state.

Sincerely,

Frank Byburn  
MDTA Director
November 1, 1971

Dr. H. H. London, Professor
Industrial Education Department
University of Missouri
Columbia, Missouri

Dear Dr. London:

I am very much interested in a study you directed and reported in 1967 entitled "How Fare MDTA Ex-Trainees — An Eighteen Months Follow-Up of 500 Such Persons."

At the present time, I am conducting research relating to MDTA programs in Southwest Virginia; however, my emphasis is on Clerk-Stenographer programs only. My main concern is with graduates who have completed clerical programs in rural Manpower Training Skill Centers. The research is being conducted as a part of my dissertation requirements at the Ohio State University.

I would like to secure permission to use the "Employee Rating Form" included in your study on page 202. There is a possibility that some revision will be made. Basically, the form seems to constitute the specific types of information needed from employers.

If you think it advisable, a letter can be sent to the Department of Labor requesting their authorization to use the rating form.

A reply at your earliest convenience will be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

John J. Stallard
4690 Horriffield Place
Columbus, Ohio 43220
November 3, 1971

Mr. John J. Stallard
4690 Merrifield Place
Columbus, Ohio 43220

Dear Mr. Stallard:

This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of November 1, 1971.

It is quite satisfactory with me for you to make use of the Employee Rating Form included in the report of my study, Page 202. However, I think it would be well also if you would ask permission of the Department of Labor for the use of this form, as the study was financed by them.

Sincerely yours,

H. H. London
Professor Emeritus
Industrial Education
June 12, 1972

U. S. Department of Labor  
Office of Manpower Policy  
Evaluation and Research  
Washington, D. C.

Gentlemen:

I would like to secure permission to use, with some modifications, the "Employee Rating Form" included in a research study supported under Contract Number 81-24-25.

At the present time, I am conducting research relating to MDTA programs in Southwest Virginia; however, my emphasis is on Clerk-Stenographer programs only. My main concern is with graduates who have completed clerical programs in rural Manpower Training Skill Centers. The research is being conducted as a part of my dissertation requirements at The Ohio State University.

Please note the attached letter submitted to Dr. H. H. London and his reply.

A confirmation of this request within the next few days will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

John J. Stallard  
4690 Merrifield Place  
Columbus, Ohio 43220

Enclosures
JUL 14 1972

Mr. John J. Stallard
4630 Merrifield Place
Columbus, Ohio 43220

Dear Mr. Stallard:

This is to acknowledge your request for permission to use the "Employee Rating Form" included in a research study supported by the Manpower Administration. The form in question was developed by Dr. H. H. London under contract 61-24-25.

You are free to use and modify the form. Our purpose in supporting research is to increase knowledge in the field of manpower and we are pleased to know that one of our contractors has made a contribution worth being used by other scholars.

We would be pleased to see your dissertation when it is completed to see how you have built on the work of Dr. London.

Sincerely,

HOWARD ROSEN
Director
Office of Research and Development
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRES TO EIGHT MDTA STATE DIRECTORS FOR VALIDATION
Inquiry Form

Name ____________________________ Date ____________________________

Position ____________________________

Address ____________________________

Introduction.—On the following pages are statements which may be used to evaluate MDTA Clerk-Stenographer programs in the Appalachian region. The statements reveal basic data which may be elicited from graduates of MDTA Clerk-Stenographer programs as well as perceptions from their employers. It is intended that these statements later be developed into a model which may assist MDTA state directors, assistant state directors, local directors, clerk-stenographer instructors, and others in the evaluation of MDTA stenographic programs.

The statements are in three major parts as follows:

I. Information from employer
II. Information from MDTA graduates
III. Characteristics of trainees

As a leader in Manpower training, you are asked to help decide which "evaluative statements" are most important, which should be eliminated, and whether any additional statements should be included.

Instructions.—Please take the following steps in the examination of the material:

a. Read each statement or question and circle one of the numbers to the right of the item in accordance with its approximate value to the process of evaluation. The key for this purpose is as follows:

5—Of particular importance to the evaluation process
4—Of "above average" significance
3—Of "fair" value
2—Of some use to the evaluation process
1—Of no importance to evaluation process; should be eliminated from statements.

b. Should you wish to suggest additional statements, please list them at the end of the section to which they are related and give each item a weighting of from 2 to 5, in the same manner you have already marked the other statements. Use additional sheets of paper if necessary.

c. Return completed data in enclosed envelope to:

John J. Stallard
4690 Merrifield Place
Columbus, Ohio 43220
PART I

EMPLOYEE RATING FORM
For Use In
EVALUATING KDTA GRADUATES

Graduate's Name ____________________________
(Last) ____________________________ (First) ____________________________ (Initial)

Employer: ____________________________
(Name of Person or Firm)

Employer's Address: ____________________________
(Number & Street) ____________________________ (City) ____________________________ (State)

Job Title of Person Supplying Information: ____________________________

1. Is this person still working for you? Yes ( ) No ( ) 1 2 3 4 5
   (If Yes, skip to #4.)

2. Do you know where this person is now employed? Yes ( ) No ( ) 1 2 3 4 5
   If Yes, give name and address of firm.

3. For what reason did this person leave your firm? 1 2 3 4 5

4. As an employee of your firm, what is (or was) this person's:

A. Dates of employment: ____________________________ to ____________________________
   (No. - Yr.) to (No. - Yr.) 1 2 3 4 5

B. Beginning base wage: $_________ per hour ______ hours per week 1 2 3 4 5

C. Highest base wage paid: $_________ per hour ______ hours per week 1 2 3 4 5

D. Beginning job title and duties (Briefly describe the duties or attach a job description sheet.) 1 2 3 4 5

E. Job title and duties at present (or when trainee left your employment): ____________________________
   (Job Title) 1 2 3 4 5
   Describe duties or attach job description sheet.
NOTE: Employers of HDTA Clerk-Stenographer graduates will be asked to respond to A through J of question 5. The employer would respond to each part of question 5 by checking Superior, Above Average, Average, Below Average, or Definitely Inferior. Please rate the following statements or questions as to whether they should constitute a part of the evaluation process.

5. In comparison with other workers of about the same age, and who have been on the same job, or a similar one, for approximately the same length of time, how would you rate this employee on:

A. Interest in work 1 2 3 4 5
B. Eagerness to learn more about job 1 2 3 4 5
C. Willingness to assume responsibility 1 2 3 4 5
D. Leadership ability 1 2 3 4 5
E. Cooperation with others 1 2 3 4 5
F. Attitude toward job 1 2 3 4 5
G. Regularity of attendance at work 1 2 3 4 5
H. Quality of work 1 2 3 4 5
I. Quantity of work 1 2 3 4 5
J. Overall promise as an employee 1 2 3 4 5

The following questions will be directed to employers as a part of the evaluation process. Please rate them as to whether they should constitute a part of the evaluation process.

6. What is (or was) the one most favorable characteristic you observed in this employee? 1 2 3 4 5

7. What seems to be the chief difficulty this employee has (or had) with his (or her) job? 1 2 3 4 5

8. In view of the way this employee has performed in your establishment, what suggestions have you for improving the training of people under the HDTA clerk-stenographer programs? 1 2 3 4 5

9. Other statements which YOU feel should be a part of the evaluation process:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
PART II

A FOLLOW-UP SURVEY OF FORMER HDTA GRADUATES

1. Since you left the HDTA program, did you seek full-time employment? (30 or more hours per week) Yes / ( ) No 2( )

2. If you did not seek full-time employment when you left the HDTA program, indicate the reason. (Check only one box)

1( ) Expected to enter another school
2( ) Housewife or about to be married
3( ) Physical or other hardship
4( ) Not interested in a job
5( ) Expected to enter military service
6( ) Only wanted to work part-time
7( ) Other (specify)

3. Did you seek part-time employment when you left this program? (less than 30 hours per week)

Yes / ( ) No 2( )

4. If you sought part-time employment instead of full-time employment when you left the HDTA program, indicate the reason. (Check only one box)

1( ) Expected to enter another school
2( ) Housewife or about to be married
3( ) Physical or other hardship
4( ) Not interested in a full-time job
5( ) Expected to enter military service
6( ) Unable to find a full-time job
7( ) Other (specify)

5. How many full-time jobs have you held since you left the HDTA program?

0( ) None
1( ) 1 full-time job
2( ) 2 full-time jobs
3( ) 3 to 5 full-time jobs
4( ) 6 or more full-time jobs

NOTE: If your answer to question 5 was NONE, skip to question 15.

6. If you got a full-time job when you left the HDTA vocational program, what was your job? 1 2 3 4 5
7. How closely did your first full-time job after leaving the HDTA program relate to the training you received? (Check only one box)

1 ( ) I was employed in the occupation for which I was trained in the HDTA program
2 ( ) I was employed in a related occupation
3 ( ) I was employed in a completely different occupation

8. Did this HDTA program adequately prepare you for your first full-time job after leaving this training? Yes 1 ( ) No 2 ( )

9. What was your beginning hourly wage on your first full-time job since leaving this vocational program? (Check only one box)

1 ( ) $1.59 or less per hour
2 ( ) $1.60 to $1.99 per hour
3 ( ) $2.00 to $2.49 per hour
4 ( ) $2.50 to $2.99 per hour
5 ( ) $3.00 to $3.99 per hour
6 ( ) $4.00 or more per hour

10. How did you get your first full-time job after leaving this HDTA program?

1 ( ) I got the job myself.
2 ( ) My family or friends helped me get the job.
3 ( ) The job placement services provided by the school helped me get the job.
4 ( ) The state employment service helped me get the job.
5 ( ) A private employment agency helped me get the job.
6 ( ) Other (specify)

11. After you got your first full-time job, have you ever again used any of the job placement services provided by the school or the HDTA program? Yes 1 ( ) No 2 ( )

(If Yes, check the service(s) you have used since getting your first job)

1 ( ) Coordinated service provided by school and state employment service
2 ( ) Vocational teacher's assistance
3 ( ) Guidance counselor's assistance
4 ( ) Other (specify)
12. What is the most you have earned on a full-time job since leaving this program? (Check only one box)

1) $1.59 or less per hour
2) $1.60 to $1.99 per hour
3) $2.00 to $2.49 per hour
4) $2.50 to $2.99 per hour
5) $3.00 to $3.99 per hour
6) $4.00 or more per hour

13. If you held two or more full-time jobs since you ended MDTA training, check one box below.

1) My last job was related to the MDTA training
2) My last job was not related at all to the MDTA training

14. Indicate below the location of your present or most recent full-time employment.

15. What is your current employment status? (Check the appropriate space or spaces below)

1) I am employed
   (a) full-time
   (b) part-time
2) I am unemployed,
   (a) but looking for work
   (b) and not looking for work
3) I am in the military service

16. If you are presently working, what is your job?

17. What wages are you presently earning?

1) $1.59 or less per hour
2) $1.60 to $1.99 per hour
3) $2.00 to $2.49 per hour
4) $2.50 to $2.99 per hour
5) $3.00 to $3.99 per hour
6) $4.00 or more per hour

18. Were you satisfied with the vocational training you received in the MDTA program? Yes ( ) No ( )
19. As best you know, what type(s) of job placement services were provided by the IDTA Center and the vocational program in which you were enrolled?

( ) School had no placement services
( ) A school placement service coordinated with the State Employment Service
( ) IDTA instructors helped place students in jobs by making referrals
( ) Guidance counselors helped students find jobs
( ) Other (specify)________________________

1 2 3 4 5

20. Would you recommend the IDTA Clerk-Stenographer program to other prospective trainees? Yes ( ) No ( )

1 2 3 4 5

21. Since you left this vocational program, have you enrolled in any additional education program(s)?

Yes ( ) No ( )

If Yes, check type(s) and purpose(s) below:

( ) General education program(s)

( ) To raise my general education level
( ) Informal, noncredit course(s)

( ) Vocational program(s)

( ) To upgrade the vocational skills previously learned in this program
( ) To learn a new occupation

What type(s) of vocational training program(s) did you attend?

( ) Private school(s)
( ) Public school(s)
( ) Business or industry

22. If you did enroll for additional education after leaving the IDTA program, have you received (or expect to receive) one or more of the following:

Yes ( ) No ( )

If Yes, check type(s)

( ) A certificate (type) ____________________________
( ) A diploma (type) ____________________________
( ) A 2-year associate degree
(Major) ____________________________
( ) A 4-year college degree
(Major) ____________________________
( ) Other (specify) ____________________________
23. Are you now enrolled in a vocational program?  
Yes ( ) No ( )

24. Are you now enrolled in any educational program(s) other than vocational? Yes ( ) No ( )

25. Are you interested in getting more vocational training? Yes ( ) No ( )

26. Are you interested in getting more general education? Yes ( ) No ( )

27. If you are interested in getting more training of any kind, indicate the type you are interested in:

28. In relation to my employment since completing NDTA training, the following subjects were of value.
(Graduate would respond by checking all that were important to him in relation to job(s) held).

- Typewriting
- Shorthand
- Business English
- Word Studies
- Office Machines
- Filing
- Secretarial Practice
- Other (specify)

29. In relation to my employment since completing NDTA training, the following subject should receive more emphasis. (Please check one)

- Typewriting
- Shorthand
- Business English
- Word Studies
- Office Machines
- Filing
- Secretarial Practice
- Other (specify)
30. In relation to my employment since completing MDTA training, the following subject should receive less emphasis. (Please check one)

[ ] Typewriting
[ ] Shorthand
[ ] Business English
[ ] Word Studies
[ ] Office Machines
[ ] Filing
[ ] Secretarial Practice
[ ] Other (specify)

31. Were the standards of the MDTA business courses too high? Yes ( ) No ( )

32. Was the MDTA business equipment adequate to prepare you for office employment? Yes ( ) No ( )

33. Do you feel that the MDTA business instructors were qualified teachers? Yes ( ) No ( )

34. Do you feel that your MDTA Guidance Counselor(s) were effective in working with you as a trainee? Yes ( ) No ( )

SUPPLEMENTARY

Please check the business subjects you had taken, if any, prior to entering Manpower training:

[ ] Typing--Personal
[ ] Typing I
[ ] Typing II
[ ] Bookkeeping I
[ ] Bookkeeping II
[ ] Business Machines
[ ] Business Arithmetic
[ ] Business Law
[ ] Consumer Economics
[ ] General Business
[ ] Retailing I
[ ] Retailing II
[ ] Shorthand I
[ ] Shorthand II
[ ] Notehand
[ ] Other (specify)

Please use the space below and on the back for comments you have on how the MDTA Clerk-Stenographer program can be improved.
PART III

CHARACTERISTICS OF KDTA CLERK-STENOGRAPHER
TRAINING PRIOR TO ENTERING TRAINING

In the evaluation process, it may be necessary to assess the characteristics of KDTA trainees prior to entering training. After completion of the program, an evaluation may be made to contrast the accomplishments of the graduates with that of their former status.

The following two pages encompass major parts to be used to relate characteristics of KDTA Clerk-Stenographer trainees prior to entering training. It may be necessary to include this component as an integral part of a "Model for Evaluating Clerk-Stenographer Programs in Appalachia."

After you have studied the component parts, will you please check your preference in the space provided regarding usefulness of such data.

_____ I agree that the "characteristics" phase should be included in a model for evaluating KDTA Clerk-Stenographer programs

_____ I do not think the "characteristics" phase should be included in a model for evaluating KDTA Clerk-Stenographer programs

NOTE: Please feel free to recommend changes in the "characteristics" phase of the study.
CHARACTERISTICS OF MDTA CLERK-STENOGRAPHER
TRAINERS

Graduate's Name ____________________________________________

(First) (Last) (Initial)

Last Known Address _________________________________________

(State) (City) (Street)

Telephone Number ________________________________

Received Vocational Services under MDTA:
1. Yes 2. No 3. Unknown

Occupation for which person was trained under MDTA:
_________________________ Classification No. __________________

(Occupation Title)

_________________________ Project No. __________________________

_________________________ Length of training in weeks ________

MDTA training started: ___________________ (Month) ____________ (Year)

MDTA training completed: ___________________ (Month) ____________ (Year)

Birthdate: ___________________ (Month) ___________________ (Year)

Primary wage earner prior to training:
1. Yes _____ No _____

Family below poverty level
2. Yes _____ No _____

Physically Handicapped.
3. Yes _____ No _____

Public Assistance recipient at time of training
4. Yes _____ No _____

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

Highest year of education completed:
Grade School High School College
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16

Primary occupation prior to training: __________________________

DOT Code
Marital Status:

1. Married  
2. Single  
3. Widowed  
4. Divorced  
5. Separated  

Eligible for training allowance: Yes  No  
Eligible for transportation allowance: Yes  No  
Dear State Director:

In the space provided, would you please write what you consider to be the major objectives of manpower training? (If you have a listing of the objectives, you may include it when you return the other data).

MAJOR OBJECTIVES

NOTE: I would like to secure from your office any publication or forms you may have which reflect your program of evaluation in NDEA.

Thank you for your cooperation.
APPENDIX C

NAMES, TITLES, AND ADDRESSES OF VALIDATING COMMITTEE WITH SAMPLE LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL
Validating Committee

Mr. Carl V. Black  
State Director  
MDTA Training  
Nashville, Tennessee

Mr. John W. Cole  
MDTA State Supervisor  
State Department of Education  
Charleston, West Virginia

Mr. Odell Faircloth  
Assistant Supervisor  
Department of Community Colleges  
State Department of Education  
Raleigh, North Carolina

Mr. Cleve E. Loman  
State Supervisor  
Manpower Training Service  
State Department of Education  
Richmond, Virginia

Mr. Lyle M. Neikirk  
Assistant Director  
Interagency Relations  
Bureau of Vocational Education  
Frankfort, Kentucky

Mr. L. E. Nichols  
State Supervisor  
MDTA Training  
State Department of Education  
Atlanta, Georgia

Mr. J. W. Noel, Jr.  
Assistant Director  
Division of Vocational Education  
State Department of Education  
Columbus, Ohio

Dr. M. Wayne Podvia  
Chief, Retraining Section  
State Department of Education  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania
June 26, 1972

Mr. Cleve E. Loman
State Director
Manpower Training Service
State Department of Education
Richmond, Virginia 23216

Dear Mr. Loman:

As State Director of the Virginia MDTA program, you are well aware of the number of clerical contracts which have been funded during the past few years. The graduates of these training programs are helping to strengthen our economy.

One means of achieving excellence in training is through constant evaluation. A research study is being conducted at The Ohio State University to set up a model that may be used in the evaluation of your future MDTA Clerk-Stenographer programs. Even though most states are now funding their Steno programs as a part of the total clerical cluster, the research will deal only with the Clerk-Stenographer phase of a clerical contract. The study will also be confined to the ten-state Appalachian region.

Your professional assistance in the validation of the enclosed instruments is of utmost importance. Your thinking will reflect the opinion of a Virginia MDTA representative in the development of the model. Instructions for completing the forms are included in the attached cover sheet.

Your cooperation in this research endeavor will be very much appreciated. If you will return the completed data by July 15, a copy of the results of the study can be made available to you within the near future.

Very truly yours,

John J. Stallard

Enclosures
Gate City Graduates

Mrs. Shirley Blalock
Mack Shelton, Attorney
Weber City, Virginia

Mrs. Helen Bowen
Scott County Schools
Gate City, Virginia

Miss Arneeda Culbertson
Scott County School Board
Gate City, Virginia

Mrs. Delta Fuller
Appalachian Power Company
Gate City, Virginia

Mrs. Patricia Nunley
Dent K. Burk Associates
Kingsport, Tennessee

Miss Patricia Peters
Scott County School Board
Gate City, Virginia

Miss Barbara Shoemaker
Scott County School Board
Gate City, Virginia

Miss Edna Mae Stanley
Quillen & Carter, Attorneys
Gate City, Virginia

Mrs. Ethel Stanley
Goodwill Industries, Inc.
Gate City, Virginia

Miss Sue Thorpe
Scott County Vocational Center
Gate City, Virginia
Columbus, Ohio Industry Personnel

Dr. Norma Benton, Nutritionist
Borden, Inc.
1840 Mackenzie Drive
Columbus, Ohio

Mr. Earl Leonard
Systems Analyst
Industrial Nucleonics, Inc.
650 Ackerman Road
Columbus, Ohio

Mr. Charles Livingston, Director
Corporate Quality Assurance
Borden, Inc.
1840 Mackenzie Drive
Columbus, Ohio

Mr. Max Weimer, Inspector
Borden, Inc.
1840 Mackenzie Drive
Columbus, Ohio
APPENDIX E

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL TO ACCOMPANY

GRADUATES' QUESTIONNAIRE

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE
August 3, 1972

Dear Clerk-Steno Graduate:

The Washington County Manpower Training Skill Center, in conjunction with The Ohio State University, is conducting a research project to set up a model for the evaluation of MDTA clerk-stenographer programs in the Appalachian region. The project involves representation in ten different states.

The Abingdon Center has been selected to test one of the major components of the model. In order to do this, it is necessary to follow-up Abingdon clerk-stenographer graduates for a seven-year period. The data will be compiled jointly--individual responses will be kept strictly confidential.

We would like to ask your support of this project by completing the questionnaire which is enclosed. A stamped, self-addressed envelope is included for your convenience.

The questionnaire should be returned to us by August 10. Won't you please give this your careful attention. Your cooperation will insure that others may profit from the Clerk-Stenographer MDTA program as you have.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jack Stallard

Enclosures
1. Since you left the MDTA program, did you seek full-time employment? (30 or more hours per week)
   ( ) Yes  ( ) No

2. If you did not seek full-time employment when you left the MDTA program, indicate the reason. (Check only one box)
   ( ) Expected to enter another school
   ( ) Housewife or about to be married
   ( ) Physical or other hardship
   ( ) Not interested in a job
   ( ) Expected to enter military service
   ( ) Only wanted to work part-time
   ( ) Other (specify) __________________________

3. Did you seek part-time employment when you left this program? (less than 30 hours per week)
   ( ) Yes  ( ) No

4. If you sought part-time employment instead of full-time employment when you left the MDTA program, indicate the reason. (Check only one box)
   ( ) Expected to enter another school
   ( ) Housewife or about to be married
   ( ) Physical or other hardship
   ( ) Not interested in a full-time job
   ( ) Expected to enter military service
   ( ) Unable to find a full-time job
   ( ) Other (specify) __________________________

5. How many full-time jobs have you held since you left the MDTA program?
   ( ) None
   ( ) 1 full-time job
   ( ) 2 full-time jobs
   ( ) 3 to 5 full-time jobs
   ( ) 6 or more full-time jobs

NOTE: If your answer to question 5 was NONE, skip to question 15.

6. If you got a full-time job when you left the MDTA vocational program, what was your job?

7. How closely did your first full-time job after leaving the MDTA program relate to the training you received? (Check only one box)
   ( ) I was employed in the occupation for which I was trained in the MDTA program
   ( ) I was employed in a related occupation
   ( ) I was employed in a completely different occupation

8. Did this MDTA program adequately prepare you for your first full-time job after leaving this training? ( ) Yes  ( ) No

9. What was your beginning hourly wage on your first full-time job since leaving the MDTA program? (Check only one box)
   ( ) $1.59 or less per hour
   ( ) $1.60 to $1.99 per hour
   ( ) $2.00 to $2.49 per hour
   ( ) $2.50 to $2.99 per hour
   ( ) $3.00 to $3.99 per hour
   ( ) $4.00 or more per hour
10. How did you get your first full-time job after leaving the MDTA program? (Check appropriate box or boxes)

( ) I got the job myself.
( ) My family or friends helped me get the job.
( ) The job placement services provided by the school helped me get the job.
( ) The state employment service helped me get the job.
( ) A private employment agency helped me get the job.
( ) Other (specify) ____________________________

11. After you got your first full-time job, have you ever again used any of the job placement services provided by the school or the MDTA program?

( ) Yes ( ) No

(If Yes, check the service(s) you have used since getting your first job)

( ) Coordinated service provided by school and state employment service.
( ) Vocational teacher's assistance.
( ) Guidance counselor's assistance.
( ) Other (specify) ____________________________

12. What is the most you have earned on a full-time job since leaving this program? (Check only one box)

( ) $1.59 or less per hour
( ) $1.60 to $1.99 per hour
( ) $2.00 to $2.49 per hour
( ) $2.50 to $2.99 per hour
( ) $3.00 to $3.99 per hour
( ) $4.00 or more per hour

13. If you held two or more full-time jobs since you ended MDTA training, check one box below.

( ) My last job was related to the MDTA training.
( ) My last job was not related at all to the MDTA training.

14. Indicate below the location of your present or most recent full-time employment.

______________________________________________________________

15. What is your current employment status? (Check the appropriate box or boxes below)

( ) I am employed
( ) full-time
( ) part-time
( ) I am unemployed,
( ) but looking for work
( ) and not looking for work
( ) I am in the military service

16. If you are presently working, what is your job? ____________________________________________

17. What wages are you presently earning?

( ) $1.59 or less per hour
( ) $1.60 to $1.99 per hour
( ) $2.00 to $2.49 per hour
( ) $2.50 to $2.99 per hour
( ) $3.00 to $3.99 per hour
( ) $4.00 or more per hour

18. Were you satisfied with the vocational training you received in the MDTA program?

( ) Yes ( ) No

19. As best you know, what type(s) of job placement services were provided by the MDTA Center and the vocational program in which you were enrolled?

( ) School had no placement services.
( ) A school placement service coordinated with the State Employment Service.
( ) MDTA instructors helped place students in jobs by making referrals.
( ) Guidance counselors helped students find jobs.
( ) Other (specify) ____________________________
20. Would you recommend the Clark-Stenographer program to other prospective trainees?
   ( ) Yes  ( ) No

21. Since you left the NDTA program, have you enrolled in any additional education program(s)?
   ( ) Yes  ( ) No

   If Yes, check type(s) and purposes(s) below:
   ( ) General education program(s)
     ( ) To raise my general education level
     ( ) Informal, noncredit course(s)
   ( ) Vocational program(s)
     ( ) To upgrade the vocational skills previously learned in the NDTA program
     ( ) To learn a new occupation

   What type(s) of vocational training program(s) did you attend?
   ( ) Private school(s)
   ( ) Public school(s)
   ( ) Business or Industry

22. If you did enroll for additional education after leaving the NDTA program, have you received (or expect to receive) one or more of the following: ( ) Yes  ( ) No

   If Yes, check type(s)
   ( ) A certificate (type) __________
   ( ) A diploma (type) __________
   ( ) A 2-year associate degree (Major) __________
   ( ) A 4-year college degree (Major) __________
   ( ) Other (specify) __________

23. Are you now enrolled in a vocational program?
   ( ) Yes  ( ) No

24. Are you now enrolled in any educational program(s) other than vocational?
   ( ) Yes  ( ) No

25. Are you interested in getting more vocational training?
   ( ) Yes  ( ) No

26. Are you interested in getting more general education?
   ( ) Yes  ( ) No

27. If you are interested in getting more training of any kind, indicate the type you are interested in: __________

28. In relation to my employment since completing NDTA training, the following subjects were of value.
   (Place checkmark for all subjects you considered of value)
   __________ Typewriting
   __________ Shorthand
   __________ Business English
   __________ Word Studies
   __________ Office Machines
   __________ Filing
   __________ Secretary Practice
   __________ Other (specify) __________

29. In relation to my employment since completing NDTA training, the following subject should receive more emphasis. (Please check one)
   __________ Typewriting
   __________ Shorthand
   __________ Business English
   __________ Word Studies
   __________ Office Machines
   __________ Filing
   __________ Secretary Practice
   __________ Other (specify) __________
30. In relation to my employment since completing MDTA training, the following should receive less emphasis. (Please check one)

- Typewriting
- Shorthand
- Business English
- Word Studies
- Office Machines
- Filing
- Secretarial Practice
- Other (specify)

31. Were the standards of the MDTA business courses too high?

( ) Yes  ( ) No

32. Was the MDTA business equipment adequate to prepare you for office employment?

( ) Yes  ( ) No

33. Do you feel that the MDTA business instructors were qualified teachers?

( ) Yes  ( ) No

34. Do you feel that your MDTA Guidance Counselor(s) were effective in working with you as a trainee?

( ) Yes  ( ) No

35. Please check the business subjects you had taken, if any, prior to entering Manpower training:

- Typing--Personal
- Typing I
- Typing II
- Bookkeeping I
- Bookkeeping II
- Business Machines
- Business Arithmetic
- Business Law
- Consumer Economics
- General Business
- Retailing I
- Retailing II
- Shorthand I
- Shorthand II
- Notehand
- Other (specify)

36. Please use the space below for comments you have on how the MDTA Clerk-Stenographer program can be improved. Use back of paper, if necessary.

37. What do you consider to be the major objectives of the Manpower Training program? (Please write the objective(s) in the space below).

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION IN THIS RESEARCH EFFORT.
APPENDIX F

LIST OF EMPLOYERS INTERVIEWED
EMPLOYERS

Appalachian Power Company
Gate City
Virginia

Johnston Memorial Hospital
Abingdon
Virginia

CAMPS Program
Virginia Employment Commission
Abingdon, Virginia

Mouldings, Inc.
Marion
Virginia

Dent K. Burk Associates
Kingsport
Tennessee

Norton Community Hospital
Norton
Virginia

Department of Federal Programs
Abingdon
Virginia

Penn, Stuart, & Eskridge
Attorneys
Abingdon, Virginia

Department of Social Services
Marion
Virginia

Quillen & Carter
Attorneys
Gate City, Virginia

Emory & Henry College
Emory
Virginia

Reuning-Millard
Insurance Agency
Bristol, Virginia

Farmers Home Administration
Gate City
Virginia

Scott County School Board
Gate City
Virginia

First National Bank
Kingsport
Tennessee

Scott County Vocational Center
Gate City, Virginia

Goodwill Industries
Gate City
Virginia

Tennessee Eastman Company
Kingsport
Tennessee

Huff-Cook Insurance Company
Bristol
Virginia

United Telephone System
Johnson City
Tennessee
EMPLOYERS (Cont'd)

Virginia Highlands Community College
Abingdon
Virginia

Virginia National Bank
Glade Spring
Virginia

Virginia State Department of Education
Abingdon
Virginia

Washington County MDTA Center
Abingdon
Virginia

Westinghouse, Inc.
Abingdon
Virginia
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