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I.

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

This is a period of social concern. There are desperate attempts being made to assess, define, and label the population to achieve the utopia of the "American Dream." America is the land of wealth, harmony, opportunity and a prosperous life for all. With this kind of image there is no room for poverty, want and human waste. This is how "The Other America," as defined by Michael Harrington, was formed and effectively hidden until it has grown to the point that it has endangered the equality concept of the American dream.¹ There is poverty, a defined class structure, and a governmental giant to control the destiny of human beings. The fact that the United States has a social problem has become recognized, admitted and accepted. There are citizens who are unemployed, unhappy, unhealthy, untrained and unproductive. Some are receiving welfare; however, many are not willing to accept the humiliation and stigma of becoming welfare recipients. The word "welfare" brings pain to the hearts of both those who pay for welfare and therefore feel burdened and unfairly taxed and to the recipients who

¹
have traded dignity and self-respect for a bare existence
and a life of poverty and shame.

The concept that it is the responsibility of the gov-
ernment to provide for all is a matter of great concern and
controversy. Harrington states, "In a nation with a tech-
nology that could provide every citizen with a decent life,
it is an outrage and a scandal that there should be such
social misery."²

Education, perhaps, can provide the tools for individu-
als existing at the poverty level to make the decision about
where they want to fit into American society and give them
the knowledge and skill to achieve their goals.

The giant task exists of providing opportunity to all
youth to learn the basics in order to survive in a literate
population. An educated and informed citizenry has been
considered as the educational goal in the United States.
Education has been accepted as necessary and most desirable.
The question of who can decide when one has had enough formal
education must be asked. Who should decide when an indivi-
dual is ready to assume responsibility for his own edu-
cational development?

Currently the social pressures of welfare, unemploy-
ment, and defining the working poor have created an aware-
ness that our society has failed a sizeable group and amends
should be made. The task of evaluating what has happened
and what should be done has been assumed by agencies, social
groups, social scientists, politicians, and economists, all of whom have theories and remedies. Legislators controlling federal funds, have started a mass process of attacking the problem. This interest has resulted in human resource programs which have had and are having an impact on society.

The study reported here is about people who have been part of a program designed to increase their competence and an analysis of what has happened to them as individuals and as a group. It is generated by a concern for the participants and those who have staffed and created the programs. The philosophies held by those responsible for such program development have had a tremendous effect on the American economy, politics, history, social structure and educational systems. Whether or not this effort was constructive or destructive can only be analyzed and questioned. But hopefully more individuals will come to observe, study, and question this trend of poverty programs.

**Background of the Problem**

Adult education has been defined and recognized as a voluntary activity. The study of participants in adult education by Johnstone and Rivera entitled *Volunteers for Learning* exemplifies some thinking about the motives which lead adults to adult education. Many adult educators such as Charters, Illich, Jessup, and Ohliger as quoted in
Chapter II, question whether involuntary adult education should exist.

It is possible that the trend to educate and train the disadvantaged has in part changed the emphasis of the adult education movement. Its function has become an increasingly governmental responsibility subsidized by federal funds. Billions of dollars are being spent in these programs which are labeled as adult education but are under the control of various governmental bureaus and departments. New programs, methods, techniques, devices, and staff development plans are being created to convert existing agencies into adult education centers.

Educators have been forced to make decisions as to the best opportunities available for the participants in relation to maintaining a successful program. The moral and ethical considerations involved with current programs for the disadvantaged are serious. How can social services and education be offered to humans in order to motivate them to accept new standards at a speed which will justify programs as being worthwhile ventures? Often the form of motivation becomes a mandatory approach. Individuals are given the option of participating or some type of formal and/or informal sanctions will occur, such as the loss of welfare benefits. This process is creating compulsory adult education in a society in which education for adults has been considered a voluntary and self initiated activity.
Context of the Problem

Historical--Adult education by definition has been an activity initiated by an adult through his own desire and need for lifelong learning. Many authors imply that an adult must be a learner from birth to death, but do not recognize a formal compulsory system.

Theoretical--Theoretically this problem is based in the philosophy that any education program which somehow induces an increase in adult education does result in a positive experience beneficial for the individual and society. This philosophy appears to be accepted by some administrators, legislators, and educators who formulate programs for the disadvantaged such as the Work Incentive Program (WIN). This approach needs to be questioned and analyzed. Whether or not adult educators can or should impose a mandatory learning experience upon other members of society is a debatable issue.

Definition of Terms

1. WIN Program--A federally funded program whose goal is to help Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) welfare recipients become employed, thereby reducing ADC rolls. The program is designed to be flexible to meet individual needs. It is a cooperative effort between county welfare departments and the Bureau of Employment Services to provide educational, vocational, and social services required to result in employment.
2. **Adult Education**—The process by which men and women (alone, in groups, or in institutional settings) seek to improve themselves or their society by increasing their skill, knowledge, or sensitiveness; or it is any process by which individuals, groups or institutions try to help men and women improve in these ways. Houle supports this definition. Bergevin defines adult education as any formal activity in which an adult participates that will result in an increase or change in knowledge, skill, attitude, or behavior. Both of these definitions indicate that WIN is an adult education program.

3. **Mandatory and Compulsory Adult Education**—The terms mandatory and compulsory are used interchangeably to connote adult education which is required without free choice of the participant and the refusal of which could result in some type of sanctions.

4. **WIN Participant**—An individual who is enrolled in the WIN program and has an employability plan which outlines educational, vocational, and social services required to result in meaningful employment.

5. **Registrant Pool**—All of the Aid for Dependent Children recipients in each county who are physically and mentally able to work and therefore are eligible to be recruited into the WIN program.

6. **WIN Orientation and Assessment**—A formal program to inform participants of all possible resources to help them
in the community. They are also informed of their rights and responsibilities. The focus is educational but the climate is structured to encourage self-assessment, decision making, and planning. It is a group, world-of-work experience.

7. Employability Development Plan--The guidelines which the participants will follow in WIN. It is formed by the participant and WIN staff members to assess educational, vocational and social needs. It can be altered but each plan or change must be signed by all involved.

8. Termination--This is the formal process which occurs when a participant leaves the program and his welfare benefits are generally ended or altered. There are three types:

A. Completed job entry period (success)--This is called Employability Plan Complete. After ninety days on a job a participant can be considered a successful completion and is generally terminated from welfare or his benefits are reduced.

B. Neutral separation--The participant is no longer a part of the WIN program due to some condition which prohibits participation. These persons are returned to the pool subject to recall at a later date. Their welfare is continued. Reasons for neutral termination are illness, family problems, lack of suitable child-care, or inability to benefit from the program after a reasonable effort.
C. Refusal to participate--If the participant fails to participate as agreed in the employability development plan without good cause, he is returned to the pool and a recommendation is made that he be removed from public assistance. He has opportunities for conferences and public hearings, through a formal adjudication process. After removal he is de-registered and removed from the pool. This category is called the drop-outs. The term drop-out is used to identify a participant who does not complete the job entry period. A differentiation is made between those who are terminated for good-cause (neutral) and those who drop-out due to a refusal to participate.

9. Vendor Payments--A system by which a welfare department places a family on a protective payment plan. Welfare pays living costs directly to the creditors, no cash is issued to the family. This can be a punitive action for non-participation in WIN, and the portion of assistance for the head of the household is excluded. This plan is also utilized to protect the children's basic needs in case the head of the household cannot be trusted to budget money wisely.

Statement of the Problem

The central question--There is a great deal of controversy among adult educators as to whether a formalized mandatory or compulsory adult education should exist. The
purpose of this study is to determine how mandatory adult education does exist in programs for the disadvantaged using the Work Incentive Program (WIN) as a case study, to determine which participants' characteristics influence participation and how participants' feelings toward WIN as a mandatory program relates to their participation.

Main hypothesis--If the adult education aspect in programs for the disadvantaged such as WIN is mandatory and is influencing participation, then should the generally accepted philosophy of adult education be questioned in order to consider this current educational phenomenon?

Sub-questions:

(1) What is the rationale involved in the creation of federal adult education programs such as WIN? What is its history and background?

(2) What is the purpose, goal, and function of WIN and its relation to adult education?

(3) In what ways is adult education in the WIN program mandatory?

(4) Does this alleged mandatory function relate to WIN participants positively, negatively, both, or neither?

(5) What participant characteristics are related to possible success?
Hypotheses:

(1) There are no significant differences in the participants' ages among the success, drop-out, or neutral termination groups.

(2) There is no significant difference in participants' sex among the success, drop-out, or neutral termination groups.

(3) There is no significant difference in participant's educational level attained among the success, drop-out, or neutral termination groups.

(4) There is no significant difference in participant's marital status among the success, drop-out, or neutral termination groups.

(5) There is no significant difference in participant's number of dependents among the success, drop-out, or neutral termination groups.

(6) There is no significant difference in participant's years of work experience among the success, drop-out, or neutral termination groups.

(7) There is no significant difference in participant's length of time on welfare among the success, drop-out, or neutral termination groups.

(8) There is no significant difference in participant's attitude about mandatory WIN participation among the success, drop-out, or neutral termination groups.
FOOTNOTES


II.

JUSTIFICATION OF THIS STUDY

Review of the Literature

Since the WIN program is relatively new and has been in a constant state of transition, very little research has been conducted specifically with WIN enrollees. This fact itself indicates the extreme need for careful research and evaluation.

However several studies have been done with related disadvantaged human resource development programs whose constituents have many of the same characteristics as WIN enrollees with program goals that are essentially the same.

Rusch and Lenone did a report entitled, "Employment Service Activities for Welfare Clients in New York from 1966-68." This program was mandatory for all persons referred by the welfare department. By 1968, 377 persons had enrolled. Placement records indicate over a three-year period the success was less than twenty-five percent. One factor contributing to success was mobility. Newcomers were placed less easily than state residents with longer tenure. This factor was a regional indicator since New York had a very liberal welfare system. Very little
residence was required to become eligible for public assistance. The low success rate was attributed to undeveloped skills and inability of participants to compete in the labor market. Since participation was mandatory no selection or screening was needed. Motivation was a factor which differentiated those who were successful and those who dropped out. The program was essentially an adult education endeavor to result in employment.¹

Several studies have been done in the Opportunities Industrialization Centers which have some similarities to WIN. The final report of the Little Rock, Arkansas program indicated that this program was a self-help one of basic education and vocational training. Students participated in a required orientation program as they do in WIN and then took vocational skill courses. Of 1,580 who enrolled, 523 got as far as training and 296 were actually placed on jobs. This again shows a high drop-out or unsatisfactory completion rate. The reasons given to explain this figure were poor selection, lack of motivation to continue, breakdown of child-care arrangements, insufficient educational functioning level and poor attendance.²

The Opportunities Industrialization Center of Dauphin County, Pennsylvania, had a similar plan. They enrolled 1,887 persons. Of these, 300 were eventually placed in jobs. One problem seemed to be a communication block. To solve this problem this study suggested that more staff
members should have been selected who had come from a dis-
advantaged background. The majority of participants were
minority members. Poor attendance, poor communication, and
a lack of interest to participate attributed to the drop-
out rate.³

The Opportunities Industrialization Center in Oklahoma
City involved local business, civic and political leaders
in their programs. This proved to raise the image of the
center in the community eyes and had a greater acceptance.
There were 268 trainees placed of a total of 707. The
success rate indicated that pre-planning with community
leaders with careful interviewing for specific jobs proved
beneficial. However it also limited the scope of its ser-
dices to fewer and more qualified applicants.

The Erie Pennsylvania Opportunities Industrialization
Center tried greater screening and selection. Only 1,284
were selected out of 1,701 and of these 405 were placed on
jobs. Such screening factors were used as education, abil-
ity to raise educational levels, age, attitude, ability to
adjust, work record, and the desire to participate. The
adult basic education and the vocational training were given
simultaneously which seemed to generate and maintain inter-
est. These results would indicate that using some screening
process to select trainees will increase the chances for
success.⁵
The Omaha Opportunities Industrialization Center final report showed some success. They selected those who could train specifically for jobs existing in the community. Education, work experience, training and personality factors were previewed to determine if the trainee could adjust to the job. There were 835 who entered the mandatory prevocational course or orientation session. Forty-six percent finished the sessions. Therefore the drop-out factor was still present but occurred earlier. Of the 280 who entered vocational training, sixty-seven percent completed. Ninety-five of these became employed.6

A high drop-out rate is present in all these programs. Poor selection along with a type of pre-planned participation appeared in all the studies. Other common problems seem to be child-care, family problems, personal troubles, lack of interest to continue, adjustment, and a generally poor response to training.

Duncan indicated that occupational achievement was often dependent upon socioeconomic background and educational attainment. Other factors which seemed significant among his sample were national origin, race, family size, intelligence, stability, aspiration, job experience, marriage, children, and income. The sample consisted of many low income people from the disadvantaged population. The above factors did seem to influence occupational choice, continuance on jobs, and success.7
The Work Training Program for the economically and socially disadvantaged in California was designed under the Manpower Act. The staff found that "demand jobs" (jobs in which labor shortages existed) often were not meaningful, and the need for child-care was a major barrier to effective participation. Also they felt vocational training was not always necessary; counseling and basic education were sufficient for many participants. Of 1,063 participants, there were a total of 726 drop-outs, 354 before training began and 372 afterwards. There were 270 with acceptable reasons. The program did not meet the needs of 456 participants. The number placed in jobs was 337.

In the study entitled, "Manpower Trainees: Who Succeeds?" past trainees were analyzed and the following background variables were isolated as being predictors for success: number of dependents, length of training, and stability of employment. The older trainees tended to complete training. Educational attainment had a positive correlation with training completion. A more stable work record seemed to be a positive factor in predicting success. The higher the number of dependents, the higher was the drop-out possibility. Single trainees dropped out twice as much as married ones. There was no significant difference between the success rate of males and females. The attitude of the trainee toward the experience also seemed to directly affect successful completion.
In the article, "Manpower Programs in Four Cities," there were common problems between Manpower Development Training (MDTA), WIN, and the Concentrated Employment Program (CEP). Of a sample of 1709 trainees only 243 were still in the manpower programs after a six-month period of time. High drop-outs plagued all the programs. In the article, one main problem in WIN was found to be with the females; the San Francisco staff indicated that few females actually intended to seek employment after training. This statement seemed to be based on the opinions of staff and counselors. The MDTA programs maintained a sixty percent retention rate. This rate was attributed to better selection, training, and an improved image in the community. Constant evaluation was used with some research studies in the MDTA programs.¹⁰

These above listed articles all describe manpower programs similar to WIN. They have common problems, mainly a relatively high drop-out rate in comparison to successful completion. They tend to have various selection criteria ranging from a mandatory assignment to a formal screening process. This selective factor tends to have various effects on participation and ultimate success. Nearly all of the studies indicate that attitude and/or desire toward participation is a factor affecting the results.

In the findings by the Bureau of Social Science Research, 280 employers were interviewed who employ WIN participants. The most important attribute they were looking
for in potential employees was a positive attitude and willingness to follow company rules. Again, the concept of attitude and desire to work is evident.11

To explore the topic of mandatory adult education there are several sources which indicate the concern. Charters states that, "a major concern of continuing education is the encouragement of adults to learn. The task of the schools demands accomplishment in full recognition that learning situations for adults are not and probably cannot be mandated by law (compulsory school attendance); therefore methods of attraction and persuasion are required."12

Sylvia Jenks discusses the social controversy of making life-long education compulsory. She suggested a need for a system of compulsory education courses. The moral and political ramifications were considered but she leaned toward the view that the end would justify the means. Her questioning of this issue magnifies the need to examine this problem.13

Kuhlen intimated that adults might be made to pursue continuing education if certain social sanctions were altered. He stated, "The motivational tendencies of people are largely learned as a result of reward and punishment systems to which they are exposed during the course of early development; it is reasonable to expect that motives must be changed during adulthood if the individual is exposed to a new set of punishment and reward patterns." This statement
seems to directly indicate the trend of assigning social sanctions to increase educational effectiveness.\textsuperscript{14}

The question of the moral issue seems to be indicated by Ohliger. He expresses concern as to the results of the trend of compulsory adult education in terms of "what we are doing to individuals." He felt that adult educators often strive to develop life-long learning without regard to and respect for human rights.\textsuperscript{15} In another article he questioned, "if adult education becomes compulsory it will negate all the principles of learning established in the field so far. Such principles are based on the idea that learning is a voluntary act." His comments seem to be particularly relevant when applied to the compulsory situation in the WIN program.\textsuperscript{16}

Illich states, "The ideology of obligatory schooling admits no logical limits . . . It could mean that men in the modern city will be increasingly the victims of an effective process of total instruction and manipulation once they are deprived of even the tenuous pretense of critical independence which liberal schools now provide for at least some of their pupils . . . schools as compulsory channels for learning, could exist and be more repressive and destructive than anything we have come to know."\textsuperscript{17} In After Deschooling What? he stated, "We must become more efficient at educating people fit for an increasingly efficient society and a new society in which education
ceases to be the task of some special agency. If the school continues to lose its educational and political legitimacy, while knowledge is still conceived as a commodity, we will certainly face the emergence of a therapeutic Big Brother.\textsuperscript{18}

Jessup stated, "It is not quite unthinkable that some adult education might be made compulsory by the state . . . in a country which professes a liberal democratic way of life, adult education is, and must be, a voluntarily undertaken activity belonging to that segment of life in which man is autonomous.\textsuperscript{19}

In the Denmark system, Rasmussen stated, "compulsory education must be interpreted as an obligation of quality and this should be reflected in legislation on education as well as in levels of administration."\textsuperscript{20}

The above excerpts are a small sample which reflect the attitude of current adult educators in relation to the topic of compulsory adult education. It shows the controversy between the voluntary or compulsory issue as a continuous one for adult education.

\underline{How This Study Would Fit Into the Research}

This study includes a description of a current program which exemplifies mandatory adult education and its effects. Since very little has been published or made available to the public describing the WIN program, there is a need to disperse information. A careful look at the history and
development of WIN is needed to evaluate its progress and determine its direction. Historical and descriptive data are necessary to compare with other programs and studies.

How This Study Would Add to the Research

This study magnifies the issue of compulsory adult education. It shows how it exists and is used in a modern manpower program for the disadvantaged. It elaborates on the possible results of applying a mandatory aspect. It provides specific data in regard to the relationship of participants' attitudes toward their participation and other indentifying characteristics, which has not been available previously. The findings provide historical, descriptive, and factual data on the WIN program and its participants.
FOOTNOTES


14 Raymond Kuhlen, Psychological Backgrounds of Adult Education. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1963.

15 John Ohliger, "Lifelong Learning--Voluntary or Compulsory?" Adult Leadership, September 1968, p. 124.


III.

HISTORY OF THE WIN PROGRAM

Welfare is a public business which has demanded the attention of political and economic leaders throughout the history of the United States. Its roots are deeply planted in the foundation of the labor structure and entwined in the social movements and political framework of the society. Among other influences, the Calvin work ethic had established the ideal that each family was expected to have a working breadwinner to provide support. Hard and steady work was the solution to problems and full employment the dream.

Since the early sixteenth century, many western governments have come to make provisions for the care of the destitute often known as relief, public assistance, or welfare. There were all kinds of relief arrangements, auxiliary to the basic economic structure. Historically, relief was generated when mass unemployment led to outbreaks of turmoil and it was used to aid labor. Also it has been a treatment for the aged, disabled, and retarded. It often punished those who did not work by setting an example to the laboring masses by instilling the fear of unemployment.
By the 1500's a trend was forming. In the Netherlands, Switzerland, England, France, and Scotland a systematic provision was instituted locally by some organ of government for all those who were actually in need of the means of existence, whatever the cause of their destitution.  

In 1531, in England, an Act of Parliament decreed that local officials search out and register the destitute and give them a document authorizing begging. By 1536, Henry VIII required local parishes to take care of their destitute and to establish a procedure for the collection and administration of compulsory donations for that purpose. By 1572 beggary was said to have reached alarming proportions. The Elizabethan Poor Laws established a local tax as a means for financing the care of paupers.  

From the 1840's on, labor yards became widespread in which the unemployed could perform casual labor type jobs to earn food and clothing. Typical tasks were construction, cleaning, loading and unloading, and groundskeeping. Workers could report to central areas and wait for an assignment. Therefore the effect of the Poor Law was that farmers and industrialists got cheap labor. The plan, called the English Speenhamland plan, is somewhat notorious but not unique. It suggested subsidizing paupers in private employment. The proposal was intended to support and strengthen a disturbed low-wage market by providing what was called in nineteenth century England a "vote in aid of wages."
The welfare system in the United States was influenced by England but relief developed slowly due to the independent ownership of farms and new frontier industries. Also the unshakable conviction was help alike by poor and affluent that tremendous opportunity was available. The belief of economic individualism, independence, and the chance to work and be self-supporting and to win esteem by hard and honest labor prevailed. The notion of relief was not consistent with these ideals.

The major thrust of welfare policy in the United States and in England in the nineteenth century was the control of pauperism. The dividing line between the poor and the paupers was the ability and willingness to work. Since administration was local, differential treatments prevailed according to location. Basically the system was to reform the poor and change their behavior, particularly their work effort.

The Illinois Funds to Parents Act established the first Aid to Dependent Children program in 1911 which was an amendment to the Juvenile Court Act. The purpose of this reform was to prevent the growth of delinquency by assisting jurisdiction over children likely to commit crimes. This aid was given primarily to white widows to support their children.

The aid programs came to be administered by state and county welfare departments. But the basic fundamental
ambiguity toward the program, on moral grounds, remained. Early conditions remained: A means test (application process to determine employability), a morals test (to ascertain if fit and proper and has a suitable home), and a discretionary control over the recipient's budget to prevent waste or high living.

Unemployment was beginning to rise in 1928. City leaders initiated "make-a-job" campaigns and "household helper" schemes. In these, unemployed men were assigned to residential areas to perform household tasks. 5

Due to economic stress, the burden on public and private relief agencies was enormous. Community chests were forced to put larger portions of their budgets into cash relief. Local citizens were exhorted to greater charity, fund raising, taxes, and contributions. Without work for a substantial proportion of the population, a way of life began to collapse. There came into being a destructive force which marked a societal disorder.

In 1933, when Roosevelt took office he moved quickly with federal acts to issue aid. The election was, however, a mandate to attempt economic relief. Federal acts were an attempt to distribute aid to as many as possible. From the start of relief there were efforts to shift direct relief to work relief. The New Deal succeeded to restore some semblance of an economic system. The Civilian Conservation Corps established jobs for 250,000 men. The Federal
Emergency Relief Administration broke all precedents in American relief-giving. For the first time, the federal government assumed responsibility for relief and appropriated substantial funds to carry it out. Roosevelt called for the enactment of protective labor legislation, tax reform, regulation of utilities, programs of social insurance, and a massive system of work relief.6

Since 1935 each state legislature has exercised a broad interpretation of the Social Security Act to design legislation and utilize administrative policies to satisfy local economics and politics. This practice has resulted in a diverse system based on local decisions. The state of welfare was actually set by policy formations during the period after 1935. There had always been a reluctance to include able bodied men as potential recipients for welfare. The federal government would not reimburse states for aid to families with unemployed fathers until after 1961 with the AFDC-UP (Aid to families with dependent children--unemployed parent) legislation. Traditionally, aid was denied to a mother who as associated with a man, especially if he lived in the house. "Man-in-the-house" rules often prohibited aid so that benefits did not reach unemployed men. Some states used investigators to conduct "midnight raids" or parked car surveillance of homes.

The matter of adapting relief to regional economies has long been an issue. The variations between states have been
questioned and are based on some reasonable principles. The practice reflects the influences of the English Poor Law which maintained relief should be a local responsibility, allowance should be less than wages, and that settlement in that community should be a prerequisite. This policy does make relief adjustable within regions and can insure that eligibility is consistent with local labor requirements. Less eligibility should prevent welfare from competing with employment.

Other significant legislation during this period was the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933 which established the federal-state employment service system. The opportunity of job placement was made free and available to the public.

The period before 1960 was marked by a welfare system full of inequalities and discrimination against blacks. In order to keep black relief mothers in the labor force they were given less welfare money and often were not given surplus commodities unless they were working. Therefore black women were confronted with the choice of trying to earn the difference between what they were given, to compare with what white women were automatically given. These mothers were forced into very low level jobs.7

The federal supervision of public welfare was placed in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) when it was created in the Eisenhower Administration.
As a result of the exposure of the glaring inequalities of welfare fund administration, in 1960 Secretary Arthur S. Fleming informed the states they could not discharge families with illegitimate children from the rolls unless some other provision was made for the children. Otherwise assistance would continue. This was formally enacted by Congress in 1966 by adding the "Fleming Rule" to the Social Security Act. This rule hampered the application of the "suitable" laws and the "socially acceptable" rules of the local states.

The 1960's is often labeled the period of welfare explosion. The rise in some areas was greater than in others. By region the rolls almost tripled in the Northeast and in the West, while the rolls rose by seventy-eight percent in the North-Central area and by fifty-four percent in the South. Urban areas accounted for seventy percent of the increase. Seventy-one percent of the welfare increase took place from 1964-68.8

In actual figures the rolls rose from 2.9 million at the beginning of 1960 to 7.3 million at the end of 1969. Public assistance increased from 1.0 billion to 3.2 billion dollars. Three explanations of the welfare rise were (1) migration of the poor from the South; (2) the increase in rising formal benefit levels, and (3) the increasing number of family units without male heads. These theories have been debated but there seems to be little agreement which
one or ones actually caused the dramatic rise in welfare. These three seem to be the most plausible explanations offered to account for such a large increase.  

As AFDC grew steadily during the 1960's Congress enacted a succession of programs with closely related goals to enhance the employability of welfare recipients. President Kennedy called for "rehabilitation instead of relief" and President Nixon wanted "workfare instead of welfare." Kennedy was alert to urban troubles. He made a vigorous appeal to the black vote in the industrial states by campaigning on strong pledges to deal with civil rights and poverty.

In the 1961 Economic Report, President Kennedy directed the employment service to expand counseling and placement services in areas of chronic underemployment. This implied that the state employment service had to assume the concept that its role was to become an effective instrument in solving the nation's manpower problems. The intent was to form community manpower centers in the employment service offices.

The cornerstone of the present manpower legislation was the Manpower Development Training Act (MDTA) of 1962. Amended in 1963, 1965, 1966, and 1968 to keep pace with the changing economic scene and shifting national priorities, the MDTA has proven to be flexible and useful. Originally
the MDTA marked the acceptance by the federal government of a social responsibility for retraining the unemployed. But the program's scope and meaning has changed throughout its development. As enacted in 1962, MDTA was a one-hundred percent federally financed program for classroom, skill, and on-the-job training for the unemployed. After one year it was to be a fifty percent matching program with the states. Surveys indicated that the unemployed were disparportionately young and uneducated. Therefore in 1963 MDTA was amended to add a special program for youth for basic education to prepare for skill training. State matching requirements were postponed.

As AFDC grew steadily in the 1960's new programs were enacted by Congress. The presumption that AFDC recipients were unemployable and outside the work force became untenable in 1961 when the federal government extended coverage to families headed by an unemployed male parent. The need for the new law was clear because the original Social Security Act denied assistance to families headed by an able-bodied male. Families were being penalized if the father could not find employment and family separation was actually increasing as fathers found their families would be maintained if they were absent. The presence of employable parents on relief prompted Congress to amend the Social Security Act in 1962 to subsidize employment programs for relief recipients. Until 1962 AFDC recipients
were considered outside the work force and public assistance funds could not be used to provide work.

States were encouraged to adopt Community Work and Training Programs (CWT) designed to offer work and economic independence. The purpose of the amendment was to reduce public criticism of relief payments to persons able to work and to create work relief projects which would train and rehabilitate recipients. The idea of "working off" relief was becoming popular again and justified as a method to raise morale and provide useful public services without replacing regular workers. Only fifty percent federal matching funds were provided for the administration of CWT projects. Projects sponsors had to contribute all cost of supervision, materials and training in addition to regular matching share of assistance. In order to obtain their maximum share of federal contribution most states chose to expand their social services rather than to implement CWT. CWT actually provided little training since the bulk of the funds was used for income maintenance. There was no monetary incentive for CWT and it was essentially required for participants to "work off" assistance.

In 1964 President Johnson continued the trend of community action. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (EOA) commonly referred to as the Antipoverty legislation allocated 350 million dollars to Community Action Programs (CAP)
which Johnson said, "would call on all resources available to the community--federal, state, local and private, human and material, to strike poverty at its source, in the streets of the cities."\textsuperscript{12}

The most significant part of the EOA as far as welfare was concerned was Title V which expanded the 1963 Community Work Training (CWT) program. Under Title V of the act, grants were to be given to state and local welfare agencies to pay full costs of "demonstration" projects so that the states could establish Work Experience and Training (WET) projects. In addition to unemployed parents on relief other needy persons including single adults were declared eligible. The Title V program reached its peak in 1967 when enrollment was 71,000.\textsuperscript{13} CWT and WET was to provide useful training and work but this proved to be a formidable task because most enrollees had multiple handicaps and little orientation to the world of work. Vocational instruction was informal and assignments tended to be low paying. Title V administrators did not make adequate use of funds. Local welfare agencies were charged with the responsibility to administer Title V. However, they had no prior experience or awareness of labor market operation, training or placement procedures. The financial expenditures show well over half of the $1,368 average cost per enrollee was spent for income maintenance and only one-sixth for work experience
activities and/or vocational education. Three out of four departed without completing their assignments and one-fifth took jobs. These placement figures seem to be consistent with the success rates of other similar programs. This section of the legislation provided the base for the future Work Incentive Program (WIN).  

The local reaction to new welfare trends was marked by mixed emotions. A type of welfare rights service that became most popular in the 1960's was the "store front service center" staffed by social workers, lawyers, churchmen, students, and recipients. The American Civil liberties Union became involved. Reprints of welfare manuals were distributed for public information. Beginning in 1966 a National Welfare Rights Organization (NWRO) was formed and produced handbooks about welfare entitlement. These outreach services increased AFDC applications. In 1967 there were 998,000 but by 1968 there were 1,099,000 applications. Legal aid was expanded. In 1968 it was allocated thirty-six million dollars. Many cases of unequal treatment between blacks and whites along with suitability cases were challenged and won.  

The above sequence of events all contributed to and affected the formation of the current WIN program. To recapitulate the final sequences, the 1964 EOA created Title V, the Work Experience and Training (WET) program, sometimes
referred to as the "Happy Pappy Program." Another name considered was "Family Unity Through Jobs." This program was to provide employment assistance to unemployed fathers not covered by the existing welfare programs and to prevent the disintegration of family units. But in practice one-half of the Title V participants were women.16

The actual legislative base of WIN was outlined June of 1967 in HR Bill 5710 which provided for federal participation in the costs of two work and training programs under previous legislation. States were encouraged to establish their own community work and training programs by the provision in the Social Security Act which allowed for federal matching in cash assistance payments to recipients age eighteen or over or to families with dependent children who are engaged in such work and training. Provision was made for up to ninety percent federal financial participation in the programs for the cost of training, supervision, materials, administration and other items. In developing policies for programs the Secretary of Labor would consult with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

On August 7, 1967 the Social Security amendments and provisions of HR Bill 12080 were introduced by Wilbur Mills, Chairman, and co-sponsored by John Byrnes to the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives. The section dealing with the community work and training programs indicates that states would be required by the bill to
establish community work and training in every area of the state where a significant number of AFDC families lived.

The Senate report of the Social Security amendments of 1967, HR 12080, Committee on Finance, November 14, 1967 modified the provisions of the House bill by establishing a new work incentive program for families receiving AFDC payments to be administered by the Department of Labor, and by defining more precisely than in the House bill those AFDC recipients who would be referred to the program. Like the Committee of Ways and Means, this committee was concerned about the continued growth in the number of families receiving AFDC. In the ten years from 1957 to 1967 the program has grown from 646,000 families that included 2.4 million recipients to 1.2 million families and nearly five million recipients. Moreover, it was estimated by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare that the annual amount of federal funds allocated to this program would increase greatly from 1.46 billion to 1.84 billion dollars over the five years from 1967 to 1972 unless constructive and concerted action was taken to deal with the basic causes of the anticipated growth.

This Senate Committee on Finance believed that the most effective program could be initiated by placing it under the Secretary of Labor. The purpose of the program was:

The establishment of a program utilizing all available manpower resources, including those authorized under other provision of law, under which
Individuals receiving aid to families with dependent children will be furnished incentives, opportunities, and necessary services in order for 1) the employment of such individuals in the regular economy 2) the training of such individuals in the regular economy and 3) the participation of such individuals in special work projects, thus restoring the families of such individuals to independence and useful roles in their communities. It is expected that the individuals participating in the program established will acquire a sense of dignity, self-worth, and confidence which will flow from being recognized as a wage-earning member of society and that the example of a working adult in these families will have beneficial effects on the children in such families.

The net cost of the program over a five-year period under the Senate proposal was 1.18 billion dollars as compared to 1.25 billion dollars under the House bill. The DOL estimated that 550 thousand persons would be trained under the House bill and 860 thousand under the Senate proposal. The House expected 60,000 persons placed in employment and the Senate predicted 290,000 under its proposal. By the end of fiscal year 1972 savings through welfare role reductions were expected to total 710 million dollars under the Senate bill as opposed to 195 million under the House bill. It was the understanding that the administration would phase out the work experience and training program under Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act. This action appeared desirable as there was much duplication between that temporary program and the permanent work and training programs provided for by this Social Security amendment. 17

Regional offices of the Department of Labor charged
each state with the responsibility of surveying local laws and coordinating with the welfare departments to form state handbooks based on federal guidelines to outline the WIN functions. The Ohio Bureau of Employment Services, Regional District V, published its manual in August 1968. The first WIN activities began in June of 1968 with a small staff in Columbus. It was through many of their efforts that the handbook was formed to be a functional document.

It is stated in this handbook that WIN signified a major shift in public policy to provide for the rehabilitation of the welfare clients rather than commitment to long-term maintenance on the welfare rolls. In Ohio the Bureau of Employment Services was the statewide sponsor of the WIN program. The state objective of WIN was to provide the necessary services and opportunities to AFDC recipients so that they could become wage-earning members of society and restore their families to independence and useful roles in their communities. The handbook indicated:

The program is intended to meet the enrollee at his level of experience of work, training, and education and place him into a job that gives him a chance to use his potential. The purpose of this program is not just training. It is employment, but also employment with a future.

It was stated that clients in WIN would be served through a team approach headed by a team counselor to develop an employability plan with the consent of each welfare client on a personalized basis.
At the federal level, the Manpower Administrator prescribed policies, standards, rules, and regulations of WIN. The Bureau of Work and Training Programs (BWDP) developed and administered WIN. The DOL and H E W coordinated WIN activities. Close liaison would be maintained between the Manpower Administration, the United States Office of Education, and the Social and Rehabilitation Service. WIN eligibility was determined by the county welfare departments; however, the legal criteria used were to consider each appropriate child and relative who was age sixteen or over and receiving AFDC. Those ineligible were:

1. a person with illness, incapacity or advanced age.
2. a person who lives too far from any WIN project that he can arrange transportation.
3. a child attending school full time.
4. a person whose presence in the home on a substantially or continuous basis is required because of the illness or incapacity of another member of the household.

The welfare agency was to refer all unemployed fathers receiving AFDC to a WIN program within thirty days after the first welfare payment.

The following priority of referral was followed:

1. AFDC unemployed fathers currently participating in a Community Work and Training Program or in Work Experience Training under Title V.
(2) other AFDC fathers.

(3) AFDC mothers and other caretaker relatives who volunteer and who are currently participating in another training.

(4) AFDC youths age sixteen and over who are not in school or training.

(5) AFDC mothers and others who volunteer and who have no pre-school children.

(6) AFDC mothers and others who volunteer with pre-school children.

(7) any other AFDC recipients determined by state welfare to be appropriate.

Ohio paid the standard incentive payment of thirty dollars per month, in addition to the welfare payment. The earnings exemption of the Social Security Act which provided that the first thirty and one-third of the salary was disregarded to consider adjusted or supplemental assistance applied only to females.

The legal provisions stated that if an AFDC recipient refused without good cause to participate in WIN or to accept appropriate employment he was given sixty days of counseling. If after that period he did not participate, welfare payments were to be in the form of vendor payments. An individual was considered to have refused to participate when he stated orally or in writing that he refused or an
individual could be considered to have refused de-facto when
the following occurred:

(1) the individual had five or more days of contin-
uous unexcused absence which impeded his progress.
(2) the individual had ten or more days of unexcused
absence in any thirty days.
(3) his conduct was disruptive or dangerous to program
activities or participants.
(4) he failed continuously to appear at appointed
times for interviews regarding employment or
placement and any aspect of the program.

Vocational assessment included all activities designed
to determine the specific needs and potentials of the en-
rollee. Other components were based on the individual's
need. Orientation was provided to WIN enrollees who were
not referred to employment. It included activities related
to introducing the enrollee to WIN and to the "world of
work." It increased awareness and understanding of all
those attributes required to get and hold a job. Enrollees'
rights, the description of WIN, procedures relating to
grievance and hearing, and understanding of the welfare sys-
tem were covered. It also could deal with motivation,
labor market information, job interviewing techniques,
applications, grooming, money management, community resources,
employment practices, taxes, or any type of relevant topic
which would relate to employability.
Work and training components included all activity related to locating and establishing needed training or experience. There was a determination of which components would be subcontracted to existing programs for development and operation and which components would be developed and operated directly by the WIN sponsor. The emphasis of On-the-job-training (OJT) was structured skill training. The enrollee was placed in a private or public work site where the employer had indicated intent to retain the individual on a permanent basis upon successful completion of training. The individual received wages paid by the employer, in accordance with the federal minimum wage, state minimum wage, or prevailing wage scale for that occupation. The employer received compensation for some training costs. Supportive services such as counseling, vocational training, basic education, and social services were provided as needed.

The work internship component emphasized exposure of enrollees to a variety of occupations and work situations by allowing the enrollees to both observe and perform typical job tasks. During the internship the enrollees participated in from two to four distinctly different work situations in either public or private non-profit organizations. During this time enrollees received their welfare payment and incentive.

The work experience component was to develop basic work
habits, provide exploration of various occupational fields, and for gaining knowledge of the "world of work." The degree of occupational skill developed depended entirely upon the type of work tasks performed. Work experience, sometimes called work sites, was provided by public and private non-profit agencies. The length of enrollment was not to exceed thirteen weeks.

The special work projects component was to provide federally subsidized work in unskilled or low skilled jobs for persons who would not benefit from a work experience or training situation or could not find jobs in the regular economy. Enrollees were to be persons of very marginal potential, physical impairment, mental incapacity or victims of adverse job market conditions. This component was never utilized in Ohio.

The educational component was provided to all enrollees who needed additional education for entrance into and continued participation in the world of work. The educational services were commensurate with the individual enrollee, his level of achievement, rate of progress, and ultimate occupational objective. Some type of testing and evaluation was established.

Permanent placement was the ultimate goal of WIN. When the enrollee was placed he received his wages and was either removed from welfare or received amended payments. The enrollee participated in the decision as to the specific job
in which he was placed. But once an appropriate job offer was made, failure to accept could be interpreted as a failure to participate in WIN. The goal was to provide the enrollee with sufficient income to raise him above the poverty level. Follow-up covered regular and intensive services. It was an extension of job development and counseling activities, designed to help the enrollee adjust to the job and become a self-sufficient wage earner. Intensive follow-up was for additional support to the welfare recipient who felt insecure and needed longer to adjust. It lasted ninety days and could average one-hundred and eighty days.

The final component was the termination aspect. Reasons to terminate were successful completion, other just cause reasons such as illness, or a refusal to participate. In addition to work and training components other program services were provided such as counseling. Counseling was considered the "heart" of WIN. Not only did it provide assistance and support to the individual enrollees but through the employability plan they determined the kinds of program components and services the enrollee received were determined. Counseling was provided to help strengthen the enrollee's self-image and formulate his vocational goal, appraise interests, aptitudes, abilities, personal characteristics, achievement and other vocationally significant characteristics, provide assistance in dealing with personal
and social problems, and determine the supportive service needs of the enrollee.

The relocation of WIN participants to other cities or states could be provided if suitable employment was found elsewhere and the family was willing to move.

The chart on the following page indicates the various alternatives a participant could follow in WIN.

The next chronological discussions over WIN occurred in the Committee on Ways and Means in the House of Representatives over Social Security and welfare proposals starting in October of 1969. The comments contained in these hearings and discussions brought to mind the problems of creating successful welfare programs. They were for the purpose of exploring the newly proposed Family Assistance Plan (FAP) but of course used WIN and its predecessors for a guide to predict the future. The testimonies were generally critical of the mandatory influences of existing programs but specific inferences could not be drawn due to the general lack of facts and experience in welfare programs. The lack of research and the presence of philosophical differences concerning the rights and responsibilities of the government to welfare recipients were apparent. The comments included were especially relevant to the topic of mandatory adult education.

In the discussion it was mentioned that WIN be that
point should have been at enrollments of 90,000 and could increase if the Family Assistance Plan was enacted to 300,000 training slots. Congressmen John Byrnes of Wisconsin pointed out that of these 90,000 training slots only 67,408 were actually being used by enrollees. He felt that there was not a full attempt to completely implement the WIN objectives.

The high drop-out rate was discussed. Over 4511 people had dropped out of WIN without good cause and 16,000 dropped out for other reasons. It was indicated in normal manpower programs, there is a drop-out problem by virtue of the nature of the disadvantaged person and his problems of making a readjustment into training and work. The median age of persons in WIN was 32. Of the 4511 terminated for lack of participation only 169 had their benefits altered. This administrative policy seems inconsistent if WIN was to function as outlined. A brief analysis of the applicant characteristic data indicated that over forty percent of the mothers reported no education beyond the eighth grade level, housing and utilities payments were difficult to meet, poor dental and medical care, insufficient food, forty-five percent of the women had been on welfare for more than three years, and almost forty percent had been on welfare at least two different times.19

Dr. George Hilly, Executive Director; Mrs. Reulah Under- ders, Vice Chairman; and Carl Macklin, General Counsel; of
the National Welfare Rights Organization (NWRO) prepared a statement also in evaluation of WIN in relation to future welfare programs. The total feeling of the NWRO was that there are inadequacies in the present welfare system. Its recommendation was to repeal the compulsory work provisions of the Work Incentive Program. The group strongly opposed forcing women with children to register for employment against their will. Mrs. Sanders stated, "I would like to advise this committee and you, don't waste any more money on training programs. I don't think you can tell me of one that has been successful. Those trained can't find jobs. They say everywhere they go, doors are slammed in their faces. If you want to save money... if you want the program to work, go out and ask those people what do they want. They are tired of setting up programs and you shoving them down their throats. They have brains. All of them are not dumb and uneducated as you think they are. They do have sense enough to sit down and come up with an intelligent answer... All of these training programs are just a waste of money."

In discussing education Dr. Wiley commented, "I think those are worthwhile objectives for their own sake, of providing everybody basic education and basic training. One of the things that we found onerous is using that objective as a way presumably of reducing the welfare costs and the welfare
rolls. That is really objectionable and I think is going to be self-defeating.  

The late Whitney Young, Jr., President of the National Association of Social Workers and Director of the Urban League, in his comments, was concerned about aspects of legislation that called for forced work, for mandatory employment and for mandatory work. He felt that this was too rigid.

To make an arbitrary decision that mothers who have children must go to work seems to me not to be good social planning. It may be far better for the society if they stay home and take care of their children. It ought to be judged on an individual basis. I think work has to be available before we can say people must go to work. The training has to be available and there has to be assurance that work will be in keeping with their interest, their aptitudes, and that they will not be exploited.

Leonard Lesser, Secretary-Treasurer of the Committee for Community Affairs, in his comments was also concerned with the requirement that all welfare recipients be required to register for work at the employment service, and that among these would be mothers. His concern with the mandatory requirement was due to a probable lack of uniformity in the application. He felt it might be used in some parts of the country just to clean out the welfare rolls, and to take people off welfare. "The voluntary registrants for work have been more than adequate to fill the available jobs." It was also pointed out that only about half of
all people presently eligible were receiving assistance at that time.\textsuperscript{22}

Ben Heineman of the President's Commission on Income Maintenance stated,

Often programs are not geared to the population they serve; often they are not geared to the requirements of the local labor market. Sometimes, training programs are used by all parties—the trainers and the trainees—basically as income support programs in the absence of other programs. When these conditions prevail, time and money are wasted. Many training programs have not worked in the past, but have survived because of bureaucratic inertia. We must recognize that consumers and potential consumers of these programs often are the best judges of their effectiveness . . . Forcing recipients of aid to sign up for training is unnecessary if the training is worthwhile in the sense of leading to a good job. And it is expensive because it allows ineffective programs to continue and prevents the reallocation of these scarce funds to more promising training programs . . . Direct government coercion is usually heavy-handed and inefficient. It is unrealistic to expect these programs to be utilized effectively by persons whose basic incomes are inadequate, uncertain, and unstable.\textsuperscript{23}

Several speakers before the house made similar comments indicating their dissatisfaction with a mandatory work and training program. They expressed concern over forcing mothers to leave the home and forcing any type of manpower program participation. They seemed to agree voluntary planning and participation was the ideal situation.

The First Annual Report of the Department of Labor on training and employment under Title IV of the Social Security Act was submitted to Congress on July 14, 1970. Total federal amounts obligated to April 30, 1970 for
manpower activities under WIN have been 151,277,287 dollars. Of this amount 140,789,346 went to the states running WIN programs. There were 155,000 enrollments, 1,000 were still in WIN, 27,000 were at work and over 53,000 have left the program prior to completing their employability plan. There were 89,445 which have been in some type of training component. 24

Data for the fiscal year 1970 indicated that seventy-one percent of WIN enrollees were women. Fifty-four percent of the enrollees were white. Forty percent were Negro, and six percent were other minority groups. Twenty-five percent had completed the eighth grade or less, forty-three percent had not completed high school, and thirty-two percent had completed the twelfth grade or more. Seventy-two percent were between ages twenty-two and forty-four, six percent over forty-five and twenty-two percent under age twenty-two. Twenty-two percent had Spanish surnames. A trend appeared to reflect the generally higher level of educational attainments found among female WIN participants than among males. 25

Average wages after three to six months were two dollars and twenty-nine cents an hour. The most noticeable problems at the beginning of the program were mechanical, establishing an operating structure and coordinating with other structures. The comprehensive nature of WIN required balancing components and a degree of sophistication in
scheduling not readily attainable. A difference in interpretation of the law between welfare and employment agencies hindered the development of a smooth efficient enrollment process. Other issues which required considerable staff attention were procedures for payment, clarification of caseworker responsibilities, child-care, and other services.

The Second Annual Report submitted to Congress on July 23, 1971 indicated that the cost of training was thirty-one million dollars, while the federal administration costs were two million, one-hundred thousand dollars. A total of 269 million dollars was appropriated for WIN. Enrollment increased by twenty-five percent from the previous year. There were 267,000 enrolled. WIN placed more than 44,100 and total terminations were 154,313 with 31,240 completions and 123,073 drop-outs and other terminations. The average hourly salary was two dollars and twenty-eight center per hour.

The majority of enrollees were women, sixty-four percent, more than half were white, fifty-six percent. The increase in male enrollment reflected the impact of the recent economic downturn. Savings to public assistance agencies because of reduced payments attributable to employment was estimated at ten million dollars.

In fiscal year 1971, twenty-two states were forced to cut back their WIN programs due to the lack of state matching...
funds for manpower or social supportive services. On-the-job training was underutilized. The relatively high number of early terminations had offset gains toward the WIN goal of removing families from the AFDC rolls. As of April 30, 1971, 123,073 WIN enrollees, nearly eighty percent of all terminations had left prior to completion of their employability plans. The personal problems of recipients were often so pressing, necessitating immediate attention, that energies directed toward training and employment were suspended. Poor health was a major cause of irregular attendance during training and employment. Local offices were asked to intensify the efforts to alleviate this drop-out problem.28

Serious problems in the nation's welfare program led to the recommendation by the President in 1969 for a major overhaul of the entire system. The essential concepts of the Administration's proposal are contained in HR bill 1 approved by the House of Representatives on June 22, 1971. Many of the problems encountered in WIN were to be corrected by this new legislation.

All recipients were required to register for employment or training. Refusal to accept work or training without good cause would result in a substantial loss of benefits. During the discussion of HR bill 1, it was stated that the Ways and Means Committee had expressed its dissatisfaction with the operation of the present WIN program.
However the Senate failed to act on the House of Representatives bill during the Ninety-First Congress. In the Ninety-Second session the House approved the legislation but a compromise could not be reached in the Senate Finance Committee.

Therefore program changes in WIN were made through Social Security Amendments. On July 1, 1972 WIN II was born. Many of the changes were created based on HR bill 1 and the dissatisfaction with the existing program. WIN II was an effort to enforce what was hoped would happen in WIN I but did not. It restated original objectives more forcefully than before. Senator Herman Talmadge of Georgia headed the effort to make changes to create a stronger program.

The Third Annual Report of the DOL to Congress on August 18, 1972 prepared by the Committee on Ways and Means summarized the annual progress plus reflected the changes in WIN. The 1971 amendments were embodied in Public Law 92-223. The amendments were effective July 1, 1972. Three major aspects of the changes were the mandatory registration of AFDC recipients, the increased focus on available employment through a WIN tax credit, and the requirement that not less than one-third of the WIN manpower funds must be expended for On-the-job training (OJT) and Public Service Employment (PSE).
President Nixon upon signing the 1971 amendments into law, stated:

With passage of these amendments, a number of the workfare ideas outlined in my welfare reform recommendations of 1969 and beyond have now become law. The principle of work requirements is in place. The Federal Government is committed to 90 percent of the cost of day care and supplemental services. Tax deductions have been provided for working mothers, for day care costs in the tax law I recently signed.

But the welfare system is yet in need of reform. Further economic incentives must be provided to keep families together, rather than break them apart--to encourage welfare recipients to take jobs, rather than to discourage them from working.29

The program status of WIN to August, 1972 indicated that a total of 456 million dollars had been appropriated and that there were 385,100 enrollments and more than 89,000 placed in employment. Some 196,000 had left the program prior to the completion of their employability plans. The average wage was two dollars and thirty-four cents per hour. The preponderance of early termination resulted from good cause (fifty-six percent) and twenty-two percent for refusal to participate. The early terminations continue to be a major source of concern.30

To summarize the problems WIN encountered, Levitan, a prominent researcher in government anti-poverty programs, indicated, "A public policy intent on transforming the welfare system into a major instrument for reducing poverty and also for self-liquidating welfare, by converting it into a manpower program in bound to rely upon coercion to
produce frustrating results. There are no easy solutions to the rising welfare costs, and whatever reforms emerge, welfare will continue to be a persistent issue in the 1970's. A realistic and viable approach is to recognize that there is a growing interdependence between welfare and work and that for ever-increasing numbers the two go together."

Levitan seems to feel that a mandatory welfare program such as WIN is destined to have limited success. It may be unrealistic to believe that welfare growth can be controlled with training and education programs. Perhaps the possibility must be considered that there will always be those who are workers and those who are welfare recipients. It is a dependent relationship which is part of society.
FOOTNOTES


28 Ibid., p. 19.


IV.

CURRENT FUNCTIONING OF THE WIN PROGRAM

Description of WIN II

The latest amendments to the Social Security Act enacted December 1971 came into effect July 1, 1972 by legislative authority of Part C Title IV. The Department of Labor regulations are provided in Part fifty-six - Title twenty-nine of the Code of Federal Regulations. The regulations for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare are provided in Title forty-five, parts 220, 233, and 234 of the Code of Federal Regulations. The WIN program is jointly administered by the DOL and HEW.

The Assistant Secretary of Labor for Manpower administers WIN for the DOL. He has the responsibility for prescribing WIN policy, setting national goals and standards and developing rules, regulations and guidelines. Also he can conduct research and evaluation for program design.

The HEW charges the Administrator of Social Rehabilitation Service as responsible for all activities pertaining to WIN. He sets welfare policy, establishes goals, and provides guidelines and standards for AFDC programs.
Primary services provided by the HEW are registration, certification, and provision of self-support services.
The HEW will determine whether current recipients or new applicants and members of their families are required to register for manpower services, training and employment.
Definitions for exemption criteria to be used in making such determinations are established by the DOL. HEW through its self-support units shall have the responsibility for providing health, vocational rehabilitation, counseling, child-care and other supportive services to WIN as requested by the DOL and certifying that these services are available.

The legislative requirements under the 1971 Social Security Act amendments require all applicants receiving AFDC benefits to register for work or training as a condition of receiving benefits. Emphasis is to be on employment, Public Service Employment, On-the-job-training, and continual exposure of WIN participants to job market information. The 1971 amendments require that at least one-third of the funds be used for these activities.

The selection priority to be used in addition to employability potential is as follows:

(1) unemployed fathers
(2) mothers--who volunteer
(3) other mothers and pregnant women
(4) dependent children and relatives who have attained age sixteen and who are out of school.

(5) all other individuals served.

The amendments provide for a Public Service Employment (PSE) program under which individuals deemed suitable for participation will be provided work which serves a useful public purpose and would not otherwise have been performed. These positions are for individuals for whom a job in the regular economy cannot be found. Their salary is reimbursable at the rate of one-hundred percent for the first year of employment. These persons should be reviewed by WIN staff to determine the feasibility of placing them in regular employment. There is a contract and the PSE employer must make a commitment to retain the participant as a regular employee after the contract expires.

The amendments reduced the amount of required stated matching funds to ten percent. This amount may be in cash or in kind contributions. In kind may be direct or indirect costs such as transportation, staff, legal counsel, safety supplies, space, education, equipment, supervision, and other services.

An intensive follow-up service was added to enable WIN to pay up to 120 dollars or fifteen dollars per week for eight weeks to employers for the additional supervision and services required for some WIN participants. The
amendments also require that social service agencies must certify that the necessary social services can be provided so that AFDC fathers can participate within thirty days of the receipt of AFDC benefits.

A Labor Market Advisory Council is required to identify and advise the local WIN manager of the type of jobs available or likely to become available in that area. This council will include representatives of labor, industry, and public service employers.

The program and performance standards established for the State of Ohio require specifically that a maximum of ninety-five percent of all allocated WIN training slots will be filled at any given time. The average enrollment period in a training component shall not exceed six months per participant. The amendments require WIN to contract for three On-the-job training contracts for every Public Service Employment contract. The average time for On-the-job training is to be six months, while Public Service Employment may be twelve months. Seventy-five percent of the total number of assigned participants should enter jobs. The placement rate for job-ready participants should be one-hundred percent. At least sixty percent of the assigned participants who enter On-the-job training and Public Service Employment should remain on their jobs after the contract is completed. At least seventy-five percent of the
assigned participants who receive institutional skill training should enter jobs and of these one-hundred percent must enter employment directly related to the field in which they received skill training. Of the total number of terminations from the program at least sixty percent must be participants who have completed their job entry period.

The operation of the WIN system depends on communication between the employment service and the welfare department. It begins with application for AFDC. The Income Maintenance Unit staff of the welfare department shall determine whether applicants are eligible for AFDC and either enter them on assistance or deny benefits. When individuals are entered on AFDC they shall be screened to identify those who must register for manpower services, training, and employment. If declared non-exempt, recipients must complete a registration card which is forwarded to the employment service. Those recipients selected will be called for an appraisal interview conducted jointly by WIN employment service staff and welfare staff. Those not selected remain in the Registrant Pool. An individual who does not respond to requests to appear for appraisal shall be returned to welfare with the recommendation that he be terminated from assistance. Documented attempts to contact the person a reasonable number of times must be recorded. At the time of the appraisal interview WIN staff may determine
that the registrant's capabilities are so limited as to preclude developing an employability plan and may not enroll him. In such cases, the registrant is returned to the pool for possible re-call at a later date.

During the appraisal interview a brief program orientation to WIN must be given which covers objectives, goals, and functions of WIN. A certification request for social services is made which must be returned before the participant can begin in WIN activities. The certification form is an assurance that the welfare department can provide the social services this participant needs to participate. Generally, it takes thirty days.

The primary goal of WIN II is to enable AFDC recipients to find appropriate permanent jobs so that they can become self-sufficient members of the nation's economy. The employability planning process is crucial to this goal. Its purpose is the development of a plan to guide the participant's progress through WIN to employment. Plans provide flexible direction and the continuity necessary for a participant to achieve suitable employment. The employability plan must be initiated at the appraisal interview. It is developed by WIN in conjunction with a welfare caseworker and the participant. The available components are the same as in WIN I.

The job function portion of WIN is designed to enable
WIN participants to obtain and maintain self-supporting employment in the regular economy, consistent with the maintenance of continuing parental care and protection of children. Placement of WIN participants is done as expeditiously as possible in appropriate work. If the likelihood of unsubsidized employment is not good then placement in subsidized employment can be utilized such as On-the-job training which can be reimbursed at the rate of fifty percent and Public Service Employment which can be reimbursed at one-hundred percent. HR bill 10947, the Revenue Act of 1971, was enacted by Congress on December 9, 1971 and signed by the President as Public Law 92-178. Section VI provides a tax credit to employers of WIN participants equal to twenty percent of the employers' wages for the first twelve months of employment effective after January 1, 1972. The credit may be claimed by those who employ workers under WIN. The months of employment do not have to be consecutive. The DOL must certify that these employees are in WIN and do not displace other workers. An Eligibility Declaration Form is completed. The amount of credit that can be claimed is limited to the income tax liability. This tax credit is being offered as an inducement to employers to expand employment opportunities for welfare recipients.

WIN II also provides an orderly system of separation. Termination is the separation of a WIN participant and occurs for any of several reasons. The most effective terminations
are successfully completing WIN activities resulting in employment or leaving welfare for other reasons. Neutral termination would be due to pregnancy, death, illness, returning to exempt status, or inability to benefit from WIN. The only negative terminations would be for refusal to participate or adjust to employment. A participant who successfully completes WIN activities shall be terminated at the completion of a ninety-day follow-up period. If the participant still continues to receive supplemental AFDC benefits his registration card will be re-cycled to the registrant pool file in order to maintain eligibility for possible employment assistance at a later date.

An overt refusal is when a participant states orally or in writing that he will not participate in WIN. A de-facto refusal is when a participant:

(1) fails to report for WIN interviews, classes or job referrals without an acceptable excuse.

(2) seriously disrupts a WIN activity or whose behavior constitutes a threat to his fellow participants.

(3) possesses the required education, experience or aptitude to perform but who makes no observable effort to benefit from WIN.

All refusal termination cases are reviewed by a termination specialist and the participant is given opportunities
for conferences, hearings, and an appeal process from the local to the federal level. The 1971 amendments made an attempt to standardize the adjudication system to be as fair as possible.
V.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Introduction

The central theme of this study deals with the question of mandatory adult education. The WIN program history and description mentioned earlier in this dissertation outlines its purposes, goals, function and program success. The mandatory pressures to participate in this program have been cited. The sub-question of--Does this mandatory function affect the program success?--must be further analyzed.

There are three basic WIN termination groups: the successes (group I); the neutral termination group (group II); and the drop-outs who have refused to participate (group III). The combination of groups II and III represent all early terminations from WIN. Seventy-five percent of all participants are terminated without completing a job entry period. Group I represents the remaining twenty-five percent and are the program successes.

This investigation seeks to determine possible factors which are possibly related to program success. Basic participant characteristics in addition to their attitudes must
be explored. To review the hypotheses as stated in the problem, there is no significant difference between the three groups when the following variables are considered: age, sex, educational level, marital status, number of children, work experience, length of time on welfare, and attitude regarding mandatory participation among the three termination groups.

**Instrumentation**

In order to collect the data needed for the statistical analysis, a questionnaire was used. Information concerning age, sex, educational level, marital status, number of children, years of work experience, and length of time on welfare was collected. The questionnaire items were designed to elicit responses regarding participants' attitudes toward the program. The questions are stated in both positive and negative terms. Opinions were sought on the mandatory program aspects, participants' educational desire, satisfaction with the WIN program, and other related personal feelings about problems, accomplishments, or desires.

A five-point response scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree was provided. This is an example of a Likert attitude scale. Each response was coded with a numerical value from one to five. Five was assigned to the most positive attitude response which could be either strongly agree or strongly disagree based on the context of the question.
The instrument was administered to two pilot groups of twenty participants each to determine question differentiation, and participant understanding as well as reliability. The questions were worded carefully to acquire honest responses and were formed with the assistance and advice of the current participants. The questionnaire was administered to one of the groups twice after a two-week time period. Their responses were compared. The mean scores on the individual items and their total questionnaire scores were equivalent. Responses indicated less than ten percent variability between the pre-test and post-test scores.

A "split-half reliability test" or Spearman-Brown formula \( r_{tt} = \frac{2r_{hh}}{1 + r_{hh}} \) was used on the other group. This formula is an odd-even estimate of reliability by comparison of the odd number items to the even numbered ones.\(^2\) For each participant there are two split-half scores, one for odd items and the other for even items. By application of the formula a correlation of .80 was found indicating suitable reliability.

No names were required on the questionnaire to insure a degree of confidentiality. The questions can be divided into four categories:

(1) attitude regarding mandatory participation--Items 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 15, 17, 30.

(2) educational desire--Items 3, 11, 14, 20, 25, 27, 32.
(3) WIN satisfaction—Items 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 16, 18, 22, 24, 36.
(4) personal feelings related to problems or desires—Items 9, 19, 21, 23, 26, 28, 29, 31, 33, 34, 35.
The questionnaire will be found in the Appendix.

Procedures

WIN participants of the 1972-73 fiscal year were selected for this study. During that year 282 persons (138 males, 144 females) were terminated as successes. There were 1200 neutral terminations (450 males, 750 females), and ninety-five drop-outs (forty-two males, fifty-three females) for refusal to participate according to the Consolidated WIN Activity Summary Report (MA 5-98) which is the official report submitted to the Manpower Administrator of the DOL.

Participants terminated during the last six months of that fiscal year were selected for the sample population. A random selection of Groups I (successes) and II (neutral) was used and all available of Group III (refusal to participate). The total sample was 150, fifty from each termination group.

An impartial interviewer was selected who could relate well with the disadvantaged population and who was willing to locate the participants and collect the completed questionnaires. She made home visits or met the participants at their convenience.
The total sample ranged in age from seventeen to fifty-five, with the mean being 31.6. There were seventy-five men and seventy-five women. The education range in terms of completion of grade levels was from the third to the fourteenth year in school, with the mean being 9.8. The marital status of the sample was thirty-seven single, seventy-six married, twenty-nine divorced, and eight separated. The number of children ranged from zero to ten with the mean of 2.98 or almost an average of nearly three children per participant. The years of work experience was from none to thirty-five years with a mean of 4.8 years. The length of time on welfare ranged from one month to three hundred months, with a mean of 31.1 months. All items were completed on the questionnaire, therefore, there were no missing data.

Method of Analysis

To analyze the available data one of the programs from the Biomedical Computer Programs was chosen from the Health Sciences Computing Facility, of UCLA. The means and correlation data were obtained from Program BMD07M. This program is known as Stepwise Discriminant Analysis as revised on July 24, 1969. For this research, discriminant analysis was used as the statistical test for the eight null hypotheses.

There were forty-three variables: age, sex, education, marital status, number of children, work experience, length
of time on welfare plus the thirty-six responses on the questionnaire.

The subjects were selected from three groups, fifty from each group based on the type of termination they were given from the WIN program. The variables were considered in relation to this grouping to determine the validity of group placement. Based on the forty-three variables a probability table was developed which indicated a high validity of group placement.

**TABLE 1**

**GROUP PLACEMENT OF WIN PARTICIPANTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Group Placement</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placement of fit according to comparison of the variables</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table demonstrates that according to a computer comparison of variables, forty-six participants in Group I were homogeneous, forty-one in Group II and forty-eight in Group III. Therefore the subjects were placed in groups
accurately both in terms of actual assigned WIN groups and in terms of homogeneity of variables.

**Scope and Limitations**

This study was limited to adult education activities for the disadvantaged and specifically a welfare population in a work oriented society. Since WIN is a very specific program the generalizations from this study should be limited to a population with similar characteristics.

The research results of this study are dependent upon the data gathered by the use of the questionnaire. It covered a few factual characteristics and contained items to explore attitudes and to determine feelings about a mandatory experience. It must be assumed that the participants were honest in their responses.

Some conclusions can be drawn from this study, but it only represents the efforts of one researcher, one questionnaire, and a relatively small sample. Compared to the thousands of persons enrolled in various types of adult education programs, this study only can represent a small start. It can provide a basis for further study and research.
FOOTNOTES


VI.

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

A statistical analysis was computed for each of the variables and the eight hypotheses as stated in the problem. The following sections present the results of this analysis for each of the stated hypotheses. A conclusion is reached concerning each hypothesis, and a summary is presented stating the findings of the research.

Hypothesis 1. (Age)

There is no significant difference in the participants' ages among the success, neutral, or drop-out termination groups. The total group mean was 31.620.

TABLE 2
AGE COMPARISONS OF WIN TERMINATION GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>30.840</td>
<td>34.000</td>
<td>30.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7.859</td>
<td>9.747</td>
<td>8.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>0.6617*</td>
<td>df 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not significant
Since at least 3.07 is the required F level for .05 level of significance there is no significant difference in age among the groups therefore the null hypothesis is accepted.

A trend to be noted is that groups I and III are quite similar in age whereas group II is older. A possible consideration is that many group II terminations are for medical reasons which might more often occur among older participants.

Hypothesis 2. (Sex)

There is no significant difference in the participants' sex among the success, neutral, or drop-out termination groups. The total group mean 1.560 (1 equals male, 2 equals female) as shown in Table 3.

This variable has proven significant at the .01 confidence level, the null hypothesis must be rejected.

The trend appeared that there was a larger percentage of females in group II, neutral, while groups I and III were similar in composition. Group comparison statistics between the groups indicate that when considering other factors involved in the step discriminant analysis procedure, the greatest difference was between group I and III, while I and II were the most similar. Since sex is a discrete variable, the statistical analysis is not as conclusive as with
### TABLE 3

**SEX COMPARISON OF WIN TERMINATION GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>1.640</td>
<td>1.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>0.530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F level</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>1-I-11</th>
<th>1-I-III</th>
<th>1-II-III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.978*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26.051*</td>
<td>113.383*</td>
<td>62.730*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significance at .01 level
continuous data; therefore, caution must be exercised in interpretation.

There are more females in both early termination groups (II and III) than males. Many of the group II terminations are for lack of child-care, which could explain the high proportion of females in this group.

Hypothesis 3. (Educational Level)

There is no significant difference in the participants' educational level among the success, neutral, or drop-out termination groups. The total group mean was 9.806 as shown in Table 4.

The F level for this variable proved to indicate a trend at the .25 confidence level, therefore the null hypothesis can be accepted. The variable of educational attainment can, however, be cited as a possible trend.

The means indicate group I (success) has the highest level of education, group II (neutral) the next, and group III (drop-outs) the lowest. The relationships between the groups show that groups I and II are most similar and groups I and III have the greatest differences. All differences between the groups are at the .01 confidence level.

There seems to be a suggestion of a positive correlation between the years of formal schooling and success in the WIN program but not a significant correlation.
TABLE 4

COMPARISON OF EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF WIN TERMINATION GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Comparison between groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9.980</td>
<td>9.920</td>
<td>9.520</td>
<td>**** (df ) 9.482* 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.953</td>
<td>1.838</td>
<td>1.542</td>
<td>(df ) 39.018* 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>2.203**** (df ) 2</td>
<td>(df ) 20.966* 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significance at the .01 level
****Significance at the .25 level
Hypothesis 4. (Marital Status)

There is no significant difference in the participants' marital status among the success, neutral, and drop-out termination groups. The total mean was 2.053. The numerical value of 1 was assigned to single participants, 2 to married, 3 to divorced, and 4 to separated participants.

TABLE 5
COMPARISON OF MARITAL STATUS OF WIN TERMINATION GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.100</td>
<td>2.140</td>
<td>1.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.735</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>0.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>0.551*</td>
<td>df 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not significant
The three groups appear to be quite similar in composition according to marital status. The F level indicates that there is no significant difference therefore the null hypothesis is accepted.

Trends indicate that group III had slightly more single participants and groups I and II more married participants.

Hypothesis 5. (Number of children)

There is no significant difference in the participants' number of children among the success, neutral, and drop-out termination groups. The number of children in this sample ranged from none to ten. The total average mean was 2.980, or almost three children.

TABLE 6

COMPARISON OF THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN OF WIN TERMINATION GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.100</td>
<td>3.040</td>
<td>2.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2.028</td>
<td>1.817</td>
<td>1.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>0.505*</td>
<td>df 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not significant
Since the F level does not prove to be significant, the null hypothesis must be accepted.

Trends indicate that group III (drop-outs) had slightly less children than group I (successes) or II (neutral). There may be more single youths in this category who do not have children.

Since the success group had more children than the other two groups, the problem of finding adequate childcare did not interfere with their participation in WIN. The number of children participants have may not be as much as a problem as previously assumed in WIN.

**Hypothesis 6. (Work Experience)**

There is no significant difference in the participants' work experience among the success, neutral, and drop-out termination groups. The total group mean was 4.780 years of work experience as shown in Table 7.

The years of work experience as represented by the sample indicates there is a significant difference at the .05 or ninety-five percent confidence level. Therefore, the null hypothesis must be rejected.

The means show group II (neutral) has the most years of experience and group III (drop-outs) the least amount. The between the group comparisons show the greatest variance is between groups I (success) and III (drop-outs) when
### TABLE 7

**COMPARISON OF WORK EXPERIENCE OF WIN TERMINATION GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Comparison Between Groups</th>
<th>I-II</th>
<th>I-III</th>
<th>II-III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.700</td>
<td>6.360</td>
<td>3.280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4.107</td>
<td>7.342</td>
<td>4.121</td>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>3.950**</td>
<td>df 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.039*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.580*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31.029*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significance at the .01 level

**Significance at the .05 level
considering all relevant factors. Groups I and II are the most similar.

Considerations to be made are that since group II is the oldest group according to Table 2, it would seem logical that they would have a greater opportunity to acquire more work experience. Group I has more work experience than group III which may indicate a greater chance for success but because of the high mean in group II more work experience does not insure success. Nevertheless work experience seems to be a factor which must be considered.

Hypothesis 7. (Length of Time on Welfare)

There is no significant difference in the participants' length of time on welfare among the success, neutral, and drop-out termination groups. The total mean was 31.06 months. The range was from one to three-hundred months on assistance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPARISON OF LENGTH OF TIME ON WELFARE OF WIN TERMINATION GROUPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not significant
The F level of this variable did not indicate a significant difference therefore the null hypothesis can be accepted.

A trend indicates that group II has been receiving welfare the longest and group III the least. However group II has been identified as an older group and one which has more females, therefore there could be a greater possibility for more months on assistance.

In summary, the factual data variables have been analyzed and it was decided that all the null hypotheses would be accepted with the exception of sex and work experience. In these variables there were trends worthy of note, but the null hypotheses were rejected.

There seemed to be more females in groups II (neutral) and III (drop-outs), the early termination groups; however this can just be noted as a trend. There is a positive trend between the years of formal education and completion in WIN, with more education indicating a greater chance for success. Most participants cluster around the ninth and tenth grade level with not much variance in the means. The work experience table (Table 7) indicated that there may be a better chance for success with more previous work experience.

In all the comparisons between the groups the difference was the greatest between groups I (successes) and III (drop-outs) and the least between groups I (successes) and
II (neutral). These differences between groups were all at the .01 or ninety-nine percent confidence level.

Therefore, in practical application trends indicate that group I (successes) has more education, more males, and more work experience than group II or III. Group II (neutral) has more females than I or III, less education than I but more than III. Group III (drop-outs) has less work experience and education than I or II. Based on these findings a male with more education and work experience may have a slightly better chance to be a WIN success than a female with little education or work experience.

Hypothesis 8. (Attitude)

There is no significant difference in the participants' attitudes regarding mandatory participation among the success, neutral, and drop-out termination groups.

To answer this hypothesis, the responses on the attitude questionnaire were analyzed. Each question was treated as a separate variable. The ones which proved significant at either the .01, .05 or .25 levels are charted together indicating the mean, standard deviation, F level, between the group comparisons, degrees of freedom and the significance. The question is restated plus a reference to the context of the statement by indicating the numerical coding. In general the higher the score the more positive is the response. The questions can be grouped into four
possible categories: mandatory attitude, educational desire, WIN satisfaction, and other personal feelings about the program or themselves. These categories are also noted in the tables on the following pages.

Examining the three termination groups, four items proved to be significant at the .01 confidence level. The comparisons between the groups indicated that the greatest variance was between group I (successes) and group III (drop-outs) and that groups I and II (neutral) were most similar.

The largest variance was for the question regarding enjoying the WIN experience, item number ten. Group I (successes) responded most favorably, with group II (neutral) being close but group III (drop-outs) generally did not enjoy WIN. This question related to satisfaction with the WIN experience. The feeling of enjoyment toward the program seems to indicate a better opportunity for success. Group I, in item twenty-three did not feel belittled by going back to school with drop-outs but group III did. This item represents a personal feeling toward this educational experience. The better one felt about attending school and the feelings of comfort in that setting, the greater the chance was for success. Group I felt that WIN gave them a better attitude toward school but III did not, in item thirteen. This item again dealt with WIN satisfaction. If the participant had a feeling that education could
### Table 9

**Comparison of Attitude Variables Which Proved Significant of Win Termination Groups**

**Question 10. I enjoyed the WIN experience. Strongly Agree = 5 (WIN satisfaction)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Comparison between groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.480</td>
<td>4.020</td>
<td>1.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>1.115</td>
<td>0.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F level</td>
<td>140.885*</td>
<td>df2/147</td>
<td>7.032*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 23. Going back to school with drop-outs was a belittling experience.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Comparison between groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.180</td>
<td>2.620</td>
<td>1.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>1.307</td>
<td>0.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F level</td>
<td>24.241*</td>
<td>df2/146</td>
<td>28.855*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 13. The WIN experience gave me a better attitude toward school.

Total mean - 3.126

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>I-II</th>
<th>I-III</th>
<th>II-III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.380</td>
<td>3.480</td>
<td>1.520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.602</td>
<td>1.265</td>
<td>0.614</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>9.056*</td>
<td>df 2/144</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.073*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>98.315*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 19. I just couldn't cope with all my life's problems to concentrate on WIN.

Total mean - 2.993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>I-II</th>
<th>I-III</th>
<th>II-III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.060</td>
<td>2.680</td>
<td>2.240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>1.284</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>7.062*</td>
<td>df 2/143</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.279*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>82.827*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 9 (Continued)

**Question 34.** I know what I want for my future goals. Strongly Agree = 5  
**Total mean - 4.006**  
(Personal feelings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Comparison between groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.440</td>
<td>3.860</td>
<td>3.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.501</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>0.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>3.995** df2/142</td>
<td>18.869 df</td>
<td>71.865* df</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 32.** I have enough education to be what I consider a success.  
**Total mean - 3.273**  
Strongly Disagree = 5 (Educational desire)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Comparison between groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>3.300</td>
<td>2.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.088</td>
<td>1.313</td>
<td>1.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>3.825** df2/140</td>
<td>16.172* df</td>
<td>59.152* df</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 1. I was told I had to participate in WIN. Strongly Disagree = 5 (Mandatory)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Comparison between groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.560</td>
<td>2.420</td>
<td>1.520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.197</td>
<td>1.311</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>3.577** df2/139</td>
<td>14.272* 9</td>
<td>54.245* 9</td>
<td>27.311* 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 30. I would have been more successful in WIN if I could have done what I wanted. Strongly Disagree = 5 (Mandatory)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Comparison between groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.860</td>
<td>2.880</td>
<td>1.280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>1.349</td>
<td>0.757</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>3.046** df2/138</td>
<td>12.801* 10</td>
<td>50.662* 10</td>
<td>25.991* 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significance at .01 level  
**Significance at .05 level  
***Significance at .10 level  
****Significance at .25 level
TABLE 10

COMPARISON OF ATTITUDE VARIABLES WHICH INDICATED TRENDS
OF WIN TERMINATION GROUPS

<p>| Question 2. I wanted to enroll in WIN. Strongly Agree = 5 (Mandatory) | Total mean = 3.640 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Comparison between groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.260</td>
<td>3.660</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>I-II: 11.759* 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>1.255</td>
<td>1.212</td>
<td>I-III: 46.060* 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>2.568*** df2/137</td>
<td>II-III: 24.527* 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 10 (Continued)

Question 21. I had to make sacrifices to participate in WIN. Strongly Agree = 5  
(Personal feelings)  
Total mean - 3.426

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Comparison between groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.980</td>
<td>3.460</td>
<td>3.840</td>
<td>I-II df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.039</td>
<td>1.248</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>2.627***</td>
<td>df2/136</td>
<td>11.205* 12</td>
<td>43.868* 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 5. At first I didn't want to attend. Strongly Disagree = 5 (Mandatory)  
Total mean - 2.786

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Comparison between groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.140</td>
<td>2.700</td>
<td>2.520</td>
<td>I-II df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.325</td>
<td>1.432</td>
<td>1.249</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>2.627***</td>
<td>df2/135</td>
<td>10.267* 13</td>
<td>41.011* 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 20. A person's education is important today to achieve success. Total mean - 4.080

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Comparison between groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.560</td>
<td>4.120</td>
<td>3.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>0.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>2.242**** df2/133</td>
<td>8.861* 15</td>
<td>36.557* 15</td>
<td>20.266* 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 15. There were times when I felt I was being pushed into something I didn't want. Strongly Disagree = 5 (Mandatory) Total mean - 2.666

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Comparison between groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>3.020</td>
<td>1.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.195</td>
<td>1.477</td>
<td>0.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>1.816**** df2/132</td>
<td>8.506* 16</td>
<td>34.019* 16</td>
<td>19.197*16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 10 (Continued)

Question 16. WIN is a worthwhile educational experience. Strongly Agree = 5  
(WIN satisfaction)  
Total mean - 3.513

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Comparison between groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.580</td>
<td>3.940</td>
<td>2.020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>1.076</td>
<td>1.151</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>1.877**** df2/131</td>
<td>7.945* 17</td>
<td>32.496* 17</td>
<td>18.664* 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 27. Education is only a tool to get a better job. Strongly Disagree = 5  
(Educational desire)  
Total Mean - 2.433

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Comparison between groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.280</td>
<td>2.280</td>
<td>1.740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.294</td>
<td>1.355</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>1.618**** df2/130</td>
<td>7.811* 18</td>
<td>30.791* 18</td>
<td>17.494* 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 10 (Continued)

Question 36. Welfare clients need a program like WIN. Strongly Agree = 5
Total mean = 3.780
(WIN satisfaction)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>I-II</th>
<th>I-III</th>
<th>II-III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.700</td>
<td>4.120</td>
<td>2.520</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>1.172</td>
<td>1.233</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>1.489 ****</td>
<td>df2/129</td>
<td>7.343*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29.441*</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significance at the .01 level
**Significance at the .05 level
***Significance at the .10 level
****Significance at the .25 level
be a beneficial experience they were more likely to become a success in the program. Depending on how strongly they felt, could determine if they eventually were placed in groups I, II, or III. Group I felt they could cope with life's problems in order to participate in WIN, in item number nineteen, but group III could not. The personal feeling of determination indicated a motivational factor. Those who felt they could fight problems evidently were able to overcome difficulties and achieve success, but others who did not feel they could, became the drop-outs, group III.

Four items proved significant at the .05 confidence level. Group I (successes) in response to item thirty-four, knew their future goals more clearly than did group III (drop-outs). This may indicate that some adults do know their needs in relation to a goal. Since group I appeared more decisive, the identification of a goal may make the attainment of success more realistic. Having a definite sense of direction seemed to be an indicator of potential success.

Group I did not feel they had sufficient education to be a success in response to item number thirty-two, while group III did. Table Four indicated that the group mean for group I indicated a higher level of educational attainment than for group III. Therefore there could be a relationship with actual attainment and desire. In this instance
it appears the higher the actual attainment, the greater was the desire to acquire more education to achieve success. This item deals with educational desire.

The response to item number one demonstrated that group I did not feel that they were compelled to participate as much as did group III. This question shows a relationship with attitude regarding a mandatory experience. Group I did not view WIN as being as mandatory as did group III, who felt more coerced to participate. This feeling of coercion varied within each participant since they are all exposed to the same information and treatment. Therefore their feelings and interpretation of the experience may influence their attitude regarding how mandatory the WIN experience actually was.

Group I did not agree they would have been as successful if they could have done what they wanted in item number thirty, while group III did. Evidently group I felt they were doing as they desired or else the result justified their experience. Group III however must have felt some resistance to their desires. This item relates to feelings about a mandatory experience.

In Table 10, three questions indicated a trend at the .10 confidence level. Generally group I (successes) wanted to enroll in WIN as stated in item number two, and group III (drop-outs) did not. This initial attitude toward the WIN experience may be influential on the total participation.
This again indicates an attitude toward a mandatory program. Group I, in item number twenty-one, did not feel they had to make sacrifices as much as did group III. This item indicates a personal feeling, but one which may influence program completion. Group I wanted to attend at first, as indicated by item number five, more than did group III. This attitude again indicates the feelings toward mandatory WIN participation. Group II (neutral) ranged between I and III.

Five items indicated a trend at the .25 confidence level. Group I (successes) felt a person's education was more important than did group III (drop-outs) in item number twenty. Group I did not feel there were times they were being pushed into something they didn't want as much as group III indicated on item number fifteen. This item again deals with a feeling about the mandatory nature of WIN. Group I indicated in their response to item number sixteen, that they felt WIN was a worthwhile educational experience more than did group III. Group I did not agree that education is only a tool to get a better job as much as group III on item number twenty-seven. This response could indicate group I felt education was more than a tool for a job. Group I as indicated on Table Four has a higher educational level than group III which could relate to their response on this item. Group I responded to item number thirty-six
that welfare clients need a program like WIN more than group III. As observed previously group II (neutral) ranged between groups I and III. The variance between groups I and III is consistently larger and the variance between I and II is the smallest. All the differences among the three groups are at the ninety-nine percent confidence level.

In summary of these sixteen items which proved to indicate a trend at a specified confidence level, five dealt with mandatory feelings, three with educational desire, four with WIN satisfaction, and four with other personal feelings.

Table 11 has those items on the attitude questionnaire which did not prove as significantly different for the three groups. Means, standard deviations, F levels, degrees of freedom, questions, coding information, and category of each item are included.

Trends can be observed in this table. Group I (successes) was generally more positive in their responses than group III (drop-outs) and II (neutral) was in between.

To restate the hypothesis, there is no significant difference in participants' attitudes about mandatory WIN participation among the success, drop-out, or neutral termination groups. Since sixteen items on the questionnaire did prove to vary at a specified significance level there is a measurable difference in these attitudes between the
TABLE 11

COMPARISON OF ATTITUDE VARIABLES WHICH DID NOT PROVE AS SIGNIFICANT TRENDS OF WIN TERMINATION GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 3. I want more education. Strongly Agree = 5 (Educational desire)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total group mean - 3.426</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>3.700</td>
<td>2.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.926</td>
<td>1.147</td>
<td>1.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>0.6101*</td>
<td>df2/126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 4. My team or counselor told me I needed more education. Strongly Disagree = 5 (Mandatory)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total group mean - 2.326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.760</td>
<td>2.240</td>
<td>1.980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.318</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td>1.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>0.356*</td>
<td>df1/126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**TABLE 11 (Continued)**

**Question 6.** Later I wanted to attend. Strongly Agree = 5 (Mandatory)
Total group mean = 3.260

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.300</td>
<td>3.620</td>
<td>1.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td>1.259</td>
<td>0.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>0.814*</td>
<td>df2/126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 7.** I think the education in WIN will help me find a job.
Total group mean = 3.333 Strongly Agree = 5 (WIN satisfaction)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.320</td>
<td>3.720</td>
<td>1.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>1.309</td>
<td>0.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>0.921*</td>
<td>df2/126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 11 (Continued)

| Question 3. The information I learned in WIN is useful in daily life. Total group mean - 3.426 | Strongly Agree = 5 (WIN satisfaction) |
|---|---|---|
| **Group** | I | II | III |
| Mean | 4.480 | 3.760 | 2.040 |
| SD | 0.543 | 1.221 | 1.049 |
| F level | 0.428* | df2/126 |

| Question 9. I probably could have found a job without attending education. Total group mean - 2.773 | Strongly Disagree = 5 (Personal feelings) |
|---|---|---|
| **Group** | I | II | III |
| Mean | 2.960 | 2.720 | 2.640 |
| SD | 1.308 | 1.325 | 1.224 |
| F level | 0.730* | df2/126 |
TABLE II (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 11. I would like to attend more education classes. Total group mean - 3.406 Strongly Agree = 5 (Educational desire)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 12. If I had the chance I would participate in WIN again. Total group mean - 2.973 Strongly Agree = 5 (WIN satisfaction)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 11 (Continued)

Question 14. Since I finished my WIN classes I have continued studying on my own. (Educational desire)  
Total group mean - 2.866  Strongly Agree = 5  (Educational desire)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.700</td>
<td>2.880</td>
<td>2.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.974</td>
<td>1.222</td>
<td>0.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>1.218*</td>
<td>df2/128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 17. I would have benefitted more if the government gave me training money and let me attend any training I wanted  
Total group mean - 3.053  Strongly Disagree = 5  (Mandatory)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.260</td>
<td>3.280</td>
<td>1.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>1.178</td>
<td>0.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>0.466*</td>
<td>df2/126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 11 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 18.</th>
<th>The push I got by WIN really helped encourage me to continue my education. Strongly Agree = 5 (WIN satisfaction)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total mean</td>
<td>3.193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.320</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>1.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.586</td>
<td>1.216</td>
<td>0.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>0.673*</td>
<td>df2/126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 22.</th>
<th>I felt that the WIN staff members were interested in me as an individual and wanted to see me succeed. Strongly Agree = 5 (WIN satisfaction)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total mean</td>
<td>3.600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.480</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>2.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.614</td>
<td>1.087</td>
<td>0.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>0.209*</td>
<td>df2/126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 11 (Continued)

Question 24. There is not enough time in WIN to catch up on the education I need. Strongly Disagree = 5 (WIN satisfaction)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.480</td>
<td>2.720</td>
<td>2.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.129</td>
<td>1.457</td>
<td>1.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>0.074*</td>
<td>df2/126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 25. I don't want to fool around with any unnecessary school. Total group mean - 2.833 Strongly Disagree = 5 (Educational desire)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.940</td>
<td>2.880</td>
<td>1.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.284</td>
<td>1.465</td>
<td>1.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>1.269*</td>
<td>df2/126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 11 (Continued)

**Question 26.** All I want is a job. Strongly Disagree = 5 (Personal feelings)

Total group mean = 2.473

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.120</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>1.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.206</td>
<td>1.488</td>
<td>1.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>0.209*</td>
<td>df2/126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 28.** I felt I was looked down upon because I was on welfare. Total group mean = 2.926 Strongly Disagree = 5 (Personal feelings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.540</td>
<td>2.900</td>
<td>2.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.182</td>
<td>1.359</td>
<td>1.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>0.444*</td>
<td>df2/126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 29. I felt I was treated as an adult.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total group mean - 3.366 Strongly Agree = 5 (Personal feelings)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.280</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>2.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>1.249</td>
<td>1.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>0.866* df2/126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Question 33. No one in WIN really understands why I had to go on welfare. Strongly Disagree = 5 (Personal feelings) |  |
| Total group mean - 3.186 |  |
| Group | I | II | III |
| Mean | 3.840 | 3.060 | 2.660 |
| SD | 0.817 | 1.284 | 0.960 |
| F level | 0.897* df2/126 |
TABLE 11 (Continued)

Question 31. I could talk freely about my problems to the WIN staff. Total group mean = 3.393 Strongly Agree = 5 (Personal feelings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.340</td>
<td>3.620</td>
<td>2.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.626</td>
<td>1.193</td>
<td>0.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>0.189*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df/126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 35. I will achieve my goals. Strongly Agree = 5 (Personal feelings) Total group mean = 3.680

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.440</td>
<td>3.640</td>
<td>2.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.577</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td>0.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F level</td>
<td>0.638*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df/2126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not significant
participants and between the termination groups. However only eight of these were at the .01 or .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis dealing with attitude must be accepted.

The participants in group I (successes) in general expressed less of a mandatory feeling and seemed to want to participate in WIN.

They tended to have a greater desire for more education, a higher level of satisfaction with WIN and expressed more positive personal feelings. In contrast group III (drop-outs) seemed to feel a more negative mandatory influence, less desire for continued education and more negative personal feelings in relation to WIN. Group II (neutral) varied between I and III but seemed to be more similar to I than to III.

When considering the attitude variables, as stated there are four basic categories into which the questions can be grouped. Table 11 groups the items on the questionnaire according to these categories and indicates the significance level, total group mean for the entire sample, the coding direction of the question--strongly agree or disagree and the numerical value, and the means for groups I, II, and III.

From Table 12, it can be observed that two mandatory items were found to be at a significant confidence level as
opposed to six which were not. One item dealing with education desire were found to indicate a significant difference, while seven were not. When dealing with WIN satisfaction two items were found to be significantly different and eight were not. Three items questioning personal feelings were at a specified confidence level but eight were not.

A total of eight items were found to be at a significant confidence level and twenty-eight were not. However, the fact that eight items indicated a difference does show a trend that attitude may be related to WIN success or failure. In observing the group means in the non-significant items of Table 11, there are trends that indicate attitude difference between groups I (successes) and III (drop-outs). The position of group II (neutral) remains between I and III. There are very few items in which the three groups produce agreement with each other.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Level of Group Mean</th>
<th>Total Code</th>
<th>Group Means</th>
<th>MANDATORY ATTITUDE</th>
<th>Group Means</th>
<th>Total Code</th>
<th>Group Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>2.166 SD-5</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>2.326</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>2.673 SD-5</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>3.260</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.</td>
<td>3.053</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.*</td>
<td>3.640</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.*</td>
<td>2.786</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.**</td>
<td>2.666</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EDUCATIONAL DESIRE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Level of Group Mean</th>
<th>Total Code</th>
<th>Group Means</th>
<th>MANDATORY ATTITUDE</th>
<th>Group Means</th>
<th>Total Code</th>
<th>Group Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>3.273 SD-5</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.426</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>3.418</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.</td>
<td>2.866</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.</td>
<td>2.833</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.**</td>
<td>4.080</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.**</td>
<td>2.433</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Group</td>
<td>Total Code</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Mean of Group</td>
<td>Group Means</td>
<td>Total Code</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Mean of Group</td>
<td>Group Means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>3.420</td>
<td>SA-5</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>3.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>3.126</td>
<td>SA-5</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>3.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.973</td>
<td>SA-5</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.193</td>
<td>SA-5</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>SA-5</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.026</td>
<td>SD-5</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.513</td>
<td>SA-5</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.780</td>
<td>SA-5</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WIN SATISFACTION**
TABLE 12 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Group</th>
<th>Total Code</th>
<th>Group Means</th>
<th>Non-Significant Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL FEELINGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>2.833 SD-5</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>2.993 SD-5</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>4.006 SA-5</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.366 SA-5</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.186 SD-5</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.393 SA-5</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicated a trend at the .10 level
**Indicated a trend at the .25 level
VII.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

WIN is a program which was generated from a series of historical events. It is an attempt at the solution to the long standing problem of unemployment and welfare reform. The problem is one which the United States has been concerned with and has been trying to solve through its development as a nation. Attempts of government and private agencies to improve welfare has not yet solved the problem. However, the rationale, goals, and purposes of WIN were formed by the welfare growth and development throughout our history.

The WIN program attempts to develop human resources. The policy which placed this responsibility with the federal government has resulted from actions of past political administrations and Congress. Nevertheless, it was created and has developed into a tremendous effort.

The fact remains WIN is an example of a mandatory adult education program. The legislation which dictates participation has been cited. The participants are in a position in which they must behave in accordance with program
regulations or they are liable for sanctions. The issue of
the desirability of a mandatory work and education program
has been discussed. Most of the comments and testimony on
the floor of Congress as cited in Chapter Three, questioned
the validity of requiring participation in any type of man-
datory program. The results of such a program were pre-
dicted to be negative. However, leaders' opinions were
elicited but not followed because the legislation which re-
sulted enforced a more mandatory approach in an attempt to
improve the welfare situation.

The relationship of the application of a principle of
mandatory participation on the success of participants in
WIN were explored by this study. Possible variables which
may be related to success were isolated and analyzed. Var-
iables which were proved to be statistically significant at
a specified confidence level of either .01 or .05, were
sex and work experience. A trend was indicated that a
possible relationship exists between success and failure in
WIN with participants' attitudes toward a mandatory program.
Those who did not want to participate or who felt coerced
were generally not successful in WIN. In contrast, those
who wanted to become involved and enjoyed the experience
were more often successful. Since participant feelings of
enjoyment, desire, and educational goals are believed to be
a determinant of success, these feelings need to be considered
as being of importance. However the data do not confirm this difference to be significant.

This study has traced the development of welfare through the current WIN program and has presented a view of WIN participants' feelings. It researched the question of mandatory adult education and the conclusion has been reached that there are factors which are related program success. The application of mandatory influences has introduced a negative factor in WIN as measured by the participant responses.

The WIN program has had failure and success. It represents a recognition that there is a core of human beings who need help. Are they worth spending the necessary time and money to train and to give them the opportunity for a better future?

The concept of offering training and education is a sound one. The greatest resource is in people and human development. This welfare population represents a large portion of this precious commodity. The question remains as to how should this resource be developed.

The most effective tools for self-improvement and development this society has to offer may be educational opportunities. How this intangible value can be offered and distributed seems to present a problem. Such programs have been attempted as mandatory adult education, voluntary
educational classes, open free training, courses with monetary incentives, planned government classes, community development courses, neighborhood centers, and subsidized private plans. What choices are best is a matter for open discussion. Possible solutions and alternatives lie with future researchers, planners, educators, and citizens who are striving for peace and prosperity for all.

**Implications for Practice**

The implication of any type of a critical examination of an adult education program such as WIN is the ultimate effect on individuals. Since the mandatory aspect has proved to be somewhat related to success, it may need to be altered. The current mandatory approach is not being used effectively. Major program changes could improve this situation. But such changes would need to be made at levels far above a local project's influence. However, each WIN project does have a staff trained to be aware of local problems and labor market conditions who could work within the set guidelines and still achieve more effective results.

Specific parts of WIN can and should be altered. The attitude of staff toward recipients should be improved by the findings of this study. There have been several assumptions made in the past which have influenced the selection of participants and opportunities offered to them. Even supervisors have approved the rejection of registrations on
the basis of their opinions. Some of these beliefs are that the following groups of participants are not successful in WIN: chronic welfare recipients, participants with large numbers of children, youth, older females without work experience, and participants with less than a tenth grade education. These assumptions are completely subjective and are not based on surveys or research. This study could dispel many of these beliefs because age, length of time on welfare, and number of children were not proven to be significantly related to success in WIN. Therefore these factors should not be used as selection criteria.

The significance of this study would seem to be that for the first time, in Franklin County, a study was conducted which involved participants and elicited their attitude and opinions. It attacked the issue of mandatory effects on participation and resulted in significant findings. The fact that several attitude responses may affect success indicates an area for possible program improvement. Educational level and work experience are fixed when a participant enters WIN. These variables may be changed on a limited basis. However attitude may be changed and influenced by program standards, policies, and staff members.

Since the questionnaire indicated feeling levels are somewhat related to success, it would seem vital to create a positive attitude when the participant enters the program.
Sending threatening letters and emphasizing the legal requirement of participation does not seem to insure active or successful participation. Even though the results of this study indicate mandatory adult education has not been entirely effective in WIN, it is doubtful whether this aspect will be altered in the near future. Whether the mandatory requirement has resulted in any positive direction or not cannot be determined by this study. If the mandatory aspect were altered, it is just a matter of conjecture if there would be a sufficient number of volunteers for a non-mandatory WIN program.

However it seems possible that an alteration to the appraisal approach could improve response. The staff which should be alert to participant feelings could emphasize choices and positive benefits. Orientation could create an enjoyable atmosphere, instilling a desire to seek meaningful education and the setting of goals. This environment would hopefully encourage a more positive attitude toward WIN.

The goals set for WIN seem unrealistic based on past success rates of WIN and other programs for the disadvantaged. The review of the literature indicated a twenty-five percent average success rate for most programs. WIN has been expected to achieve a seventy-five percent success rate. But the average has been twenty-five percent. Perhaps a careful
re-evaluation of the goals at all levels is necessary.

Basic principles of adult education need to be incorporated into the WIN concept. A respect for adults as unique learners needs to be given by recognizing their potential and giving them an opportunity to assess their educational, vocational, and social needs. WIN needs to provide the necessary tools and resources. Too often, the pressure for fast results creates an atmosphere in which the participant must accept a mandatory program with limited choices. More freedom to create a relationship which is conducive to learning is needed. A rigid time frame of twelve months limits the possibilities of WIN and often erects a barrier to the obtaining of realistic goals. The program is often not suited to the needs of the participants, but still they are required to participate, therefore failure results. A more flexible program is needed without a set time limit. The standards require set numbers of participants in each component, therefore timing may dictate whether a participant can follow the plan he may need. This again is too rigid to the individual adult needs. The goals are too specific and limiting to effectively serve participants and provide the experience they require as humans.

A type of re-alignment toward more consideration of the participants as unique humans, and the realization their
feelings and attitudes are important and could possibly result in a more successful program. The attitude of the learner is significant and is of more importance than bureaucratic details in the final analysis of evaluating program success.

**Implications for Theory Development**

The relationship between the results of this study to the literature marks a trend to form adult education theory. It considers that adults have distinctive needs as learners and the treatment of their feelings and attitudes is essential for success. The consistency of program goals with participants' attitudes and reasonable evaluation can create continued emphasis toward success.

The fact that a governmental entity has been given the power to legislate mandatory adult education is not consistent with the principles and conditions some adult educators believe to be necessary for a successful adult education program. This program and others like it are going through all the motions necessary to reach the planned goals but are only succeeding in a small number of cases. Adult educations' principles are not integrated with social welfare and vocational needs.

The relationship between compulsory adult education and the stimulation of life-long learning may be nil. The two areas could be diametrically opposed. Life-long learning
is often the desire adult educators hope they can instill in adult learners. To those who have attained this quest, it is the basis for a life rich in pleasure and knowledge. The ability to create this sense in others may be a difficult task, but one to which educators must be dedicated. If education is sought by learners, there is no need to assign it. It appears if life-long learning is present, compulsory adult education is unnecessary. However this relationship can be explored through further research. When a federal agency has dictated programs such as WIN, the needs of the society may not be consistent with the needs of the learner. The legislative power vested in government represents a threat to a free society. If educational needs can be decided then the freedom to learn, to read, to express one's thoughts may be in jeopardy. The ethical question must be considered.

Whether any mandatory aspects be included in adult education programs or not is a question which needs further research. In WIN it seems to be having some negative relationship on attitudes but its total impact requires more exploration.

Implications for Further Research

There are several possibilities for further research. The factors cited did indicate possible reasons for success versus failure but are just a start. Questions generated
are: Just how significant is attitude in the completion of adult education programs? Does a similar pattern exist in a voluntary program? What can be done to change attitude? What would happen to WIN if it would become voluntary? How can welfare departments encourage participation without forcing it? How can one motivate a desire for adult education and self-improvement? Who is responsible to decide if adults need more education or self-improvement? Are programs such as WIN worth the costs? How does staff attitude affect participation? What are more specific characteristics of adults who seek education as opposed to those who refuse it? Just what kinds of educational needs do disadvantaged adults have?

Each question which proved significant in this study could be explored for further research such as those who felt belittled as opposed to those who did not, why some felt they made sacrifices and others did not, why one group felt education was only a tool and why one group had goals and the other did not. They all represent a possible nucleus for meaningful research. The subject of attitude and feelings seems to be a powerful force but one which is difficult to measure and assess. However, the respect and treatment of attitude may be the difference between success and failure or more important the educators' ability to apply a meaningful adult education experience to all who are willing to accept the challenge.
CIRCLE THE CHOICE WHICH BEST DESCRIBES YOUR ANSWER

SA - Strongly Agree
A - Agree
? - I Don't Know
D - Disagree
SD - Strongly Disagree

1. I was told I had to participate in WIN.  
   SA A ? D SD

2. I wanted to enroll in WIN.  SA A ? D SD

3. I want more education.  SA A ? D SD

4. My team or counselor told me I needed more education.  
   SA A ? D SD

5. At first I didn't want to attend.  SA A ? D SD

6. Later I wanted to attend.  SA A ? D SD

7. I think the education in WIN will help me find a job.  
   SA A ? D SD

8. The information I learned in WIN is useful in daily life.  
   SA A ? D SD

9. I probably could have found a job without attending education.  
   SA A ? D SD

10. I enjoyed the WIN experience.  SA A ? D SD

11. I would like to attend more education classes.  
    SA A ? D SD

12. If I had the chance I would participate in WIN again.  
    SA A ? D SD

13. The WIN experience gave me a better attitude toward school.  
    SA A ? D SD
14. Since I finished my WIN classes I have continued studying on my own.

15. There were times when I felt I was being pushed into something I didn't want.

16. WIN is a worthwhile educational experience.

17. I would have benefitted more if the government gave me the training money and let me attend any training I wanted.

18. The push I got by WIN really helped encourage me to continue my education.

19. I just couldn't cope with all my life problems to concentrate on WIN.

20. A person's education is important today to achieve success.

21. I had to make sacrifices to participate in WIN.

22. I felt that the WIN staff members were interested in me as an individual and wanted to see me succeed.

23. Going back to school with other drop-outs was a belittling experience.

24. There is not enough time in WIN to catch up on the education I need.

25. I don't want to fool around with any unnecessary school.

26. All I want is a job.

27. Education is only a tool to get a better job.

28. I felt I was looked down upon because I was on welfare.

29. I felt I was treated as an adult.

30. I would have been more successful in WIN if I could have done what I wanted.
31. I could talk freely about my problems to the WIN staff.  
   SA  A  ?  D  SD

32. I have enough education to be what I consider a success.  
   SA  A  ?  D  SD

33. No one in WIN really understands why I had to go on welfare.  
   SA  A  ?  D  SD

34. I know what I want for my future goals.  SA  A  ?  D  SD

35. I will achieve my goals.  SA  A  ?  D  SD

36. Welfare clients need a program like WIN.  
   SA  A  ?  D  SD

PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING:

AGE______________________SEX______________________

EDUCATION (Highest grade completed)__________________________

MARITAL STATUS____________________NUMBER OF CHILDREN________

YEARS OF WORK EXPERIENCE________

LENGTH OF TIME ON WELFARE__________
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