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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The decade of the sixties was characterized by a proliferation of human resource programs. Nearly a dozen were designed to address the multiple employment and training problems of the disadvantaged in the job market. During the seventies, attention was focused on the duplication of services provided and the difficulty of coordinating these diverse employment and training programs. Simultaneously, the revenue-sharing concept was raised, debated and adopted by the Nixon Administration as part of the proposed New Federalism. "Both of these developments--the perceived need for reforming the collection of manpower programs and the Administration's drive for revenue-sharing--led to the enactment of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973--CETA (P.L. 93-203). The legislation, the first in a series of proposed special revenue-sharing bills, transferred control over a large portion of federal revenues to state and local jurisdictions for flexible use in lieu of a variety of categorical federal manpower programs." (Mirengoff and Rindler, 1976:iii). Thus, CETA represents an attempt to alter a piecemeal system of employment and training programs that developed during the sixties by
implementing two basic premises of employment and training policy: (1) decentralization (local authorities know best local needs and how to respond to them) and (2) decategorization (to deal effectively with those needs, maximum flexibility in the use of employment and training resources should replace the system of categorical programs).

As signed into law on December 28, 1973, CETA consisted of six titles, four of which authorized the planning and delivery of employment and training services. Two subsequent amendments to CETA (P.L. 93-567, P.L. 94-444) authorized a total of eight titles:

. Title I authorizes prime sponsors to provide for comprehensive employment and training activities (i.e., classroom training, on the job training, work experience, public service employment) and services (e.g., counseling, testing, job development) for the unemployed, underemployed and economically disadvantaged.

. Title II provides for public service employment programs in areas with 6.5 percent or higher unemployment for three consecutive months. Participants must be underemployed or unemployed for at least thirty days and must reside within the areas of high unemployment.

. Title III generally provides nationally sponsored and supervised training and job placement programs
for special groups such as youth, offenders, older workers, persons of limited English ability, Indians, migrant and seasonal farmworkers, and others with particular labor market disadvantages.

. Title IV provides for the Job Corps, a residential program of intensive education, training and counseling for disadvantaged men and women 16-21 years.

. Title V establishes a National Commission for Manpower Policy. Appointed by the President, it is composed of federal, state, and local elected officials involved in employment and training programs, persons served by employment and training programs and members of the general public. It is designed to identify the nation's employment and training needs and goals and evaluate the effectiveness of programs.

. Title VI provides for emergency public employment programs to augment the number of subsidized jobs available during periods of severe unemployment. Programs under this Title take two forms: public service projects and public service employment type jobs like those under Title II.

. Title VII contains general provisions applicable to all Titles, such as definitions and prohibitions against discrimination.
Title VIII is the Youth Employment Act which added provisions for youth (14-20 years) employment both in school and out of school.

The Congress has reauthorized CETA extending the legislation until 1982. The new legislation concentrates upon serving the economically disadvantaged and spells out a clear objective for CETA: increase the earned income of persons who participate. Since this study is based upon FY 1978 program operations, all Title references will refer to the 1973 legislation. These 1973 titles correspond to the Titles in the new legislation as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1973</th>
<th>1978</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title I - Comprehensive Manpower Services</td>
<td>Title I A,B,C - Comprehensive Employment and Training Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title II - Public Service Employment Programs</td>
<td>Title II D - Comprehensive Employment and Training Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title III - Special Federal Responsibilities</td>
<td>Title III - Special Federal Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IV - Job Corps</td>
<td>Title IV - Youth Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title V - National Commission for Manpower Policy</td>
<td>Title V - National Commission for Employment Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title VI - Emergency Jobs Program</td>
<td>Title VI - Countercyclical Public Service Employment Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title VII - General Provisions</td>
<td>Title I - Administrative Provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title VIII - Youth Act</td>
<td>Title IV - Youth Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Present</td>
<td>Title VII - Young Adult Conservation Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title VII - Private Sector Opportunities for the Economically Disadvantaged</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The original CETA legislation did not authorize any new employment and training services. "Instead it consolidated the authorization for many existing employment and training services and it accomplished two significant administrative changes in the process:

- It shifted to a substantial degree the authority for planning, implementing, operating, monitoring and assessing programs from the federal government to the state and local prime sponsors (i.e., it decentralized the program).

- It allowed the prime sponsors the flexibility to design the services and the service mix around the needs of the jurisdiction's target population (i.e., it decategorized the program)." (National Commission for Manpower Policy, 1978a:40).
The development of the coordination of employment and training programs rests largely in the way the employment and training network has evolved. Historically, employment and training programs have evolved through the realization of and response to specific problems that required the attention of the federal government. Rather than this being a process of framing an overall policy of human resource development and utilization, the development of employment and training policy has been largely a piecemeal approach attacking specific dysfunctions or attempting to meet certain social needs. (National Commission for Manpower Policy, 1975). Prior to the sixties the principal agencies and programs providing employment and training activities and services were the employment service, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation institutions. During the sixties, awareness of other employment and training needs of large groups within the population led to the implementation of programs aimed at resolving their specific labor market problems. The first program, the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, was designed to provide economic development opportunities for economically depressed areas. It also contained a relatively modest employment and training component. In 1962, the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) was enacted to provide training to those who had become unemployed through technological or other structural changes in industry. Amended in 1968, the focus of MDTA was shifted
from the technologically displaced to the poor and disadvantaged. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (EOA) as amended established a number of new programs related to employment and training. These included the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Job Corps, Work Experience Program, Operation Mainstream and the Concentrated Employment Program.

During the early sixties, there was a great deal of experimentation on how to resolve the different employment problems of special groups. "Out of this structured and unstructured experimentation grew a realization that excessive fragmentation of programs was inefficient and was denying many individuals access to the whole range of services that were available in different programs. Bureaucratic battles over control of programs within and among federal agencies, struggles among state agencies, controversies between state and local agencies and contests among local agencies further reduced the effectiveness of the manpower network that was then in place. At the same time, there was growing pressure from many state and local governments for an increased role in the administration of these programs. The combination of these factors led to consideration of both legislative and administrative proposals for reform" (National Commission for Manpower Policy, 1975:12).
Two new approaches were attempted in 1967. The Cooperative Area Manpower Planning Systems (CAMPS) was an attempt to improve coordination in employment and training programs through coordinated planning. Interested parties in the employment and training process voluntarily formed CAMPS committees that were expected to assess local needs and develop programs to meet these needs. While the early CAMPS efforts are considered to be disappointing (i.e., since the federal funding agencies were not bound by these plans, they tended to have minimal influence on funding decisions), the CAMPS effort did provide a local forum for the exchange of information among service deliverers and it helped solidify the concept of local planning for employment and training activities and services (National Commission for Manpower Policy, 1975).

The second 1967 attempt at better coordination, the Comprehensive Employment Program (CEP), was focused on providing intensive employment and training services to areas of high unemployment. This early attempt at providing operational coordination through local sponsors did provide some useful lessons in the development and tailoring of individual employability development plans--plans which utilized the services of a variety of programs to assist participants (National Commission for Manpower Policy, 1975).

Other administrative initiatives followed from 1969 to 1972. These attempts aimed at strengthening CAMPS by
providing funding for independent staffs and more direct involvement of governors and mayors in the planning process. In addition, the Department of Labor began an experiment to develop Comprehensive Manpower Programs in nine jurisdictions. The idea behind the Concentrated Manpower Program was to provide flexibility in the use of MDTA and EOA funds so that the programs could be structured to meet local needs. There is not sufficient evidence to judge the efficacy of these latter two administrative initiatives as the CETA legislative reform soon overtook them (National Commission for Manpower Policy, 1975).

In an effort to reduce the fragmentation and to increase the flexibility of employment and training programs to serve the needs of individual participants CETA was passed in 1973. It combined the resources and services available under MDTA and EOA. The CETA legislation also heavily emphasized the need for coordination of CETA programs with other employment and training programs (e.g., employment service, vocational education). Thus, it was thought that CETA would provide the framework for improved employment and training program coordination because it:

. provided for more comprehensive planning
. consolidated previously separate categorical programs
. gave state and local officials responsibility for planning and providing these services
The Problem

Increasing coordination among employment and training programs through comprehensive service delivery is generally accepted as a partial solution to the problem of having too few resources in relation to the size of the needs being addressed. However, translating the goal of comprehensive delivery of employment and training activities and services into an operational reality remains problematic. Conceptual and definitional problems exist as to what is meant by comprehensiveness and what can and cannot be accomplished through it. Unless the concept and scope of comprehensiveness is properly understood, there is a strong possibility of overestimating its potential to increase program effectiveness and an equally great potential to fail to realize the performance improvements that comprehensiveness can yield.

Comprehensive Service Delivery. Comprehensive delivery of employment and training activities and services involves the identification of the common goals and objectives among the various pieces of employment and training legislation, and employment and training-related programs. It attempts to interrelate the mix and delivery of services toward these common objectives without sacrificing individual program goals.
For example, under a comprehensive delivery system, participants may have the opportunity to transfer between activities under Title I, among Titles, to other employment and training activities, or to enroll in two activities simultaneously. Conceptually, it is assumed that through comprehensiveness, service delivery will be improved and increased benefits will accrue from the limited resources available.

**Erosion of Comprehensiveness.** Since the inception of CETA in 1973, there appears to be a slow, but identifiable, shift from decategorized to more categorized employment and training programs. Kruger and Curry (1978:46) suggest that "despite a surplus of fanfare and rhetoric, it is clear that Congress did not intend CETA to be a decategorized manpower program as many local officials would like to believe or were led to believe. In fact, there is evidence that both Congress and the Department of Labor have attempted to limit local flexibility to the greatest extent possible." Two recent examples reflect this trend.

1. The federal role as defined under CETA, includes the basic function of assuring prime sponsor compliance with the Act, reviewing prime sponsors' plans and assessing program performance. In an effort to carry out these functions, the Department of Labor has taken a series of steps which give it increased power and control over prime sponsors. These steps include: more stringent assessment of the prime sponsors' grant applications and the development of national
performance standards such as entered employment rates, and indirect placement rates (Kruger and Curry, 1978; National Commission for Manpower Policy, 1976).

Program performance indicators are generally considered to be a move towards nationally established program performance standards. The establishment of national performance standards, in turn, often are feared to lead to eventual control over the mix of employment and training services prime sponsors choose. The National Council on Employment Policy has stated that "centralized performance goals run counter to the spirit of the CETA. Individual prime sponsors and their programs are as unalike as apples and oranges; attempting to apply a single standard to them denies local initiatives" (Kruger and Curry, 1978:46).

(2) A second example of the erosion of block grant flexibility comes from recent legislative action by the Congress. Originally, Congress was reluctant to have the public service employment program become one of the allowable activities under Title I. As a result, Title II was authorized and funded for this purpose. In response to the increasing unemployment rate and the economic recession, Congress added a new Title VI (the Emergency Jobs and Unemployment Assistance Act) to CETA in 1974, which was later extended. Most recently Congress has added several specific youth programs to CETA by expanding Title III and adding Title VIII (Kruger and Curry, 1978; National Commission for
Manpower Policy, 1976) as well as several targeted programs such as the Private Sector Initiatives Program (PSIP) and Skill Training Initiatives Program (STIP).

Although these enactments include some features of the block grant approach, they clearly illustrate that Congress harbors second thoughts on the authorization of block grants, generally and CETA specifically. The Congressional tendency to give flexibility and then to withdraw that same flexibility over time can be clearly observed. In fact, the Congress is now beginning to administer the public employment program through legislation. The . . . Emergency Jobs Program Extension Act goes so far as to establish specific criteria for determining participant eligibility for the jobs funded under Title VI. The prime sponsor's option to determine whom among the unemployed is to be served with this portion of the funds has been eliminated. In addition, the prime sponsors' program planning flexibility--never anything to brag about in the public employment program--has been further eroded. The purposes for which the money is to be spent, and in what time frame are specific and are dictated from the banks of the Potomac. The prime sponsor is a project director administering a federal program through designated program agents (National Commission for Manpower Policy, 1976:211).

Thus, these two actions add to the uncertainties surrounding the intent of CETA and the future role of decentralized, decategorized employment and training programs.

The Issue. As outlined above, over the past few years, there appears to be a shift in CETA away from its original intent. While the original intent of CETA was to serve the needs of the chronically and structurally unemployed, shifts in the economy have triggered a change in emphasis to the
cyclically unemployed (Mirengoff and Rindler, 1976; Pressley and McGraw, 1978). In 1974, total attention was focused on the implementation of Title I because (1) the Title I appropriation was larger than all other Titles combined, and (2) Title I included all the major institutional changes to be made in the delivery system. Thus, Title I was where the concept of a decentralized, decategorized employment and training system would actually be implemented. However, a combination of factors interrupted the demonstration of CETA as it was first designed (McPherson, 1978). These factors included:

(1) The intergovernmental employment and training delivery system was not in place when CETA became law. Staff expertise was not present and few understood the magnitude of the task of developing a comprehensive planning and delivery system (McPherson, 1978; Mirengoff and Rindler, 1976; Ripley, 1977).

(2) Traditional categorical program service deliverers were already in place and not to be easily redirected or displaced by the new prime sponsors' initiatives. Consequently, substantive changes in either the mix of services or in the delivery system were not immediately forthcoming (Mirengoff and Rindler, 1976; McPherson, 1978; Ripley, 1977).

(3) The authorization of Title VI shortly after the implementation of CETA and the enactment of the Youth Programs overshadowed the efforts to develop a flexible and
decentralized employment and training system under Title I. Specifically, since FY 1974, annual appropriations have nearly quadrupled. While billions have been added to categorical Titles, only $300 million have augmented the Title I program (McPherson, 1978:6).

Even though CETA's more idealistic objectives have not been achieved at all levels, the basic framework of a decentralized, decategorized employment and training delivery system has been put in place. This framework is defined in the Title I program. However, as employment and training policy has evolved, and specifically as CETA has been amended, we have seen the development and partial erosion of a decentralized, decategorized delivery system without determining if its assumptions (i.e., that comprehensive service delivery promotes effective employment and training activities) tested in the administrative initiatives (e.g., CAMPS, Concentrated Employment Program, Comprehensive Manpower Program) were correct. The idea that a centralized, categorical delivery system has been accepted primarily due to the obvious duplication of services provided in the past and the intuitive appeal of the idea.

This dissertation seeks to answer the broad question: What types of CETA delivery systems are more effective? It poses a basic question about the delivery of employment and training programs by asking if more comprehensive service delivery systems provide more effective employment and training
programs.

Hypotheses

Given the above discussion, the primary hypotheses of this dissertation is that a highly comprehensive delivery system will be positively correlated with more effective employment and training activities. Work experience will be a focus in this study. It assumes that work experience can be a more effective employment and training activity when it is perceived as related to and used in the context of other Title I activities. In order for this to occur, prime sponsors would have to operate a comprehensive delivery system.

The opportunity of participant to transfer between activities under Title I, among Titles or to other employment and training programs is a central feature of comprehensiveness. Under CETA, prime sponsors are given even more flexibility than under prior employment and training programs, i.e., they may combine activities in order to fit each participant's needs. The most common combination found is work experience and classroom training. The theoretical rationale for the integration of work and education can be traced in the writings of John Dewey (1938), and Alfred N. Whitehead (1932). Willard Wirtz in the Boundless Resource (1975:58) has expanded upon this theme by calling for "fusing the education and work experiences to provide much more intensive opportunity--where individual
circumstances warrant it . . ." Although Wirtz's remarks are focused on youth, the fusion of education and work, and his other recommendations such as year round schooling and flexible modular scheduling illustrate the need for flexibility to meet individual needs.

Research to date shows that the extent of comprehensiveness of the delivery system varies considerably among prime sponsors. Mirengoff and Rindler (1976) found that of 28 prime sponsors studied, four operated comprehensive delivery systems, 11 mixed delivery systems and 13 independent delivery systems. Ripley (1978) identified a similar distribution of comprehensiveness; i.e., of the 15 sites, only one had a high degree of programmatic integration; six had at least some elements of integration, and eight had made virtually no attempt to achieve programmatic integration. In a later study Mirengoff and Rindler (1978) reported that of the 28 prime sponsors studied, one-third adapted a comprehensive delivery system for Title I programs, one-quarter have a mixed system, and the remaining 40 percent have retained categorical delivery.

The critical issue, therefore, is whether or not prime sponsors move toward providing the comprehensive delivery systems envisioned under CETA. Therefore, the following hypothesis will be tested:

1) If prime sponsors operate comprehensive delivery systems, then the effectiveness of their employment
and training activities will be higher.

In order to test this hypothesis, the type of delivery system a prime sponsor implements will be measured along three dimensions identified by Mirengoff and Rindler (1976, 1978): degree of coordination, degree of access to programs by participants, and degree of continuity in guidance by prime sponsor staff. Effective employment and training activities will be defined by the prime sponsor's FY 1978 placement rate. For a fuller discussion of these items, see Definition of Terms in Chapter I and Chapter III.

It is clear that the decision process in CETA is anything but a straightforward procedure shared by all prime sponsors. While a study (Ripley, 1978) using a national sample of prime sponsors found that local decision-makers have a great deal of potential latitude in determining who gets served and how well the program performs, there doubtlessly exists a web of constraints on the decision process of every prime sponsor.

Ripley (1978) found three major sets of explanations for variations in program performance: (1) the preferences, priorities, and commitments of influential actors; (2) program mix, and (3) local management decisions. To the extent that program mix is determined by local management decisions and local management decisions are controlled by the more influential actors, these three explanatory variables can be reordered as:
actor preferences + management decisions + program mix. In other words, the particular power structure in a prime sponsor affects the decisions made by that prime sponsor, one which is the program mix.

Ripley (1977) found that Title I program component choices were explained in part by (a) previous program choices; (b) environmental constraints (population density, manufacturing jobs per capita, number of existing vocational education facilities); (c) preferences of decision makers.

In his two case studies of correctional institutions, Perrow (1970:34) notes that "the main difference between these two institutions appears to be the conception of the nature of the 'raw material' with which they dealt . . . Once a definition is embedded in a program, the opinion of personnel who remain at the institution becomes congruent with it." He further states that the case studies show that "within the same 'type' of organization a wide variety of techniques, structures, and goals can be used. In order to understand these differences it is important to find out how an organization conceives its task and its raw material, how interdependent is its system, how closely controlled it must be" (Perrow, 1977:36). Perrow's assertion may be rewritten as a hypothesis in the following form:

2) If prime sponsors have a commitment toward helping the disadvantaged, then the effectiveness of employment and training activities will be higher.
Ripley (1977) analyzed the influence pattern of all manpower actors in each Ohio prime sponsor for 4 different kinds of Title I decisions. The analyses revealed that the prime sponsor staff emerges as dominant on most Title I decisions while the Federal representative appears to be the least important actor. The chief elected official had considerable influence on some Title I decisions (e.g., program mix, selection of program deliverers). The Manpower Planning Council ranged from positions of no importance in some prime sponsorships to high importance in a few. Service deliverers retained an important voice in some prime sponsorships (especially Title I target group choices). In a later study, Ripley (1978) found that a higher degree of programmatic integration is more likely to be present in those prime sponsors in which the staff has a higher degree of independence from political officials and in smaller cities or single county prime sponsors. Thus, a third hypothesis is offered:

3) If decision-making in a prime sponsorship is widely distributed, then the effectiveness of its employment and training activities will be higher.

Ripley (1977) found that the attitudes of influential manpower actors are important in helping to shape the program mix. At this point, a basic question must be raised: From where do these preferences stem? Traditionally, the long history of work experience in employment and training
programs has led to various preconceptions about the purpose of work experience. For example, work experience was used as an income maintenance activity under Operation Mainstream (Perry, et al., 1976). Work experience under CETA is a short-term assignment designed to enhance the employability of those who have never worked or have not recently been working in the competitive labor market. Since work experience itself technically involves no specific training component, one might expect that its greatest contribution would be in terms of developing these general employment "skills" or attitudes. While there is little doubt that work experience can help to form desirable job attitudes, its potential may go well beyond that.

Consider, for example, "in Plato's *Meno*, an uneducated slave boy is guided by Socrates to rediscover the Pythagorean theorem . . . Where did the slave get the knowledge that could lead him to this complicated conclusion? Socrates said that the slave had been born with it in his soul, but the text shows that even an illiterate could have acquired the basic knowledge from his observation of life" (Houle, 1976:20). Episodes and anecdotes, such as the one above, represent the beginning of the experiential learning movement. However, the line is not a direct one as reflected in the following brief history.

Houle (1976) identified five patterns of advanced learning that were operating during the medieval
period, two of which were firmly grounded experiential learning. First, the craft guilds provided apprenticeship training, which was based upon experiential learning. Chivalry was the second type of advanced learning. The chivalric system of education was almost entirely experiential learning. Basic literacy was learned from the ladies of the court and tutors, while other important skills, knowledge and attitudes were obtained in the courtyard, tournaments and battlefields.

The nineteenth century witnessed the rise of professionalized army services, and the growth of an industrial society whereby apprenticeship was no longer based on a craft system but became far more organized and complex, and universities flourished. Thus, the older systems of education that were being abandoned were usually based upon experiential learning, a form of instruction far different from the traditional way of work of the universities (Houle, 1976). However, by the 1860s, the need for a combination of formal classroom training and experiential learning became apparent. This change in thought is reflected in the writing of John Stuart Mill (1874) as he attempted to describe how the two types of learning should be harmoniously combined in a liberal arts curriculum (e.g., foreign language should not be taught; it is much more readily acquired by living in a country). During the rest of the nineteenth century, the growth of planned experiential learning
continued. In 1876, The Johns Hopkins University medical school began its emphasis on practical applications of knowledge. Eventually, most professions required practicum or simulated exercises such as practice teaching, field work and moot court. Formal classroom learning and experiential learning are finding themselves partially consolidated in today's educational system. For example, courses are often designed to include classroom lecture and applied laboratory work. In addition, current efforts are being focused toward awarding academic credit for experience. "Results from the General Education Test showed that about 70 percent of those who took it could earn a high school diploma or its equivalent, though they had, on the average, only ten years of schooling, and that those who entered college by passing the test did about as well as those who secured diplomas in the usual way" (Houle, 1976:32).

Work experience differs from other training activities in that it is limited to work, i.e., it includes no formal learning program. Whatever learning occurs takes place in the context of task performance and the incidental instructions given by other workers who know the task. Hence, the primary learning mode is experiential rather than the more symbolic information assimilation of classroom learning. There is a general belief that experiential learning is better for disadvantaged individuals and that information assimilation is better for those who are educationally
advantaged (Coleman, 1977).

In addition to experiential learning being better suited for disadvantaged populations, it may provide a motivational inducement not found in other types of learning.

Teaching specific topics or skills without making clear their context in the broader fundamental structure of a field of knowledge is uneconomical in several deep senses. In the first place, such teaching makes it exceedingly difficult for the student to generalize from what he has learned to what he will encounter later. In the second place, learning that has fallen short of a grasp of general principles has little reward in terms of intellectual excitement. The best way to create interest in a subject is to render it worth knowing, which means to make the knowledge gained usable in one's thinking beyond the situation in which the learning has occurred. Third, knowledge one has acquired without sufficient structure to tie it together is knowledge that is likely to be forgotten (Bruner et al.:31-32).

In the traditional classroom mode the connection between information and action does not usually come until sometime after the learning is terminated. This is why motivation frequently must be extrinsically supplied (e.g., by grades, instruction behavior).

In summary, work experience as experiential learning may provide: (a) the opportunity to learn general employment skills; (b) a better mode of learning for the disadvantaged; (c) a clear link between knowledge and action, and (d) its own intrinsic rewards. In addition, work experience used in conjunction with some other training activity may produce results which are more generalizable than on the job training which is typically restricted to
the specific skill requirements of the participant's current position. Thus, two additional hypotheses are offered:

4) If prime sponsors perceive work experience as a viable activity, then the transferability of participants in employment and training activities will be higher.

5) If prime sponsors have positive perceptions about experiential learning, then the transferability of participants in employment and training activities will be higher.

In order to test these hypotheses the dependent variable, transferability, will be measured by the degree to which adult Title I participants are transferred from one Title I activity to another Title I activity, transferred from one Title I activity to Title II or VI, and enrolled in two Title I activities simultaneously.

An ACIR study (1977) reported that the Employment and Training Administration found that about two-thirds of the sample sponsors continue to use multiple deliverers in the transition period for institutional training, job development, and placement, and other services. Even though a certain amount of multiplicity was necessary to meet diverse participant problems, or geographically dispersed needs, the fairly widespread nature of this condition revealed a lag in the undertaking of coordination efforts. Mirengoff and Rindler (1976:117) similarly found that "for the most
part, existing programs in cities, counties, consortia, and balance of state areas continued under CETA with the same program operators." However, despite subcontracts to former program agents which retained much of the old categorical flavor at each site, Levitan and Zickler (1974) conclude that these trial experiments generally confirmed the ability of local officials to consolidate program operations and implement comprehensive programs, frequently at administrative savings. Therefore, an additional hypothesis is raised:

6) If subgrantees are selected in order to provide the most effective employment and training services, then the effectiveness of employment and training activities will be higher.

Definition of Terms

CETA was designed to provide employment and training activities to the unemployed, underemployed and economically disadvantaged in order that they may become economically self-sufficient. Title I establishes block grant assistance to state and local governments for employment and training activities. Cities and counties of 100,000 population or more or combinations of governments (consortia) in which one member meets the population requirements are eligible to be a prime sponsor. In order to receive funds, prime sponsors must prepare a comprehensive employment and training plan. Prime sponsors have the option to determine the mix of employment and training activities that will be
funded in their political jurisdiction that will meet the needs of the unemployed, underemployed and economically disadvantaged.

**Delivery System.** Given the latitude awarded prime sponsors, the employment and training plan designed by each prime sponsor to provide employment and training activities and services (delivery system) varies from one prime sponsor to another. The types of delivery systems have been categorized by Mirengoff and Rindler (1976, 1978) as (a) independent--uses existing activities with minor modifications rather than merging them into an overall delivery system, (b) mixed--some activities and services are consolidated while others operate independently, and (c) comprehensive--activities and services are combined in one or more manpower center(s) but operations may be subcontracted to other institutions. Ripley (1978) also identified three levels of programmatic integration: high, some, none. The categorization of the delivery system used in this study (Mirengoff and Rindler, 1976, 1978) may be viewed on a continuum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Comprehensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Activities and Services.** Employment and training activities are those under which funds may be expended according to the CETA legislation. They include on-the-job training, classroom training, public service employment,
and work experience. Employment and training services are those supportive services allowable under CETA to assist participants to overcome barriers to training and/or employment. These include, but are not limited to, counseling, job development, job coaching, legal assistance, child care, and transportation allowances.

**Work Experience.** Work experience is an allowable employment and training activity. The term "work experience" has been used and abused throughout the history of U.S. employment and training programs. Traditionally, many perceive work experience as an income maintenance activity (Perry et al., 1976). However, under CETA, the purpose of work experience is to provide short-term or part-time experience to enhance the employability of adults who have not been working in the competitive labor force.

**Effectiveness of Employment and Training Activities.** The National Council on Employment Policy (1978:267) has noted that it is difficult to determine if CETA programs have been effective.

Decentralization and decategorization under CETA may have increased diversity as state and local sponsors were encouraged to develop programs and priorities best suited to their individual needs. Aggregate assessment is, therefore, problematic. Job creation cannot be judged by the same standards as placement; services for the most disadvantaged are not directly comparable to those for more advantaged workers displaced by the recession; programs operated by community groups may have different inputs and effects from those run by state and local bureaucracies; efforts in high unemployment areas face greater obstacles than
those in tight labor markets. To complicate matters further, there are a number of unresolved conceptual issues in measuring program impacts, as well as practical constraints on the precision of evaluations. Judgments rest ultimately on normative standards of success or failure.

J. D. Thompson (1967:97) has offered two propositions that assist in a definition of effective employment and training activities: "Organizations are multidimensional, and when they cannot show improvement on all dimensions, they seek to show improvement on those of interest to important elements of the task environment." Given the relatively high unemployment rate in the United States, and the difficulty of measuring the effectiveness of employment and training programs as raised by the National Council on Employment Policy, the task environment (e.g., Department of Labor, Congress, the citizenry) has focused on job placement as a major indicator of the success/failure of employment and training programs. Therefore, the effectiveness of employment and training programs shall be defined for the purpose of this study, in terms of the FY 1978 Title I placement rate.

Transferability of Adult Title I Participants. At this point, the reader must return to the idea of decentralized delivery of employment and training activities and services. While the primary goal of employment and training activities is placement, not every activity will directly lead to placement. For example, this is especially true when one
focuses on the work experience activity where other measures of effective work experience are: (1) enrolling in another Title I activity concurrent with work experience or after work experience, (2) enrolling in a CETA activity under another Title (e.g., public service employment), (3) returning to school, and (4) enrollment in a manpower service (e.g., job placement). Each of the four measures mentioned above may lead to the placement goal of CETA. This interrelationship may be visualized in Figure 1.

Thus, for the purposes of this study, transferability will be measured by the number of participants that are transferred from one Title I activity to another Title I activity, transferred from one Title I activity to Title II or VI and enrolled in two Title I activities simultaneously.
Figure 1
Title I Delivery System

Note: A participant may move from one activity to placement, or from one activity to another, or from one activity to one service, or simultaneously enroll in two activities or one activity and one service. Whatever the pattern of services and activities provided, it is assumed that the more comprehensive the delivery system, the more flexibility in the delivery system, then the more individualized the activities and services provided, resulting in an increased placement rate.
Limitations of the Study

The following limitations of this study are acknowledged:

1) This is a study of prime sponsor delivery systems. Thus, the number of variables selected to determine prime sponsor effectiveness is limited since in order to collect information on other variables such as the frequency of participant transfers between Title I activities and services or between Titles requires direct review of participant files and/or interviews with both participants and prime sponsor staff members. In addition, the primary variables selected deal with programmatic aspects impacting upon program success and not the economic variables (e.g., unemployment rate).

2) The large number of possible variables which could have been included in this study was narrowed using previous research findings and the experience of the researcher. The subset of the variables included in the study should be recognized as a partial set of variables rather than an exhaustive list.

3) Data obtained from prime sponsors is often considered to be marginally accurate by employment and training professionals due to errors in reporting and double counting of participants. Although this data will be used in this study, this caveat should be kept in mind.
4) Balance of State prime sponsors were eliminated from the sampling population because of the difficulty of these prime sponsors to operate comprehensive delivery systems (e.g., geographic diversity, diversity of the target populations within the prime sponsorship). In addition, new prime sponsors and those prime sponsors who operate the programs under exceptional circumstances were eliminated from the sample.
CHAPTER II
RELATED RESEARCH

On December 28, 1973, President Nixon signed the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act into law, stating that it was one of the finest pieces of legislation that he had signed that year. "He went on to remark that this was the first legislation to incorporate the essential principles of Special Revenue Sharing and that this long-overdue shift in the intergovernmental responsibilities is now a reality in one key area of government domestic programs--manpower" (Kolberg, 1978:42). This chapter traces the development of employment and training policy in the United States from its origins to the passage of and amendments to CETA. To understand the significance of this policy development, legislative and executive actions will be traced through the development of intergovernmental relations policy.

Intergovernmental Relations. Intergovernmental relations has been defined as "an important body of activities or interactions occurring between governmental units of all types and levels within the U.S. federal system" (Anderson, 1960). This definition reflects several important ideas set forth about intergovernmental relations in Storm over the
States (Sanford, 1967):

1. The national government cannot effectively reach its goals without the power of the states.

2. The states cannot serve all their people without the power of the national government.

3. The city cannot overcome its problems without the power of the state.

4. The national and state governments cannot do their duty by city residents without the powers of the city government.

Less than two years after Storm over the States was published, President Nixon addressed the nation outlining four major planks in his "New Federalism" program. His August 8, 1969 speech emphasized a basic tenet underlying intergovernmental relations: "We can no longer have effective government at any level unless we have it at all levels. There is too much to be done for the cities to do it alone or for Washington to do it alone, or for the States to do it alone."

The Origins of Intergovernmental Relations. The origins of modern intergovernmental relations are found in the 1930s with the advent of the New Deal efforts to combat the Depression. It was concerned with the delivery of public services to clients--a focus that continues today (e.g., federal aid to education, urban development, employment and training programs).
The fifties marked the emergence of the term intergovernmental relations in statutory language. Specifically, in 1953, the Congress created the temporary Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (P.L. 83-129) which conducted the first official broad-ranging view of national-state-local relationships since the adoption of the Constitution. A second commission created in 1959 (Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations) was smaller, but produced a series of research recommendations and studies on intergovernmental relations.

During the sixties and seventies, the formal use of the concept intergovernmental relations was widespread and growing. The Intergovernmental Cooperation Act was passed in 1968 and required regional and state review of most federal grant applications initiated by any local government. The Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 provided federal funds for professional training of state and local officials and both allowed and encouraged the temporary transfer of career officials between the federal government and state and local governments.

By 1970 nearly all states had established an executive agency or official to deal exclusively with intergovernmental relations. While most of these tended to emphasize state-federal relationships, several states created separate community affairs departments to handle state-local relationships.
Features of Intergovernmental Relations. These are five features which both describe intergovernmental relations and suggest the increased complexity and interdependency in the U.S. political system. They have been identified by Wright (1978) as:

1. Although intergovernmental relations occur within the federal system, they encompass more than the term federalism usually connotes. Whereas federalism emphasizes national-state relations with occasional attention in interstate relations, intergovernmental relations recognizes all combinations of relationships among units of government.

2. Strictly speaking, there are no intergovernmental relations, only relations among officials who govern different units of government. The individual actions and attitudes of public officials are at the core of intergovernmental relations.

3. Relations among officials are not one time nor occasional occurrences, nor formerly ratified in agreements nor rigidly fixed in statutes nor court decisions. It includes the day to day contact and exchange of views.

4. All public officials participate in intergovernmental relations. As a result, the concerns and interests of intergovernmental relations practitioners and researchers more closely coincide in
the area of administration than in the legislative, executive or judicial areas.

5. Policy is generated by the interactions among all public officials. In recent years, economic and political complexity combined with rapid social and technological changes has reduced the capacity of the courts and the legislature to deal with continuous pressures for policy changes, therefore putting greater pressure on and allowing more discretion to administrators in formulating and implementing public policy. Policy, then, pervades all intergovernmental relations actions.

An Intergovernmental Relations Model. Several models of intergovernmental relations have been reviewed (Wright, 1978). For example, in the separated-authority model, the national government and state governments are separated implying that the types of governments are independent and autonomous. The local governments are included within and dependent on the state governments. The inclusive-authority model views the three levels of government as the national government overarching the state governments, and the state governments in turn overarching the local governments. Hierarchy dominates and state and local governments are viewed as appendages of a powerful national government in control of a centralized system.
A third model, the over-lapping authority model, can perhaps best help us to understand the development of employment and training policy. This model "describes intergovernmental relations as patterned, interdependent and bargained behavior among national, state and local officials. Contacts and exchanges between officials may be cooperative or competitive; the determining factors may include: the policy issue or problem, the status (elected or appointed) of the officials, the partisan leanings of participants and the constituency (city, state and national) being represented" (Wright, 1978:30). This model may be visualized in Figure 2.
Phases of Intergovernmental Relations. Wright has divided the development of intergovernmental relations into five phases:

- **Conflict**: 19th century to 1930s
- **Cooperative**: 1930s to 1950s
- **Concentrated**: 1940s to 1960s
- **Creative**: 1950s to 1960s
- **Competitive**: 1960s to 1970s

Each of these phases are summarized in the following paragraphs.

**Conflict.** The conflict stage centered on identifying the proper "sphere of governmental power and jurisdictions and defining the boundaries of officials' actions" (Wright, 1978:40). The sorting out of roles and boundaries between governmental units highlights this period. For example, Marshall's decision in McCulloch vs. Madison while asserting national supremacy opened a series of battles between national and state-local taxing authorities over who had the power to tax what activities in other jurisdictions.

**Cooperative.** During this period, the prime issues of national concern were economic problems and international threats. These threats led to an increased need for collaboration. Policy innovations during this period included tax credits and a dozen conditional grants-in-aid programs enacted during the Depression. The war years provided a rise in emergency funding arrangements. In summary, the
intergovernmental relations collaboration that prevailed during this period was primarily financial.

Concentrated. The Truman-Eisenhower-Kennedy years changed intergovernmental relations into specific, functional areas. During this period, twenty-one (21) major grants-in-aid programs were established, nearly doubling the total number of programs initiated during the Depression. Underlying this period was the emergence of professionals in each of the grants-in-aid fields (e.g., urban renewal). Public administration writers at the time, such as Frederick Mosher (1968), heralded this period as the triumph of the "professional state" in the public service.

Creative. The creative period was built upon the cooperative and concentrated periods. This period may be identified by (1) program planning that emphasized local, areawide or statewide plans and Program Planning Budgeting Systems (PPBS), (2) over four hundred (400) project grants, and (3) public participation such as the provision incorporated into the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

This period has been termed the "project-categorical grant explosion" (Wright, 1978:55). According to Wright (1978) the period can be identified by:

1. Proliferation of grants;
2. Expanded use of project grants;
3. Increased variety of matching ratios;
4. Introduction of special incentive grants;
5. Use of multifunctional or multiple-program grants;
6. Diversification of eligible requirements;
7. Increased grants to urban areas;
8. Inflexible administrative and fiscal requirements;
9. Extensive mandating of planning requirements;
10. Variability in federal regional administration.

Competitive. The proliferation of grants, the clash between professional and participation-minded clients, and the gap between promise and performance led intergovernmental relations to enter a new phase. Pressure grew to alter and reverse previous grant trends. It was proposed that grants be consolidated under the auspices of special revenue sharing. With the strong support of mayors and governors, general revenue sharing was passed by the Congress. The same president in 1973 sought to stem the flow of grant funds by massive impoundment.

Employment and Training Policy as an Illustration of Intergovernmental Relations. The federal government's initial intervention into employment and training policy occurred around sixty years ago, with the federal-state vocational education program. The involvement was expanded by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration (1920), the U.S. Employment Service (1933), the GI Bill (1944), the Employment Act of 1946, and the National Defense Education Act of 1958. The New Frontier and Great Society periods produced a series of categorical programs aimed more directly at employment
and training opportunities for the unemployed. CETA con-
tinues this thrust. Different levels of government have
been involved with employment and training activities over
time, with shifts in influence and responsibility. Tracing
the development of employment and training policy through
Wright's five phases of intergovernmental relations (i.e.,
conflict, cooperative, concentrated, creative, and compet-
itve) illustrates the changes in intergovernmental rela-
tions in the U.S. These changes are summarized in Figure 3.

Conflict. The Depression of the 1930s provides a change
in the history of U.S. economic policies. "The dual threads
of concern for manpower as an economic resource and concern
for the welfare of workers have always been present--the
former paramount in slavery, immigration, the Morrill Act,
and the Smith-Hughes Act, the latter predominating in aboli-
tion of slavery and child labor and in wage and hour legis-
lation" (Levitan and Siegal, 1966:32). Though both con-
cerns historically have coexisted, the dominance of the
social welfare orientation in employment and training pol-
icies is a development of recent decades.

Cooperative. The development of employment and train-
ing policy during this period was greatly affected by the
Depression. As Clague and Kramer (1976) note, during this
period there was no unemployment insurance system in opera-
tion. The early burden of dealing with unemployment fell
to private families, private welfare agencies, and emergency
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IGR Phase</th>
<th>Period of History</th>
<th>Employment and Training Policy Developments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>1930s and before</td>
<td>Morrill Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smith-Hughes Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>1930s to 1950s</td>
<td>Civilian Conservation Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Emergency Relief Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Works Project Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Act of 1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentrated</td>
<td>1940s to 1960s</td>
<td>Area Redevelopment Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manpower Development Training Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>1950s to 1960s</td>
<td>Economic Opportunity Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Job Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Neighborhood Youth Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Operation Mainstream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Adult Basic Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Work Experience Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- New Careers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Concentrated Employment Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>1960s to 1970s</td>
<td>Cooperative Area Manpower Planning Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive Manpower Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CETA (as amended)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Employment and Training Policy Development by IGR Phase
relief organizations which were created to meet local needs. But the problem was too great to be met by private giving and local governments were overwhelmed by the increasing number of people on the relief rolls. By 1932, the burden of public assistance was being shifted to the state governments, many of whom found the responsibility to be too much to handle. Thus, the federal government was forced to take action to alleviate unemployment. The first federally sponsored work relief and training program, the Civilian Conservation Corps (1933), established over 1500 camps and enrolled unmarried men 18-25 years old to work on federal conservation and construction projects. Two months later, Congress authorized the Federal Emergency Relief Administration which began to funnel federal financial aid to state and local governments. In 1935, the Works Projects Administration was created as a "make work" program. "The decision to create the Works Projects Administration was of far-reaching importance, not only for solving the immediate and urgent unemployment problems of the economy, but also for utilizing manpower in the future. As of that moment in time the federal government assumed nationwide responsibility for the alleviation of unemployment, it began to foster job creation, training for jobs, economic stability and all the other requirements for what later came to be termed 'full employment'" (Clague and Kramer, 1975:4).
The termination of World War II in August 1945 raised concern about the possibility of a massive unemployment problem. In response to this, the Employment Act of 1946 was passed. As Levitan and Siegal (1966) note the Employment Act recognized the new political reality that the level of employment was subject to and the responsibility of public policy. It affirmed the national goals of an "economic climate that would provide job opportunities to all persons able, willing and seeking work" (Levitan, Mangum, and Marshall, 1976:37). However, the anticipated high level of unemployment did not develop in the immediate postwar period largely because labor demand was sustained at high levels by a backlog of consumer spending. And, the Korean War brought labor scarcity and a reduction to three percent unemployment by 1952.

Concentrated. Following the Korean War, unemployment rose. The Gross National Product, which grew at an average of 4.9 percent between 1947 and 1953, grew only 2.4 percent per year during 1953-1960 (Levitan and Siegal, 1966). Senator Paul Douglas had been sponsoring a bill on area redevelopment since 1955, but "the Eisenhower Administration had consistently opposed any attempts by the federal government to stimulate economic growth in depressed areas for the purpose of increasing employment opportunities" (Clague and Kramer, 1975:11). With the election of 1960, the concept received strong support from the Kennedy Administration and
the Congress. In 1961, the Area Redevelopment Act was passed. It was designed to stimulate economic growth in areas that were experiencing high unemployment. The program offered four incentives to companies and communities that were interested in redevelopment activities: (1) provision of loans to companies that relocated or expanded industrial facilities in economically depressed areas, (2) provision of financial aid to local jurisdictions to make public improvements needed for the establishment of manufacturing and commercial firms in economically depressed areas, (3) provision of technical assistance to firms in the development of new products, new markets and new resources, and (4) assurance that a qualified, skilled labor force was available to those businesses in economically depressed areas. The program is generally considered to have had very limited success. For example, from the human resource perspective, the most enterprising workers generally included most of the younger ones who had left the economically depressed areas. Thus, incoming business firms generally considered the potential work force to be unskilled or older workers not likely to be retrainable.

During his second year in office, the Kennedy Administration presented a more comprehensive employment and training program to Congress. This legislation, the Manpower Development and Training Act (1962), and its amendments contained two foci: to retrain skilled workers who
had been displaced by automation and to provide education and training opportunities for the unskilled unemployed. Thus, the thrust of the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) was on training the labor force.

This period marked the beginning of tackling the country's human resources problems by authorizing and implementing categorical employment and training programs. However, while unemployment averaged about 4 million annually from 1961 to 1964, a little more than 100,000 persons participated in employment and training programs yearly.

Creative. The creative period can be identified by the predominance of categorical employment and training programs. In the mid-sixties the civil rights movement mushroomed, the welfare rolls expanded and the unemployed became more vocal. The employment and training programs enacted up to 1964 assisted the most qualified unemployed while failing to address the critical problems of the hard-core unemployed. The War on Poverty legislation addressed upgrading the labor force and providing an escape from poverty. First, MDTA was amended between 1963 and 1966 to expand its scope. As amended, MDTA was divided between training for labor shortage occupations and training to meet the needs of the economically disadvantaged. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 was designed to provide programs that would help the employability of the economically disadvantaged. The early programs under the EOA included:
--- Job Corps, a residential program offering disadvantaged youth (16-21 years) basic education, vocational training, counseling and work experience.

--- Neighborhood Youth Corps, a work training program for youth (16-21 years) to increase the employability of the youth and to reduce school dropout rates. It consisted of three components: in-school program (offering part time work to students in an effort to make it financially easier for them to stay in school), out of school program (work experience, remedial education, and supportive services to youth who dropped out in an effort to increase their employability) and summer program (full time work experience during the summer months).

--- Operation Mainstream, a work experience program for persons over 55 years of age.

--- Adult Basic Education, a program to remedy educational deficiencies in people who had minimal schooling and needed basic education to compete for better paying jobs.

--- Work Experience Program, an employment and training program for recipients of funds under Aid to Families and Dependent Children.
Amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act in 1966 and 1967 increased the number of programs and target populations to be served. These additional programs included:

--- New Careers, a program to prepare disadvantaged adults for paraprofessional jobs in critically undermanned public and private non-profit agencies.

--- Concentrated Employment Program, the first step in systematically delivering employment and training services to the disadvantaged by concentrating employment and training efforts in census tracts with the highest unemployment rates.

The Nixon Administration made few changes in employment and training policy during its first term. However, "beginning early in 1973, wholesale rejection of the Great Society programs and the elimination of its residue seemed suddenly to become administration policy" (Levitan et al., 1976:260). These efforts led to the next phase of employment and training policy development.

Competitive. The Concentrated Employment Program was the first attempt at the elimination of duplicative employment and training services through comprehensive service delivery. "Although many Concentrated Employment Programs have gained valuable experience in organizing comprehensive services by gathering a variety of manpower contracts, the important lesson of the Concentrated Employment Program experience was that mandating coordination among manpower program
agents will not assure comprehensive planning and programming at the local level. It took specific legislative authority to consolidate the Manpower Development and Training Act and Economic Opportunity Act programs, and it is not clear that the new legislative mandate will achieve more integrated and comprehensive manpower programs than the Concentrated Employment Program or that it will even mean more efficient management" (Levitan et al., 1976:262).

An almost simultaneous development with the Concentrated Employment Program was the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System in 1967. The foundation of the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System was area, state and regional coordinating committees. Cooperative Area Manpower Planning Systems brought together for the first time on an organized basis, the various local, state and federal agencies involved in employment and training activities. The program gave many persons on the state and local level experience in employment and training planning that turned out to be a great asset as the employment and training programs became decentralized in the seventies. Although Cooperative Area Manpower Planning Systems were beset with problems, it did lay the foundation for the concept of local administration of employment and training programs. By 1973, every state, 126 cities, 4 counties, 1 council of government and 19 Indian tribes had Department of Labor grants to support Cooperative Area Manpower Planning Systems planning staffs. With the
Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System and the end of the sixties came a thrust toward decentralized, decategorized employment and training programs. In 1973, the Comprehensive Manpower Program was initiated as a pilot project in nine locations. It was the final step of the Nixon Administration toward decentralization within the constraints of the categorical legislation funded during this period.

In FY 1974, the next step toward decentralization was taken with the passage of CETA. Under CETA, eligible state and local governments (referred to as prime sponsors) were granted the authority to determine employment and training policy, to develop programs, and to operate programs. CETA represented a beginning effort to place the basic planning and evaluation of domestic programs in state and local governments with the federal government retaining responsibility for overall policy and evaluation (Kolberg, 1978; Levitan et al., 1976). During FY 1975, 403 prime sponsors were authorized to serve as CETA prime sponsors. During FY 1979, 460 prime sponsors will plan and operate CETA programs.

CETA was designed to meet two goals: decentralize and decategorize employment and training programs (Kolberg, 1978; Mirengoff and Rindler, 1976). According to a recent study (Mirengoff and Rindler, 1978), decentralization has been achieved. "For the first time, manpower programs in each community are built into the local government structures under the authority of elected officials. But the shift from
federal to local control occurred without abdication of federal oversight responsibilities and the degree of federal presence continues to be a controversial issue" (Mirengoff and Rindler, 1978:3). The second goal, decategorization, aimed at discontinuing the categorical employment and training programs operating before CETA to give prime sponsors flexibility in putting together an employment and training services mix that meets their local needs. "However, in response to new developments (e.g., rising unemployment) Congress added new categories of service (e.g., Title VI). Categorical programs which amounted to more than one-half of all CETA resources in 1975, accounted for three-fourths of appropriations in 1978. Indeed, all of the program titles in CETA, except Title I authorize categorical programs" (Mirengoff and Rindler, 1978:5). If Congress continues this trend by responding to the needs of specific groups, the flexibility of employment and training programs will diminish, resulting in a shift back toward the pre-CETA period by increasing the federal presence and reducing state and local discretion. As a result of this trend, CETA has become "a hybrid program, not entirely decentralized, not completely decategorized" (Mirengoff and Rindler, 1978:5).

Summary. By using Wright's intergovernmental relations model, the development of employment and training policy has been traced through five states of intergovernmental relations development. The role of the federal government in
this area took on increasing importance during the Depression era programs of the thirties and continued to expand, culminating in the seventeen categorical programs authorized in the sixties. CETA represented a first attempt at implementing special revenue-sharing by shifting planning and operation responsibilities to state and local officials. However, since the passage of CETA in 1973, we have seen the responsibilities and authority of state and local officials eroded by the passage of categorical type programs like Title VI and Title III. The categorical thrust was sparked by the recession and the decision to launch large programs aimed at the generally high unemployment rate. The enactment of the youth programs (specifically to attack the high youth unemployment rate) in 1977 further categorized employment programs. Thus, Title I, the only decategorized Title, accounted for 42 percent of the CETA appropriations in 1975 and 23 percent in 1977.

Related Research on Employment and Training Programs

The review of the related research for this study is subdivided into two major sections. First, relevant research on pre-CETA studies will be summarized as a body of knowledge. Next, CETA research studies will be discussed individually and as a body of knowledge.
Pre-CETA Studies

In 1976, the Wharton School (Perry et al., 1976) published a review of over 200 pre-CETA studies, most of which are unpublished government reports or private foundation reports. The majority of these studies focused upon economic outcomes of the programs. And in most cases, only a single outcome was studied. Thus, the issue of comprehensive service delivery was not the major focus of employment and training literature in the late sixties. The general findings of the major studies of six pre-CETA programs illustrate this point.

Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA). MDTA was designed first to provide training for the technologically displaced and later amended to provide training for the disadvantaged. The research suggests that the program had a positive impact upon the economic status of post-program participants (e.g., post-program employment, wage rates, and earning levels for participants compared favorably to non-participants with similar pre-program backgrounds and experiences). The basic contribution to MDTA was found to be the provision of specific skills, personal confidence and institutional contacts required to facilitate entry or re-entry into the labor market rather than to serve as a vehicle for upward mobility within that market or as a force for change in the institutional structure of the market (Perry et al., 1976).
New Careers. The New Careers program was created by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to prepare disadvantaged adults and out of school youth for careers in public service areas such as health, education, welfare, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety. It had been particularly successful in terms of its impact on the attitudes of its participants. The program generally raised participants' hopes and ambitions. However, it fell short on several of its goals. The small scale of the programs resulted in a limited impact on the services rendered by municipal governments and the unemployment situations. In addition, the title "New Careers" was a misnomer since the program was incapable of delivering on its promise. This occurred because the average educational achievement of New Careers participants was considerably above that of other employment and training programs. To the New Careers participant, a new career means a position with career potential. But institutional barriers (e.g., civil service and licensing requirements) were difficult to break down (Perry et al., 1976).

Public Employment Program (PEP). PEP, under the Emergency Economic Act of 1971, was designed to "address the problems of unemployment and the inadequacy of vital public services curtailed by inadequate local and state revenues" (Perry, 1976:252). Thus, PEP provided job opportunities for specific target groups (e.g., veterans, older workers) by providing funds for unmet public service needs. Research
findings reveal the program's efforts toward training and supportive services were small when compared with other employment and training programs, given the monetary restrictions of the Emergency Economic Act and the extensive "creaming" of participants (Perry et al., 1976).

**Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC).** NYC was established under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to provide part-time work experience, remedial education and limited training for disadvantaged youth who were dropouts or potential dropouts. In general, there were few attempts to assess the impact of the program. However, NYC seemed to function as a combination income maintenance and maturation service to help youths stay out of trouble (Perry et al., 1976).

**Operation Mainstream.** The Economic Opportunity Act was amended to establish Operation Mainstream, a program designed to meet the special needs of rural communities and workers 55 years of age and older. However, it did not provide the older participants with the skills necessary to compete in the open labor market. Thus, it served the purpose of income maintenance and increasing the self-image of older workers (Perry et al., 1976).

Although the research described above does not lay the groundwork for comprehensive service delivery, three pre-CETA programs were designed with this concept in mind: The Concentrated Employment Program, the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System and the Comprehensive Manpower Program.
Concentrated Employment Program (CEP). CEP was created in 1967 to provide for a coordinated employment and training delivery system in areas of high unemployment, underemployment and poverty. This program may be considered as one of the forerunners of CETA since the theory behind CEP was that a single coordinating organization in a local target area could orchestrate the services provided by various local employment and training and social service agencies in an effort to improve the labor market experience of disadvantaged workers. However, Perry et al., (1976:339), found that "six of eight evaluation reports (received) challenged this rationale for CEP and offered documented evidence of the interorganizational conflict and lack of cooperation which adversely affected CEP's potential for achieving its objectives." One of the major factors contributing to the conflict arose from a lack of clear understanding of CEP's mission by many subcontracting organizations. This was compounded by the fact that there were no clear guidelines for organizational linkages when the program was implemented. Thus, for example, in some areas the employment service which had traditionally served non-disadvantaged workers came into conflict with the community action agencies which were advocates of the poor. There is also little evidence to support a judgment regarding the economic impact of CEP since few studies devoted attention to this question and among those which did, small samples were used (Perry et al., 1976).
Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System (CAMPS) and Comprehensive Manpower Program (CMP). In 1973, two administrative initiatives helped lay the groundwork for decentralized employment and training programs. The CAMPS effort attempted to provide for more comprehensive employment and training planning by providing for independent CAMPS staffs and more direct involvement by governors and mayors in the employment and training planning process. The second experiment was the CMP in nine pilot areas. Each of the nine projects was intended to be a unified employment and training delivery system serving a state or local labor market with a local government or consortium acting as a single prime sponsor for all employment and training activities. There is little research available to assess the effectiveness of these two efforts. As the National Commission for Manpower Policy has stated, "there is not sufficient evidence to judge the efficacy of these latter two administrative initiatives as the CETA legislative reform soon overtook them" (National Commission for Manpower Policy, 1975:14).

Thus, the pre-CETA period was filled with a variety of overlapping programs that were administered through categorical grants. Given this situation and the movement of the Nixon Administration toward revenue-sharing, employment and training efforts moved toward decentralized, decategorized service delivery. However, the success of the experimental efforts (i.e., CAMPS, CMP) were difficult to determine given
the short period of time in which they operated and the difficulty of massaging the categorical programs funded into a comprehensive delivery system. However, the programs did lay the groundwork for CETA, by focusing attention on comprehensive planning and comprehensive service delivery, and by introducing new concepts and ideas that could be implemented under comprehensive delivery systems (e.g., employability development plans for individualized service delivery).

**CETA Studies**

The CETA literature is relatively limited. As opposed to the pre-CETA literature which focused upon outcomes, the CETA literature is primarily descriptive. CETA research may be grouped by the following basic categories:

- transition from categorical programs to CETA
- case studies
- implementation studies
- employment and training policy and issues papers

**Transition from Categorical Programs to CETA**

1) The CETA—Impact on People, Places and Programs, (Mirengoff and Rindler, 1976) attempted to assess the premises of decategorized and decentralized delivery systems and the social, economic and political effects of CETA by gathering data from 28 prime sponsors. The findings focused upon six substantive concerns in Title I: distribution of resources, planning process, administrative process, arrangements for delivery program services to participants, mix of employment
and training programs operating, and types of participants served. Because of time and staff constraints the report found that first-year Title I planning efforts were relatively superficial. However, it was clear that employment and training planning and decision-making had become more complex. For the most part, existing programs continued with the same service deliverers as under the categorical programs. But two trends were noted. First, there was a move toward operation of some program components directly by prime sponsors. Second, the role of the employment service and the community action agencies as service deliverers was being redirected. Significantly, a number of areas were trying to bring about a better coordination of the local employment and training delivery systems.

2) The CETA: Early Reading from a Hybrid Block Grant (ACIR, 1977). This report is an attempt to assess CETA's record by describing some of the major changes that have occurred in decision-making regarding the nature, scope and direction of employment and training services; and the issues and problems associated with CETA.

Specifically, the report states that "even with the removal of some categories, the programs that they had launched continued by prime sponsors. Although CETA did achieve some improvements in the links between employment and training agencies and streamlined the delivery system, in a sense, functional fragmentation was replaced by jurisdictional
fragmentation. In short, the effects of consolidation of programs and service delivery systems were blunted by the establishment of new categories and new agencies" (ACIR, 1977:50).

3) Transition to CETA in Eight Prime Sponsors (Miringoff, 1976). The case studies in this document describe the early experiences of eight prime sponsors in implementing CETA. The studies focus on Title I and examine the changes that occurred in the planning, administration, and operation of local employment and training programs and the effects of decentralization on inter-organizational relationships and program participants.

Case Studies. Several case studies of single prime sponsors have been produced since CETA was implemented. Two representative studies are identified below:

1) CETA: Its First Year in Lowell, Massachusetts (Dickinson, 1975). This paper summarizes the implementation of CETA during its initial year in Lowell, Mass. Changes in the program, target groups and service deliverers from 1974 to 1976 were found to be incremental.

2) CETA Implementation in Michigan (Kobrak, 1975). Although this paper looked at several Michigan prime sponsors, the case study methodology used places the study in this category. The study found that caution and conservatism has been the primary approach to employment and training programming because elected officials desire to avoid political
embarrassment. However, it was found that local officials have become more knowledgeable and involved in employment and training policy, and the staffs assumed leadership in employment and training decision-making. Council participation varied from active to a rubber-stamp role.

3) **Employment and Training Programs: The Local View** (Mirengoff, 1978). This study focused on the first two years of CETA in nine prime sponsorships. Overall, the study reveals that employment and training programs have become an established part of local governments and local programs are becoming more coordinated. However, the case studies do reflect problems found throughout the CETA literature, such as promised planning and the tendency of local governments to rely too heavily on CETA for maintaining public service responsibilities.

**Implementation Studies**

1) **The Implementation of CETA in Ohio** (Ripley, 1977). This study identified changes in service deliverers due to community action agencies and the CEP agencies losing funds, primarily as a result of changing target group emphasis. The biggest change was the increased assumption of service delivery by the prime sponsors themselves increased their assumption of service delivery. Local planning councils also varied from active to low involvement. It should also be noted that more than half of the prime sponsors sampled appeared to be operating or working toward a more
comprehensive delivery system.

2) CETA Prime Sponsor Management Decision and Program Goal Achievement (Ripley, 1978). This report attempts to assess the relation of different management decisions to goal achievement and the conditions under which specific management decisions seem most likely to maximize goal achievement. To obtain the data, fifteen prime sponsors throughout the U.S. were selected which were perceived to be illustrative of areas in which prime sponsor decisions have been linked to the attainment of programmatic goals. One of the broadest findings of the study was that at the local level, CETA is not a highly constrained system. It found that local decision-makers have a great deal of latitude in determining who gets served and how well the program performs.

3) CETA in Eastern Massachusetts (Barocci and Myers, 1977). This study is based upon field research concentrating on four prime sponsors. The study reported that administrative difficulties have occurred in most of the prime sponsors during the period studied, the involvement of elected officials tended to be stronger in the smaller cities in planning and implementing the Title I programs, coordination of other employment and training programs with those funded under CETA has yet to come to fruition, and the local planning councils varied considerably in their usefulness.

4) "Implementing CETA: The Federal Role" (Van Horn, 1978). This study focuses upon the federal government's role
in implementing the first two years of CETA. The article reports that the "Policy of decentralizing authority to the local level still has the potential for being the best approach to manpower program delivery and to the delivery of many social programs. The success of certain manpower programs I have observed could usually be attributed to the superior competence of local government personnel. Poor program performance stemmed from incompetence combined with attitudinal, organizational, economic, and political restraints at all levels in the federal system. The costs incurred by decentralizing social programs to local elected officials seem on balance to be tolerable, but local advocates of this approach must counter the tendency of such programs to serve the more advantaged members of their communities" (p. 181). This latter situation is commonly known as "creaming."

5) CETA: Manpower Programs under Local Control (Mirengoff and Rindler, 1978). This report is a second phase of the study that produced Comprehensive Employment and Training Act: Impact on People, Places and Programs (Mirengoff and Rindler, 1976). It examines the difference between Title I programs with their predecessors and analyzes the legislative goals versus program results by focusing on: resource availability and allocation, planning, administrative, service mix, delivery of service, public service employment, participants served and program effectiveness.
Policy and Issues. The National Commission for Manpower Policy has produced 29 reports and three books since 1975 focusing on employment and training policy and issues. Two of these reports have particular implications for this study.

1) Manpower Program Coordination (1975). This report was based upon information obtained from survey questionnaires sent to all State Manpower Services Councils, interviews with eight state employment and training offices and 20 prime sponsors, and two field conferences. Using this three-tier approach of data collection, the report addresses the coordination issue, planning issues, and specific coordination issues at the local, state and federal levels. It reports that CETA coordination is limited. For example, it concluded that few prime sponsor planning councils had become fully functional and prime sponsor coordination with vocational education programs and Title II programs was limited.

2) Third Annual Report to the President and Congress of the National Commission for Manpower Policy: An Assessment of CETA (1978b). In its report, the Commission strongly supported the underlying principle of CETA (i.e., to provide prime sponsors with optimal flexibility to use federal funds in order to meet local employment and training needs). The Commission views the recent restrictions on this freedom (e.g., youth programs) as based upon an effort to meet priority needs. However, it recommends that "in the future, Congress avoid designating specially targeted programs for
specially designated client groups or purposes. The proliferation of specialized programs leads to administrative inefficiency, undue constraints on local flexibility, inter-title substitution (for example, a reduction in the number of youth being served under non-categorical titles), dilution of available resources, and the ultimate risk that very little will be accomplished beyond the initial satisfaction of the best organized constituencies" (National Commission for Manpower Policy, 1978b:6). The Commission also addresses the issues of specifying additional service deliverers in the CETA legislation by recommending that "in the future, Congress should also avoid designating additional prescriptive providers of services" (National Commission for Manpower Policy, 1978b:7).

3) Developing Manpower Legislation: A Personal Chronicle (Kolberg, 1978). This work is the personal account of the development of CETA and related programs from 1973 to 1977 by William Kolberg, former Assistant Secretary of Labor. It relates the legislative struggles that led to the passage of CETA and the roles played by different actors in the process.

Implications of the CETA Research

The research described above does not fit into a neat package of knowledge where latter studies build upon prior ones. However, they do (1) identify in a descriptive mode, the transition to CETA, and (2) chronicle the implementation
of CETA. Although the descriptions cover varied aspects of CETA planning and implementation, they do provide pertinent data (and in many cases, consistent findings) upon which this study attempts to build. As it pertains to this study, several variables affect the extent of comprehensiveness of a prime sponsor's delivery system. These variables include: efforts toward comprehensive service delivery to date, program mix, planning council involvement, staff involvement, service deliverers selected and actors' attitudes and preferences. The prior research findings for each of these variables is summarized below.

**Extent of Comprehensiveness in Prime Sponsor Delivery Systems.** The concept of comprehensive service delivery (the degree to which CETA participants are able to move between different Title I activities and services, receive a combination of activities and services and/or move between different prime sponsor programs) is questioned by very few because it is obviously more efficient for both participant and program administration if there is no duplication of services. Despite the consensus that comprehensiveness would be good, it has turned out to be an especially elusive goal, partially the result of vested interests of the organizations which have historically delivered certain services to specific populations and partially because there has been no strong push at the state and local levels to accomplish the goal.
The primary consensus in the employment and training literature reveals that comprehensive delivery of employment and training activities has not yet come to fruition (ACIR, 1977; Barocci and Myers, 1977; Mirengoff and Rindler, 1976, 1978; Ripley, 1977). Mirengoff and Rindler (1976:117) found that "significant progress is being made in integration manpower services at the local level. Most of the prime sponsors in the sample have taken steps toward more integrated programs . . . Comprehensive manpower delivery models are being installed in four prime sponsor areas and mixed exist in eleven. In the remaining thirteen cases, prime sponsors have chosen to maintain preexisting programs with only minor changes." However, in a more recent study (1978) they found that one-third of the prime sponsors have adopted a comprehensive delivery system for Title I programs, one-quarter have a mixed system and the remaining 40 percent have retained categorical delivery systems. Ripley (1978:26) found a similar distribution of comprehensiveness. "In the fifteen sites only one had a high degree of programmatic integration. Six more had at least some elements of integration. Eight had made virtually no attempt to achieve programmatic integration. However, in his early study of Ohio prime sponsors, Ripley reported that more than half the prime sponsors appeared to be operating or working toward a more comprehensive delivery system (Ripley, 1977). The ACIR study (1977) reports that about two-thirds of the prime
sponsors sampled by a Department of Labor study continued to use multiple deliverers in the transition period for institutional training, job development and placement and other services. "Even though a certain amount of multiplicity was necessary to meet diverse participant problems or geographically dispersed needs, the fairly widespread nature of this condition revealed a lag in the undertaking of coordination efforts. On the other hand, one-third of the prime sponsors reported taking steps to either reduce the number of deliverers or consolidate certain activities, such as recruitment, assessment, and counseling, into a single agency" (ACIR, 1977:34). Another indicator of problems in implementing comprehensive delivery systems is reflected in the transfer of participants from one Title to another. During the early months of implementation, less than half of the prime sponsors surveyed by the Department of Labor referred Title I participants to Title II or Title V programs. Moreover, only one-fourth of those sponsors made arrangements for the provision of Title I services to Title II participants (ACIR, 1977:34).

Program Mix. There is considerable evidence that prime sponsors generally have not made large changes in their Title I programs (Ripley, 1977, 1978). "When this reasoning (incremental decision-making) is applied to CETA it simply means that, if true, program mix in a prime sponsorship at any given time will largely be a function of prior
program mix" (Ripley, 1978:16). Thus, early prime sponsor delivery systems tended to fund the same programs as in the past, but with a greater emphasis on work experience (Mirengoff and Rindler, 1976, 1978). For the purposes of this study, it is difficult to build upon prior research about trends in program mix since work experience in these studies is generally perceived as a lowly employment and training activity, i.e., the importance and utility of experiential learning is not considered.

Planning Councils. Inherent in the rationale for a decentralized, decategorized employment and training system is the premise that local authorities are in the best position to understand the local employment and training needs and to plan and provide them. Section 104 of the CETA legislation requires that prime sponsors create a planning council with broad based representation (e.g., representatives of participants, labor unions, agriculture, education). In addition, prime sponsors are to provide their planning councils with professional, technical and clerical staff to aid in review and evaluation functions. The section concludes with the case that the prime sponsor will make final decisions. Thus, the planning councils serve advisory roles.

In the early days of CETA, planning councils were considered to have little influence in prime sponsor decision-making (ACIR, 1977; Mirengoff and Rindler, 1976; National Commission for Manpower Policy, 1975). Later studies note
the variation in planning council importance. Ripley (1977:6) stated that planning councils "range from positions of no importance in some prime sponsorships to the higher importance in a few. Overall, the councils seem to have most influence in the choice of significant segments." In their later study, Ripley (1978:75) found that planning council involvement was distributed as follows: active and influential councils (eleven cases), active but not influential councils (twelve cases), and neither active nor influential councils (nine cases). Mirengoff and Rindler (1978) later found that about one-third of the twenty-eight prime sponsors sampled brought their planning councils fully into FY 1976 planning. This trend toward planning council involvement is also reported in an ACIR study where twenty-three percent of the prime sponsor staff members and forty percent of the planning council members interviewed believe that their council had played a major role in their FY 1976 Title I planning. About two-fifths of the planning councils made extensive (four or more) recommendations to the staffs or planning councils chairpersons, and in practically every case, they were incorporated into the Title I plan (ACIR, 1977).

**Prime Sponsor Staff.** Prime sponsor staffs have been found to be influential in Title I decision-making (Barocci and Myer, 1977; Ripley, 1977, 1978). Ripley (1978:26) found that "in the thirteen prime sponsorships with high staff influence there are clear relationships between preferences
of the staff and service of the economically disadvantaged."

**Service Deliverers.** As discussed under "Extent of Comprehensiveness in Prime Sponsor Delivery System" above, during the early years of CETA, prime sponsors generally continued to fund the pre-CETA service deliverers operating in their geographical areas (ACIR, 1977; Mirengoff and Rindler, 1978). However, Ripley (1977:10-11) found that the influence of service deliverers in CETA decision-making has declined dramatically over the past two years. Decline has been greatest in prime sponsorships in which service deliverers have been kept off the planning councils, thus having no official forum in which to represent their views. They have remained influential in prime sponsorships in which they were firmly entrenched through years of previous manpower experience. . . . Overall, the service deliverers were more influential in the smaller prime sponsorships where neither staff, political officials nor planning council have much expertise. This pattern is gradually changing as the staff in these areas develop expertise and as the growth of public service employment programs draws the attention and participation of political officials.

**Actors' Attitudes and Preferences.** The attitudes of influential employment and training actors are important in helping shape participant mix and thereby effect performance indirectly because program mix affects performance directly (Ripley, 1978). The Ripley study found that there were clear relationships between staff preferences and service to the economically disadvantaged. Prime sponsors that served relatively fewer economically disadvantaged were managed by staffs with a weaker commitment for serving this target group. In the cases where staff preference did not
follow participant service patterns, the impact of the attitudes of political officials were felt (who in this case had no commitment to serve the economically disadvantaged).
CHAPTER III
PROCEDURES AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The Study Population

Four hundred and sixty (460) state and local governmental units were funded as CETA prime sponsors for FY 1979. The prime sponsors consist of 67 cities, 180 counties, 144 consortia, 49 states and territories, and 20 cities, counties or rural areas operating CETA programs under exceptional circumstances or as concentrated employment programs. Twelve of these prime sponsors are new prime sponsors operating CETA programs for the first time during FY 1979. (ETA Interchange, 1978)

The Study Sample

Of the 460 prime sponsors operating in FY 1979, eighty-one (81) prime sponsors were eliminated from the sample for the following reasons:

- 49 states and territories because in almost all cases they tend to operate independent delivery systems due to the special nature of these prime sponsorships (e.g., diverse geographic, economic, and demographic situations in each Balance of State prime sponsorship).
20 cities, counties or rural areas operating CETA programs under exceptional circumstances or as concentrated employment programs because they do not serve areas as populated as other prime sponsors (over 100,000 people). Thus, the size of these special prime sponsors may impact upon the design and effectiveness of the delivery system.

12 new prime sponsors because the data collected in this study will cover FY 1978 and these prime sponsors were not operating Title I programs at this time.

Data Collection Procedures

One survey instrument was designed to collect the study data. The instrument was distributed by mail with prepaid return envelopes. One follow-up instrument was mailed 10 days after the first survey instrument was mailed.

The instrument was printed upon gold colored paper. Research has shown that the response rate of a questionnaire which is mimeographed on white paper will be lower than the response rate of one which is printed on green paper (Pucel, 1973). Nixon (1954) suggests that questionnaire returns will be higher when they are printed on high quality colored paper. Incentives (e.g., a packet of instant coffee and an Ohio State University pencil) was also included with the instrument in an attempt to increase the response rate.
Pucel et al. (1970) found in a follow-up study of vocational education programs that response rate for the group that received an incentive with the questionnaire was 6.6 percent to 11.8 percent higher than the response rate for the control group who received no incentive. Salomone and Miller (1974) also found after analyzing sixteen difficult patterns or combinations of mailing techniques that an inducement plus several follow-up letters produced a substantial return rate. For this study, a response rate of fifty percent or above was considered to be acceptable.

Survey Instrument

A survey instrument was developed to gather data on each of the variables in this study (Appendix A). Initial versions of the questionnaire will be reviewed by selected Ohio State University faculty and knowledgeable National Center for Research in Vocational Education professional staff. The final draft version was field tested by the Ohio Balance of State prime sponsor staff. Each reviewer received a brief verbal introduction to the study and was then asked to complete the questionnaire, reacting to its construct and face validity and to its general format, length, and clarity. The questionnaire content and statistical techniques used are summarized below by hypothesis.
Hypothesis 1: If prime sponsors operate comprehensive delivery systems, then the effectiveness of their employment and training activities will be higher.

All prime sponsors were divided into one of three categories (e.g., comprehensive, mixed, independent) which reflects the amount of comprehensiveness present in their delivery system. The elements which define each of the above categories are based upon the prior work of Mirengoff and Rindler (1976, 1978) described in Chapters I and II. Thus, for the purposes of this study, each delivery system was categorized according to the following dimensions. The accompanying weight assigned to each dimension also appears below.

Dimension 1: - Degree of Coordination

a) All Title I programs are merged with Title II and VI programs (participants are referred to PSE programs as a program option) 5 High
b) All Title I programs are merged in system operated through manpower center or centers 4

c) Title I programs in area coordinated but separate. Functional specialization. Refer clients to each other. 3

d) Partial coordination among some deliverers (e.g., CEP, or employment service/vocational education cooperating in skill training) 2

e) Programs almost completely independent. No shared services. 1 Low
Dimension 2: - Degree of Access to Programs by Participants

a) Full range of Title I, options open to clients depending on his/her assessed need and available slots 3 High
b) Partial range of Title I options 2

Dimension 3: - Degree of Continuity in Guidance by Prime Sponsor Staff

a) Client assigned to counselor or team and remains responsible to that counselor or team throughout training or employment to placement 4 High
b) Client transferred from one program component to another and returns to the intake/assessment point for job development and placement 3

c) Client referred from intake point to training, work experience or PSE. Responsibility transferred from one component to another. No continuity in guidance 2

d) Client transfers from one component to another on his/her own (or remains in one component). No continuity in guidance 1

Mirengoff and Rindler (1976, 1978) state that the range of possible ratings is 11 (most comprehensive Title I delivery system and most coordinated client flow) to 3 (least coordinated). They note that if Title II and Title VI
programs are integrated with Title I (i.e., clients are referred to Public Service Employment as an additional option) add a weight of 1 to the score. This alteration is illustrated in the scheme above by the addition of a weight 5 in Dimension 1.

The effectiveness of the employment and training activities was based upon one primary indicator—the FY 1978 Title I placement rate. (See Chapter I for a discussion of the variable "Effectiveness of Employment and Training Activities.")

The placement rate data was cross tabulated by type of delivery system. Chi square values were then computed to determine if the findings were significant statistically. (The .05 level of confidence was established as the required level of significance for testing the hypotheses.) Chi square was chosen because it determines whether the deviations in the findings are due to sampling error or some interdependence or correlation among the frequencies (Isaac, 1977). It is a test of association between two variables when each is divided into mutually exclusive and exhaustive categories so that any given observation can be assigned to one and only one of the categories (Allen, 1967). It is computed by using the formula (Linton and Gallo, 1975):
\[ x^2 = \sum \frac{(fo - fe)^2}{fe} \]

where 
\( a \) = the number of levels of the independent variable (the number of cells)
\( fo \) = the observed expected frequencies for each of the cells
\( fe \) = the expected frequency for each of the cells based upon some theoretical explanation

To use the chi square test, the raw data must be analyzed as frequencies, each respondent must be counted only once, and the categories should be defined a priori.

Hypothesis 2: If prime sponsors have a commitment toward helping the disadvantaged, then the effectiveness of employment and training activities will be higher.

This hypothesis was tested by asking prime sponsors to respond to eight statements that reflect a prime sponsor's level of commitment to serving the economically disadvantaged along a five-point scale: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree. Again, the responses to each statement were analyzed and cross tabulated by placement rate. Chi square was then used to determine if the relationships found were significant.
Hypothesis 3: If decision-making in a prime sponsor­ship is widely distributed, then the effectiveness of its employment and training activities will be higher.

Hypothesis 3 was tested by using the control graph technique. The control graph technique examines the hierarchical distribution of control in an organization and the possible performance implications of this distribution for organizational effectiveness (Tannenbaum, 1966, 1968, 1974). It also helps to clarify the relationship of personal control to organizational effectiveness. Thus, the technique is a means to conceptualize and to measure the distribution of influence and control in organizations. Arnold Tannenbaum (in press), who originated the measure, explains that "The graph consists of two axes, the horizontal one representing the hierarchical scale of an organization with the rank and file at one end and the director at the other end, and the vertical axis representing the amount of control exercised by each of the hierarchical echelons" (Tannenbaum and Cooke, in press). The technique has been applied in a large number and wide variety of organizations: industrial and business; schools, colleges and universities; socialist and capitalist, European and American organizations; voluntary associations; unions; municipal agencies; and military organizations. With very rare exception, organizations show a hierarchical distribution of control according to the control graph method;
persons and groups at the top are reported to exercise more control than groups at the bottom. This result is entirely predictable and it would seem to suggest therefore some degree of validity of the measures at least at this gross level (Tannenbaum and Cooke, in press:4).

Tannenbaum and Cooke (in press: 2-3) note that the control graph technique is a simplification. However, they identify several advantages of the technique. "First, it provides an approach to describing in terms of two continuous dimensions a number of organizational types . . . Second, the control graph offers a holistic characterization of control in organizations . . . Third, the control graph suggests the total amount of control . . . is a correlate of important aspects of organizational functioning including criteria of organizational effectiveness." Weaknesses of the control graph technique have been identified as it simplifies a complex process and it relies exclusively on questionnaires.

The control graph technique was used in this study to measure the distribution of decision-making within each prime sponsor. One prime control graph was constructed:

How much say or influence do each of these groups have in designing your Title I delivery system?
The response choice for the control graph range from: 1 = little or no influence; 2 = some influence; 3 = quite a bit of influence; 4 = great deal of influence; and 5 = a very great deal of influence.

The data were analyzed in two ways. First, the level of influence was computed and analyzed for each of the actors identified. The data were then cross tabulated by placement rate. Chi square was used to determine the significance of the findings. Second, the variations of influence of one actor vis-à-vis other actors were analyzed by computing a t-test to determine if the variation in actual influence of each actor from the amount of influence each actor should have is statistically significant. The t-test measures the statistical significance of the difference between two sample means (Isaac, 1977). The statistic is usually used when the sample size is small.

The t value is computed by determining the means of the two samples and the sum of the means squared.
following formula is then used to compute the t value.

\[
t = \frac{m_1 - m_2}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{d_1^2 - d_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}\right)\left(\frac{n_1 + n_2}{n_1 n_2}\right)}}
\]

Hypothesis 4: If prime sponsors perceive work experience as a viable activity, then the transferability of participants in employment and training activities will be higher.

Prime sponsors were asked to respond to five statements that represent their attitude toward experiential learning along a five-point scale: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree. One example of such a statement is: "work experience primarily is intended to enhance the employability of those who have never worked." The responses for each statement were analyzed and cross tabulated by three measures of transferability: transfers within Title I; between Title I and Titles II and VI; and enrollment in two Title I activities simultaneously. The data were then analyzed using chi square to determine if the relationships found were significant.
Hypothesis 5: If prime sponsors perceive work experience as a viable activity, then transferability of participants in employment and training activities will be higher.

This hypothesis was tested by asking respondents to rate all four allowable Title I activities against four pairs of polar adjectives (using Osgood's Semantic Differential): useful/useless, effective/ineffective, appropriate/inappropriate, cost effective/cost ineffective. The semantic differential is a method for measuring the meaning of concepts. The rating is made according to the respondent's perception of the relatedness or association of the adjective to the word concept (Miller, 1977). The responses to each of the four activities along the four polar adjectives were analyzed and then cross tabulated by the three measures of transferability. Again, chi square was used to determine statistical significance.

Hypothesis 6: If subgrantees are selected in order to provide the most effective employment of training services, then the effectiveness of employment and training activities will be higher.

The hypothesis was tested by asking prime sponsors to rank order which of seven factors have the most to least impact in determining how prime sponsor subgrantees are selected where 1 = the most impact and 7 = the least impact.
The responses were cross tabulated by placement rate and analyzed using chi square to determine if the distributions were significant.

Variables

The table below identifies the variables to be measured and their relationship to the hypotheses and questionnaire items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Questionnaire Item(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree of comprehensiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5, 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of program</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.1, 26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of commitment toward helping the disadvantaged</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of program</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.1, 26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of decision-making</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of program</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.1, 26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of work experience</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.1 to 13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferability of participants</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of understanding of purpose of experiential learning</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferability of participants</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of subgrantees'</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of program</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.1, 26.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

This chapter reports findings of the current study in terms of the methodology described in Chapter III. First, an analysis of the return rate is offered. Second, each hypothesis is reviewed and then is accepted or rejected on the basis of statistical analysis.

Analysis of Return Rate

Of the three hundred forty-six (346) questionnaires mailed to prime sponsors, two hundred forty-seven (247) or seventy-one (71) percent actually returned completed questionnaires. This high rate of return might be attributable to the aesthetic quality of the questionnaire (e.g., grade of paper and printing), the inclusion of incentives (an Ohio State University pencil and a packet of coffee) and a second mailing of the questionnaire to those prime sponsors who did not respond to the first mailing.

Those prime sponsors who returned the questionnaires are described below:

DOL Region. Between thirty-one (31) percent to sixty-seven (67) percent of the prime sponsors in each DOL region responded to the questionnaire. Table 1 identifies the number of prime sponsors responding by region, the percent each region comprises of the total sample, and the percent of
prime sponsors responding from each DOL region versus the total population in the region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOL REGION</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT OF TOTAL POP. IN REGION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of Prime Sponsor. Approximately half of the prime sponsors in the sample (49 percent) are single counties, thirty-two (32) percent are consortia and thirteen (13) percent are single cities.

Geographic Area. The majority of prime sponsors responding (sixty [60] percent) classify themselves as urban prime sponsors whereas thirty-two (32) percent labeled themselves as rural prime sponsors.

Population. Over half of the respondents (fifty-nine [59] percent) serve population areas of between 100,000 to 300,000 residents. Nine (9) percent of the respondents serve population areas of over 750,000 residents.
Unemployment Rate. Of those prime sponsors responding, fourteen (14) percent serve areas with an unemployment rate of less than four (4) percent during FY 1978, forty-two (42) percent served areas with an unemployment rate between four (4) percent and six (6) percent, and thirty-six (36) percent served areas with an unemployment rate of over six (6) percent.

Hypothesis 1: If prime sponsors operate comprehensive delivery systems, then the effectiveness of employment and training activities will be higher.

Using Mirengoff and Rindler's (1976) scale, prime sponsors were asked to classify their delivery system according to three dimensions: degree of coordination in the Title I adult component, degree of options available to adult Title I participants, and degree of guidance services adult Title I participants receive. The respondents classified their Title I delivery systems along each of the three dimensions as follows:

Degree of Coordination in the Title I Adult Component: The majority of prime sponsors perceived their delivery system to contain an element of coordination. Specifically, forty-three (43) percent reported that Title I activities and services are coordinated in a system operated through manpower center(s), e.g., participants frequently transfer from one Title I activity or service to another, and twenty-three (23) percent reported that all Title I activities and
services are coordinated with Title II and VI programs, e.g., participants are often transferred from Title I to public service employment programs.

**Degree of Options Available to Adult Title I Participants.** A majority of the respondents (seventy-four [74] percent) reported that adult participants have only one option of a Title I activity.

**Degree of Guidance Services Adult Title I Participants Receive.** Most prime sponsors reported that participants are transferred from one component to another and receive limited counseling (forty-five [45] percent). Thirty-five (35) percent reported that participants are transferred from one activity to another and return to intake/assessment for job development and placement.

The raw score of each prime sponsor along the above dimensions was summed. The prime sponsors were then divided into three types of delivery systems: independent (less than 5 points), mixed (5 to 8 points) and comprehensive (over 8 points). The majority of prime sponsors reported their delivery system to be mixed (eighty-one [81] percent), while fourteen (14) percent identified a comprehensive delivery system and five (5) percent an independent delivery system. This trend toward mixed and comprehensive delivery systems has been identified in the employment and training literature. For example, Snedeker and Snedeker (1979) report that mixed systems are the most common type of delivery system.
Mirengoff and Rindler (1978) stated that one-third of the prime sponsors in their study operated comprehensive delivery systems, one-quarter have a mixed system, and the remaining forty (40) percent independent delivery systems. They report "as part of the trend toward integration, almost half the local (prime) sponsors in the sample have moved to centralize the entry facilities for the Title I program and bring them under the control of a single agency. There has also been some movement to centralize exit functions. However, there is little or no coordination between employability development programs of Title I and the PSE program under Titles II and VI. Nor is there movement of applicants between programs, even in areas where a common intake center registers applicants for both PSE and Title I." (P. 56).

Given the above and the fact that prime sponsor self-classification (versus rankings by outside observers on each dimension in the Mirengoff and Rindler study) tends to lead to inflated scores, places this study's findings in focus (i.e., the pronounced trend toward mixed delivery systems). However, the skewed distribution of responses made it difficult to rigorously test this hypothesis.

Prime sponsors were also asked to report the number of persons served and the number of persons entering employment as reported in the September 30, 1978 Title I Quarterly Progress Report. From this data, the placement rate was
computed for all prime sponsors. The data revealed that forty-three (43) percent of the prime sponsors achieved a placement rate up to thirty-three (33) percent (low placement rate), forty (40) percent placed thirty-four (34) to sixty-six (66) percent of their participants (moderate placement rate) and fifteen (15) percent placed over sixty-seven (67) percent of the participants served (high placement rate).

Hypothesis 1 is answered in the negative: there are no significant differences in the placement rate given different prime sponsor delivery systems ($X^2 = 3.90$, $P = .69$). Seventy-seven (77) percent of the prime sponsors who identified their delivery system as comprehensive, forty-three (43) percent of the prime sponsors who obtained placement rates of less than thirty-three (33) percent, and forty-two (42) percent obtained a placement rate of between thirty-four (34) percent to sixty-six (66) percent. This data is summarized in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Placement Rate by Type of Prime Sponsor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thus, it does not appear that the type of delivery system a prime sponsor operates significantly affects its placement rate. Given the above finding, we are led to focus on other factors that might impact upon placement rates. These factors may be viewed on several levels. For example, programmatically, the type of participants selected (e.g., adults versus full-time students), and type of activities offered may affect placement rates. Prime sponsor demographics (e.g., urban or rural, unemployment rate, prime sponsor size) might also affect placement rates. In addition, individual participant characteristics (e.g., socio-economic status, education level) could also have an impact upon placement rates.

**Hypothesis 2**: If prime sponsors have a commitment toward helping the economically disadvantaged, then the effectiveness of employment and training activities will be higher.

Hypothesis 2 posits that the presence of a high level of commitment to the economically disadvantaged will result in an increase in the successful completion of employment and training activities. Prime sponsors were requested to respond to eight statements about their prime sponsor's attitude toward the economically disadvantaged using a five-point scale (Strongly Disagree=1/Disagree=2/Neutral=3/Agree =4/Strongly Agree=5):
- Title I should only serve the economically disadvantaged. (ECODISI)
- Too large a percentage of funds are spent on the economically disadvantaged. (ECODIS2)
- More economically disadvantaged people should be served in the PSE programs. (ECODIS3)
- This prime sponsor should spend a larger percentage of its money on the economically disadvantaged. (ECODIS4)
- A majority of PSE participants should be economically disadvantaged. (ECODIS5)
- CETA was designed to serve only the economically disadvantaged (ECODIS6)
- CETA was designed to serve the unemployed, regardless of the length of time they have been unemployed. (ECODIS7)
- Title I funds should be used to rehire laid-off city or county workers. (ECODIS8)

The range of responses to each statement is summarized in Table 3. In order to answer the hypothesis, the response to each of these statements was analyzed by prime sponsor placement rate (see Table 4). The findings are discussed below:

- Sixty-eight (68) percent of the prime sponsors reported agreed that Title I should only serve the economically disadvantaged (ECODISI). Of those who agreed with the statement,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECODIS1</td>
<td>4% (8)</td>
<td>19% (19)</td>
<td>7% (7)</td>
<td>30% (29)</td>
<td>39% (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECODIS2</td>
<td>7% (7)</td>
<td>8% (8)</td>
<td>13% (13)</td>
<td>39% (39)</td>
<td>33% (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECODIS3</td>
<td>6% (13)</td>
<td>17% (41)</td>
<td>20% (48)</td>
<td>39% (93)</td>
<td>17% (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECODIS4</td>
<td>9% (21)</td>
<td>24% (57)</td>
<td>26% (62)</td>
<td>24% (57)</td>
<td>18% (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECODIS5</td>
<td>1% (3)</td>
<td>8% (19)</td>
<td>16% (38)</td>
<td>47% (110)</td>
<td>28% (66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECODIS6</td>
<td>10% (24)</td>
<td>38% (90)</td>
<td>18% (43)</td>
<td>25% (58)</td>
<td>9% (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECODIS7</td>
<td>10% (24)</td>
<td>47% (112)</td>
<td>11% (27)</td>
<td>25% (60)</td>
<td>6% (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECODIS8</td>
<td>1% (3)</td>
<td>3% (7)</td>
<td>11% (25)</td>
<td>33% (79)</td>
<td>52% (124)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 4
Placement Rate by Attitude toward Economically Disadvantaged

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECODIS 1</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECODIS2</td>
<td>50% (12)</td>
<td>70% (69)</td>
<td>74% (98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECODIS3</td>
<td>42% (15)</td>
<td>75% (75)</td>
<td>79% (84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECODIS4</td>
<td>68% (7)</td>
<td>41% (41)</td>
<td>49% (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECODIS5</td>
<td>68% (24)</td>
<td>70% (68)</td>
<td>80% (84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECODIS6</td>
<td>63% (8)</td>
<td>52% (38)</td>
<td>47% (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECODIS7</td>
<td>29% (7)</td>
<td>45% (33)</td>
<td>45% (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECODIS8</td>
<td>82% (28)</td>
<td>88% (86)</td>
<td>84% (89)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
seventy-four (74) percent achieved a low placement rate and seventy (70) percent a moderate placement rate. However, only one-half of the prime sponsors who achieved a high placement rate agreed with the statement. The distribution of responses is significant at the .000 level ($X^2=73.027$).

- Seventy-one (71) percent of the prime sponsors agreed with the statement too large a percentage of funds are spent on the economically disadvantaged (ECODIS2). However, while seventy-nine (79) percent of the prime sponsors with low placement rates and seventy-five (75) percent of the prime sponsors with moderate placement rates agreed with the statement, only forty-two (42) percent of the prime sponsors with high placement rates agreed with the statement ($X^2=44.412$, $P<.000$).

- A majority of the prime sponsors (fifty-six [56] percent) agreed that more economically disadvantaged people should be served in PSE programs (ECODIS3). Again, a majority of those prime sponsors who agreed with the statement achieved low and moderate placement rates (sixty-three [63] and sixty-one [61] percent respectively) while twenty-nine (29) percent of the prime sponsors who agreed achieved a high placement rate ($X^2=44.847$, $P<.000$).

- Less than one-half of the respondents (forty-two [42] percent) agreed that a larger percentage of its money should be spent on the economically disadvantaged ECODIS4). While forty-nine (49) percent of the prime sponsors with low
placement rates and forty-one (41) percent of the prime sponsors with moderate placement rates agreed with the statement, sixty-eight (68) percent of the prime sponsors with high placement rates disagreed with the statement ($X^2=48.223, P<.000$).

- Three-quarters of the prime sponsors responded that a majority of the public service employment participants should be economically disadvantaged (ECODIS5). Regardless of the prime sponsor placement rate, a majority of those with low (eighty [80] percent), moderate (seventy [70] percent) and high (sixty-eight [68] percent) placement rates agreed with the statement. The distribution of the responses is not statistically significant ($X^2=8.133, P<.420$).

- Forty-one (41) percent of those prime sponsors reporting disagreed with the statement CETA was designed to serve only the economically disadvantaged (ECODIS6). While fifty-three (53) percent of those prime sponsors with low placement rates and forty-eight (48) percent of those prime sponsors with moderate placement rates disagreed, thirty-seven (37) percent of those prime sponsors with high placement rates disagreed. The distribution of these responses is significant at the .004 level ($X^2=22.361$).

- A majority (fifty-seven [57] percent) of the respondents disagreed that CETA was designed to serve the unemployed regardless of the length of time they have been
unemployed (ECODIS7). While fifty-five (55) percent of those prime sponsors with low and fifty-five (55) percent of those prime sponsors with moderate placement rates disagreed with the statement, seventy-one (71) percent of those prime sponsors with high placement rates disagreed ($X^2 = 15.181$, $P < .056$).

Eighty-five (85) percent of the prime sponsors agreed that Title I funds should be used to rehire laid-off city or county workers (ECODIS8). Regardless of the prime sponsor placement rate, over eighty (80) percent of the respondents in each placement rate category agreed with the statement. The distribution of the responses is not statistically significant ($X^2 = 4.485$, $P < .811$).

The analysis of variables ECODIS I to ECODIS 8 and the statistically significant responses reported for variables ECODIS 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7 leads to affirming hypothesis 2. From an analysis of the data, a definite pattern emerges. Specifically, while a majority of the prime sponsors with low and moderate placement rates agreed with ECODIS 1, 2, 3 and disagreed with ECODIS 4 and 7, those prime sponsors with high placement rates tended to have a split opinion about ECODIS 1, disagree with ECODIS 2 and 3, and agree with ECODIS 4 and 7. This discrepancy in responses between those prime sponsors with low and moderate placement rates and those with high placement rates lends support to the premise that those prime sponsors with high placement rates have a
different attitude toward the economically disadvantaged than those prime sponsors with low or moderate placement rates. Thus, it appears that while those prime sponsors with high placement rates have mixed feelings about Title I serving only the economically disadvantaged, they do believe that more funds should be expended on the economically disadvantaged, more economically disadvantaged participants should be served in PSE programs, and CETA was designed to serve the unemployed regardless of the length of time they have been unemployed.

Hypothesis 3. If decision-making in a prime sponsorship is widely distributed, then the effectiveness of employment and training activities will be higher.

Hypothesis 3 states that the presence of widely distributed decision-making among critical actors will result in an increase in the successful completion of employment and training activities. Prime sponsors were asked two questions to determine the extent to which decision-making is distributed within the prime sponsor:

- How much say or influence do each of these groups have in designing your Title I delivery system?

- How much say or influence do each of these groups have on your planning council?

The responses to each question are reported below.
Prime sponsors reported that the staff has the greatest influence (eighty [80] percent) in designing the Title I delivery system followed by the planning council (forty-five [45] percent), subgrantees (thirty-seven [37] percent), elected officials (twenty-seven [27] percent) and DOL representatives (nineteen [19] percent). The distribution of identified influence is depicted in Table 5.

A majority of prime sponsors who achieved low placement rates (fifty-two [52] percent) and moderate placement rates (fifty-two [52] percent) perceive staff as having a great deal of influence while forty-one (41) percent of the prime sponsors with high placement rates perceive the staff as having a great deal of influence. The planning council is perceived to have a moderate amount of influence (between fifteen [15] percent and thirty-three [33] percent) regardless of the placement rate. Subgrantees are perceived as having a relatively low amount of influence regardless of placement rate (low - fifty [50] percent, moderate - forty-one [31] percent, high - forty-four [44] percent). Elected officials are also rated as having some influence (low - forty [40] percent, moderate - thirty-six [36] percent, high - thirty-three [33] percent). The distribution of decision-making among critical actors by prime sponsor placement rate is summarized in Figure 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Little or no influence</th>
<th>Some influence</th>
<th>Quite a bit of influence</th>
<th>A great deal of influence</th>
<th>A very great deal of influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>3% (6)</td>
<td>6% (14)</td>
<td>9% (22)</td>
<td>29% (68)</td>
<td>51% (121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Council</td>
<td>3% (7)</td>
<td>21% (51)</td>
<td>27% (66)</td>
<td>32% (76)</td>
<td>13% (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subgrantees</td>
<td>15% (32)</td>
<td>46% (100)</td>
<td>26% (56)</td>
<td>11% (24)</td>
<td>4% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Officials</td>
<td>22% (53)</td>
<td>35% (84)</td>
<td>16% (38)</td>
<td>15% (35)</td>
<td>12% (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOL Representatives</td>
<td>30% (73)</td>
<td>37% (90)</td>
<td>10% (26)</td>
<td>14% (34)</td>
<td>5% (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4

Influence of Critical Actors on Title I Planning
Figure 5 reveals that regardless of a prime sponsor's placement rate, the staff appears to have the most influence followed by the planning councils. The subgrantees, elected officials, and DOL representative are reported to have some or little influence. Chi square values revealed significant differences in the distribution of the data for staff \( (X^2=65.587, \ P<.000) \), planning council \( (X^2=48.256, \ P<.000) \), and DOL representative \( (X^2=48.490, \ P<.000) \), and non-significant findings for subgrantees \( (X^2=3.917, \ P<.865) \) and elected officials \( (X^2=14.101, \ P<.079) \). Prime sponsors were also asked to rank from most ("1") to least ("4") the impact of critical actors on the Title I program mix. The reported results confirm this trend: staff \( (\bar{X}=1.64) \), planning council \( (\bar{X}=2.14) \), subgrantees \( (\bar{X}=2.98) \) and elected officials \( (\bar{X}=3.03) \).

In addition, T-tests were computed to determine if the increased influence of the staff is statistically significant. Table 6 reveals that the influence of staff is significantly greater than that of other actors. A similar trend appears for the influence of the planning council where the planning council's influence is significantly greater than elected officials, subgrantees or DOL representative. And, the influence of elected officials is significantly greater than that of subgrantees or DOL representative (.037 level or higher).

On the planning council, prime sponsor staff is reported to have the most influence (fifty-four [54] percent) followed
### Table 6

Significance of Critical Actors on Title I Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Planning Council</th>
<th>Subgrantees</th>
<th>Elected Officials</th>
<th>DOL Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Council</td>
<td>T = -5.92 P &lt; .000</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subgrantees</td>
<td>T = -18.43 P &lt; .000</td>
<td>T = -9.86 P &lt; .000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Officials</td>
<td>T = -13.43 P &lt; .000</td>
<td>T = -7.39 P &lt; .000</td>
<td>T = 2.10 P &lt; .037</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOL Representative</td>
<td>T = -13.88 P &lt; .000</td>
<td>T = -7.80 P &lt; .000</td>
<td>T = -.79 P &lt; .430</td>
<td>T = -2.25 P &lt; .025</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
by the employment service (twenty-three [23] percent),
business/industry (twenty-three [23] percent), community-
based organizations (twenty-two [22] percent), vocational
education (nineteen [19] percent), labor (seventeen [17] per-
cent), minority groups (fourteen [14] percent), veterans
representative/groups (fourteen [14] percent), and agricul-
ture (ten [10] percent). The distribution of influence is
summarized in Table 7, and by placement rate in Figure 5.

Figure 6 reveals that prime sponsor staff are reported
to have a great deal of influence on the planning councils
along with vocational education, the employment service,
business/industry and minority groups. \( (X^2=59.086, P<.000,\)
\( X^2=58.109, P<.000, X^2=47.035, P<.000, X^2=16.028, P<.042,\)
\( X^2=17.182, P<.028 \) respectively.) In addition, T-tests were
computed to determine if the increased influence of staff is
statistically significant. Table 8 reveals that the influ-
ence of the prime sponsor staff on the planning council is
significantly greater than other critical actors; vocational
education's influence is significantly greater than agri-
culture, community-based organizations and veterans, the
employment service, labor and business/industry's influence
is significantly greater than agriculture and veterans,
minority groups' influence is significantly greater than
agriculture and community-based organizations' influence is
significantly greater than veterans \( (P<.000) \).
Influence of Critical Actors on Planning Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Little or no Influence</th>
<th>Some Influence</th>
<th>Quite a bit of Influence</th>
<th>A great deal of Influence</th>
<th>A very great deal of Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>9% (22)</td>
<td>14% (33)</td>
<td>19% (46)</td>
<td>29% (68)</td>
<td>26% (62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
<td>9% (21)</td>
<td>35% (83)</td>
<td>28% (66)</td>
<td>17% (41)</td>
<td>8% (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Service</td>
<td>10% (23)</td>
<td>37% (89)</td>
<td>28% (67)</td>
<td>16% (38)</td>
<td>7% (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>18% (42)</td>
<td>37% (88)</td>
<td>25% (59)</td>
<td>11% (27)</td>
<td>6% (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Industry</td>
<td>13% (31)</td>
<td>37% (91)</td>
<td>27% (65)</td>
<td>16% (38)</td>
<td>7% (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>57% (130)</td>
<td>23% (53)</td>
<td>11% (25)</td>
<td>8% (18)</td>
<td>2% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based Organizations</td>
<td>19% (44)</td>
<td>27% (65)</td>
<td>32% (77)</td>
<td>15% (36)</td>
<td>7% (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Groups</td>
<td>12% (29)</td>
<td>36% (87)</td>
<td>30% (72)</td>
<td>17% (42)</td>
<td>5% (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Representative/Groups</td>
<td>22% (54)</td>
<td>37% (91)</td>
<td>27% (65)</td>
<td>12% (28)</td>
<td>2% (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5
Influence of Critical Actors on the Planning Council
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Vocational Education</th>
<th>Employment Service</th>
<th>Labor</th>
<th>Business/Industry</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Community-Based Organizations</th>
<th>Minority Groups</th>
<th>Veterans Representative/Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
<td>T=</td>
<td>-7.51</td>
<td>P&lt;.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Service</td>
<td>T=</td>
<td>-7.66</td>
<td>P&lt;.000</td>
<td>P&lt;.213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>T=</td>
<td>-7.55</td>
<td>P&lt;.000</td>
<td>P&lt;.113</td>
<td>T= -1.59</td>
<td>P&lt;.705</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Industry</td>
<td>T=</td>
<td>-7.27</td>
<td>P&lt;.000</td>
<td>P&lt;.119</td>
<td>T= -1.57</td>
<td>P&lt;.409</td>
<td>P&lt;.600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>T=</td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>P&lt;.000</td>
<td>P&lt;.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based Organizations</td>
<td>T=</td>
<td>-6.83</td>
<td>P&lt;.000</td>
<td>P&lt;.010</td>
<td>T= -7.83</td>
<td>P&lt;.78</td>
<td>P&lt;.734</td>
<td>P&lt;.614</td>
<td>P&lt;.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Groups</td>
<td>T=</td>
<td>-696</td>
<td>P&lt;.000</td>
<td>P&lt;.273</td>
<td>T= -1.10</td>
<td>P&lt;.841</td>
<td>P&lt;.741</td>
<td>P&lt;.765</td>
<td>P&lt;.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Representative/Groups</td>
<td>T=</td>
<td>-10.21</td>
<td>P&lt;.000</td>
<td>P&lt;.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

Significance of Critical Actors on Planning Council
The prime sponsors' perceptions of influence on the planning council were also analyzed by placement rate since the planning council's influence on the design of the Title I delivery system was reported to be significant at the .000 level. The following patterns emerged:

- A majority of prime sponsors with low and moderate placement rates perceive staff to have a great deal of influence while thirty-five (35) percent of those prime sponsors with a high placement rate reported the same perceptions ($X^2=59.088$, $p<.000$).

- Approximately forty (40) percent of the prime sponsors with low and moderate placement rates perceive vocational education as having little to some influence while thirty-two (32) percent of those prime sponsors with high placement rates perceived vocational education to have a great deal of influence ($X^2=58.109$, $p<.000$).

- A majority of the prime sponsors with moderate placement rate, forty-three (43) percent of those prime sponsors with low placement rates and thirty-eight (38) percent of those prime sponsors with high placement rates reported the employment service as having little to some influence ($X^2=47.035$, $p<.000$).

- A majority of prime sponsors with low and moderate placement rates reported labor as having little to some influence while thirty-three (33) percent of the prime sponsors with high placement rates reported the same perceptions.
- A majority of the prime sponsors with moderate and high placement rates reported business/industry has little to some influence while forty-five (45) percent of those prime sponsors with low placement rates reported like perceptions ($X^2=64.804$, $P<.000$).

- Regardless of the placement rate, over half of all prime sponsors reported that agriculture has little or no influence ($X^2=16.028$, $P<.042$).

- A majority of prime sponsors with high placement rates perceive community-based organizations and minority groups as having little to some influence while prime sponsors with low and moderate placement rates reported as such ($X^2=44.018$, $P<.000$; $X^2=17.182$, $P<.028$, respectively).

- Regardless of the placement rate, a majority of prime sponsors reported that veterans representative/groups have little to some influence ($X^2=12.322$, $P<.137$).

Prime sponsor decision-making does not appear to be widely distributed among critical actors. Therefore, hypothesis 3 is rejected. Staff is reported to have the greatest influence upon the design of the Title I delivery system, followed by the planning council (where staff is also reported to have the greatest influence). These findings, i.e., a limited number of actors affecting the design of the Title I delivery system, follow the findings of Mirengoff and Rindler (1978) where the CETA staff is at the locus of decision-making.
As they state (1978:80), "on the whole, the move has been slow toward a participatory style of decision-making."

**Hypothesis 4:** If prime sponsors perceive work experience as a viable activity then transferability of participants in employment and training activities will be higher.

Prime sponsors were requested to respond to five statements about experiential learning based upon their policies using a five-point scale (Strongly Disagree=1/Disagree=2/Neutral=3/Agree=4/Strongly Agree=5):

- Most kinds of skills are better learned through experience than in a classroom (EXPLRN1)
- Learning through experience is the best learning mode for disadvantaged persons (EXPLRN2)
- The best kind of learning occurs in the classroom (EXPLRN3)
- Learning through experience is a key part of training (EXPLRN4)
- Classroom learning is the best learning mode for disadvantaged persons (EXPLRN5)

To test the hypothesis, three measures of transferability of adult Title I participants were used:

- Transferred from one Title I activity to another Title I activity (ITRANS)
- Transferred from one Title I activity to Title II or VI (ITOPSE)
Enrolled in two Title I activities simultaneously (SIMULT)

The above data were analyzed by cross-tabulating the five statements about experiential learning with the three measures of transferability. The findings are reported in Table 9.

Table 9
Attitude toward Experiential Learning by Transferability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ITRANS</th>
<th>ITOPSE</th>
<th>SIMULT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPLRN1</td>
<td>$X^2 = 5.216 \ P &lt; .516$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 16.069 \ P &lt; .041$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 13.223 \ P &lt; .104$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPLRN2</td>
<td>$X^2 = 10.043 \ P &lt; .123$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 7.002 \ P &lt; .536$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 5.778 \ P &lt; .672$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPLRN3</td>
<td>$X^2 = 11.915 \ P &lt; .064$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 16.287 \ P &lt; .012$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 9.849 \ P &lt; .131$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPLRN4</td>
<td>$X^2 = 13.253 \ P &lt; .039$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 107.404 \ P &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 54.320 \ P &lt; .000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPLRN5</td>
<td>$X^2 = 17.217 \ P &lt; .009$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 18.841 \ P &lt; .016$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 8.257 \ P &lt; .220$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data reveal that twenty-seven (27) percent of the respondents disagreed, thirty-three (33) percent were neutral and forty-one (41) percent agreed with the statement: "Most kinds of skills are better learned through experience than in a classroom." In addition, eighty-four (84) percent of the prime sponsors transferred less than twenty-five (25) percent of their participants from a Title I activity to an activity under Titles II or VI ($X^2 = 16.069, P < .041$). In response to the statement: "The best kind of learning occurs in the classroom," sixteen (16) percent of the respondents disagreed, forty-one (41) percent were neutral and forty-three (43) percent agreed. When the data was analyzed by the percentage of transferability, the distribution of responses revealed that eighty-nine (89) percent of the prime sponsors transferred less than twenty-five (25) percent of their participants from a Title I activity to a Title II or VI activity ($X^2 = 16.287, P < .012$).

The distribution of prime sponsor responses to the statement: "Learning through experience is a key part of training" is statistically significant for each of the three measures of the dependent variable. Eighty-four (84) percent of the respondents agreed, eight (8) percent were neutral and eight (8) percent disagreed with the statement. When comparing these responses to the distribution of responses for each of the three measures, the following pattern arises: Prime sponsors who agree with the statement do not transfer
significantly more participants from one Title I activity to another Title I activity ($X^2=13.253, P<.039$); do not transfer more participants from one Title I activity to Titles II or VI ($X^2=107.404, P<.000$); nor do they have more participants enrolled in two Title I activities simultaneously ($X^2=54.320, P<.000$).

In response to the statement: "Classroom learning is the best learning mode for disadvantaged persons," forty-two (42) percent of the prime sponsors disagreed, thirty-nine (39) percent were neutral, and nineteen (19) percent agreed. In crosstabulating these responses by the three outcome measures, it appears that prime sponsors who disagreed with the statement did not transfer more participants from one Title I activity to another ($X^2=17.217, P<.009$) nor did they transfer more participants from one Title I activity to an activity under Title II or VI ($X^2=18.841, P<.016$).

In reviewing the patterns that are reflected in the data, it appears that the presence of a high degree of understanding of the theory behind experiential learning does not result in an increase in transferability of adult participants within and between Titles, i.e., hypothesis 4 is rejected. However, several patterns are present in the data. First, the majority of prime sponsors transfer less than twenty-five (25) percent of their adult participants from one Title I activity to another Title I activity or from one Title I activity to an activity under Title II or VI, or enroll an
adult participant in two Title I activities simultaneously. Second, regardless of the percentage of adult participants who transfer from one Title I activity to another Title I activity, one Title I activity to an activity under Title II or VI, or participate in two Title I activities simultaneously, the majority of prime sponsors agree with the statement that learning through experience is a key part of training (EXPLRN4). Third, regardless of a prime sponsors' placement rate, a majority reported that learning through experience is a key part of training (EXPLRN4).

**Hypothesis 5:** If prime sponsors perceive work experience as a viable activity, then transferability of participants in employment and training activities will be higher.

Hypothesis 5 tests the assumption that prime sponsors with positive perceptions toward work experience will report an increase in the transferability of adult participants within and between Titles. Using a semantic differential, prime sponsors were asked to rate four Title I activities along the following polar adjectives: useful/useless, effective/ineffective, appropriate/inappropriate, cost effective/cost ineffective, with a negative rating =1 and a positive rating =7. An analysis of the ratings (see Table 10) illustrates that prime sponsors perceive on the job training and classroom training as the most useful, effective, appropriate and cost effective activities. Public service employment,
### TABLE 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude toward Title I Activities</th>
<th>Usefulness</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Appropriateness</th>
<th>Cost Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Training</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 5.88$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 5.90$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 5.80$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 5.33$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-the-Job Training</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 5.94$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 5.43$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 5.84$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 5.77$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Employment</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 4.04$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 3.82$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 3.64$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 2.96$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 4.96$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 4.83$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 5.03$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 4.23$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
funded under Title I, received the lowest rankings against each of the polar adjectives while work experience fell in the middle.

To determine if prime sponsor attitudes towards work experience differed significantly from their opinions about other activities, a T-test was used to analyze the data. Prime sponsors perceive classroom training to be a more useful (T=10.11 P<.000), effective (T=4.12 P<.000), appropriate (T=.756 P<.000) and cost effective (T=5.60 P<.000) activity than work experience. In addition, on-the-job training is perceived to be more useful (T=4.29, p<.000), effective (T=7.92 P<.000), appropriate (T=7.774, P<.000), and cost effective (T=11.44 P<.000) activity than work experience. However, work experience is perceived to be more useful (T=3.63 P<.000), effective (T=6.11 P<.000), appropriate (T=8.03 P<.000), and cost effective (T=11.60 P<.000) than public service employment funded under Title I (see Table 11).

The four work experience semantic differential scales were analyzed against the three measures of participants' transferability: ITRANS, ITOPSE, SIMULT (see Table 12). The distribution of prime sponsor responses reveals that those prime sponsors who reported transferring less than twenty-five (25) percent of their adult participants from a Title I activity to an activity under Title II or VI eighty-five (85) percent believed work experience to be an
Table 11: Work Experience
Significance of Attitude toward Title I Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Usefulness</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Appropriateness</th>
<th>Cost Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASSROOM TRAINING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usefulness</td>
<td>$T = -10.11 \ P &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$T = -8.82 \ P &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$T = -8.54 \ P &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$T = -13.90 \ P &lt; .000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effectiveness</td>
<td>$-3.95 \ &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$-4.12 \ &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$-3.27 \ &lt; .001$</td>
<td>$-8.44 \ &lt; .000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriateness</td>
<td>$-9.23 \ &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$-8.01 \ &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$-7.56 \ &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$-12.66 \ &lt; .000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cost effectiveness</td>
<td>$-1.06 \ &lt; .089$</td>
<td>$-1.73 \ &lt; .085$</td>
<td>$-1.03 \ &lt; .306$</td>
<td>$-5.60 \ &lt; .000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OJT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usefulness</td>
<td>$-4.29 \ P &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$-4.61 \ P &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$-3.80 \ P &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$-8.47 \ P &lt; .000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effectiveness</td>
<td>$-7.89 \ &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$-7.92 \ &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$-6.98 \ &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$-11.44 \ &lt; .000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriateness</td>
<td>$-12.71 \ &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$-8.44 \ &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$-7.74 \ &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$-12.71 \ &lt; .000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cost effectiveness</td>
<td>$-7.89 \ &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$-7.92 \ &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$-6.98 \ &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$-11.44 \ &lt; .000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSE (Title I)</strong></td>
<td>$3.63 \ P &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$3.95 \ P &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$5.56 \ P &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$1.05 \ P &lt; .300$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usefulness</td>
<td>$3.63 \ &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$3.95 \ &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$5.56 \ &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$1.05 \ &lt; .300$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effectiveness</td>
<td>$6.19 \ &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$6.11 \ &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$7.22 \ &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$2.58 \ &lt; .011$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriateness</td>
<td>$7.67 \ &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$6.90 \ &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$8.03 \ &lt; .000$</td>
<td>$3.54 \ &lt; .001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cost effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12
Attitude toward Work Experience by Transferability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK EXPERIENCE:</th>
<th>ITRANS</th>
<th>ITOPSE</th>
<th>SIMULT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>$X^2=14.205 \quad P&lt;.716$</td>
<td>$X^2=28.966 \quad P&lt;.221$</td>
<td>$X^2=24.498 \quad P&lt;.328$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
<td>$X^2=19.440 \quad P&lt;.365$</td>
<td>$X^2=44.059 \quad P&lt;.008$</td>
<td>$X^2=21.906 \quad P&lt;.585$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effectiveness</td>
<td>$X^2=17.167 \quad P&lt;.512$</td>
<td>$X^2=55.180 \quad P&lt;.000$</td>
<td>$X^2=39.967 \quad P&lt;.022$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness</td>
<td>$X^2=17.511 \quad P&lt;.488$</td>
<td>$X^2=38.013 \quad P&lt;.004$</td>
<td>$X^2=10.479 \quad P&lt;.915$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
appropriate \((X^2 = 44.059, P < .008)\), cost effective \((X^2 = 55.180, P < .000)\) and useful \((X^2 = 38.013, P < .004)\) activity. Additionally, a majority of prime sponsors, (seventy-five [75] percent) reported that less than twenty-five (25) percent of their adult participants were enrolled in two Title I activities simultaneously, yet perceive work experience as cost effective \((X^2 = 39.967, P < .022)\). Thus, hypothesis 5 is refuted. The hypothesis assumes that a prime sponsor who has positive perceptions about work experience would use work experience as a supplement to other activities (e.g., work experience and classroom training simultaneously) or work experience as a precursor to another activity (e.g., work experience then on-the-job training, work experience then PSE) rather than as an end in itself. However, from the data, it appears that the majority of delivery systems do not foster the transfer of adult Title I participants from one Title I activity to another, from one Title I activity to Title II or VI or enrollment of an adult participant in two Title I activities simultaneously. Several possible explanations may be offered for these findings. First, prime sponsor size tends to affect the delivery of services. Smaller cities and counties are more likely to have integrated delivery systems whereas larger urban areas and consortia often tend to retain categorical type programming whereby each local governmental jurisdiction can maintain control over segments of the CETA program (Mirengoff and Rindler, 1978; Ripley, 1978). Second,
categorical programs may permit better handling of particular target groups because of the need to understand their special problems. Third, the shift toward integrated service delivery does not happen naturally, but it requires continuous effort on the part of the prime sponsors and its subgrantees in order to design and implement the mechanism to transfer participants. And, finally, few prime sponsors may have the inclination, time, or perhaps talent to operate a delivery system which encourages transferability.

Hypothesis 6: If subgrantees are selected in order to provide the most effective employment and training services, then the effectiveness of employment and training activities will be higher.

Hypothesis 6 proposes that if prime sponsors select subgrantees in order to provide the most effective employment and training activities, then there will be an increase in the successful completion of employment and training activities. To test this hypothesis, prime sponsors were asked to rank order (1=most impact to 7=least impact) seven factors present in the employment and training literature reported to impact upon the selection of prime sponsor subgrantees. In this study, prime sponsors reported that the following factors affect the selection of subgrantees: subgrantees' prior performance (\( \bar{X} = 2.34 \)) followed by the absence of alternative service deliverers (\( \bar{X} = 3.20 \), the decision to serve a particular
target group ($\bar{X}=3.60$), a subgrantee provided activities and/or services pre-CETA and therefore continues, ($\bar{X}=3.63$), a subgrantee provided activities and/or services pre-CETA ($\bar{X}=3.72$), economic conditions ($\bar{X}=4.23$) and political conditions ($\bar{X}=5.19$).

When the above data are analyzed by placement rate, the following pattern appears:

- The absence of alternative service deliverers. The impact of this factor appears to be evenly distributed from most to least impact regardless of placement rate ($X^2=17.734$, $P<.124$).

- Decision to serve particular target group. The impact of this factor appears to be normally distributed among prime sponsors from most to least impact, regardless of placement rate ($X^2=9.352$, $P<.673$).

- Economic conditions. Sixty-seven (67) percent of the prime sponsors with high placement rates ranked economic conditions as a factor with high impact, as opposed to thirty (30) percent of the prime sponsors achieving low placement rates and twenty-nine (29) percent achieving moderate placement rates ($X^2=25.440$, $P<.013$).

- Political considerations associated with the subgrantee. Sixty-two (62) percent of the prime sponsors with high placement rates ranked political considerations as having a great deal of impact, while seventeen (17) percent and twelve (12) percent of the prime sponsors with
low and moderate placement rates respectively ranked political considerations as having a great deal of impact \( (X^2=67.523 \ P<.000) \).

- Quality of subgrantee prior performance. This factor is reported to have a great deal of impact by prime sponsors who achieved high placement rates (95 percent) moderate placement rates (83 percent) and low placement rates (70 percent) \( (X^2=24.203 \ P<.019) \).

- Provided activities and/or services pre-CETA. Seventy-seven (77) percent of the prime sponsors with high placement rates, eighty-three (83) percent with moderate placement rates and seventy (70) percent with low placement rates reported that this fact has impact \( (X^2=27.280 \ P<.007) \)

- Provided activities and/or services pre-CETA and therefore continues. Regardless of the placement rate, a majority of prime sponsors ranked this factor as having impact \( (X^2=11.500, \ P<.487) \).

The selection of subgrantees is often viewed as a political decision (Mirengoff and Rindler, 1976; Ripley, 1977, 1978). This study reveals that the influence of political considerations is present in prime sponsors with high placement rates as is the influence of economic conditions. Subgrantee prior performance is also perceived to be a salient factor in the selection of subgrantees as is the continue funding of subgrantees who operated employment and training
programs pre-CETA. The identification of subgrantee prior performance as the primary factor affecting the selection of subgrantees by a majority of prime sponsors and by fifty-three (53) percent of the prime sponsors with high placement rates and fifty-nine (59) percent of the prime sponsors with moderate placement rates lends support to hypothesis 6.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, POLICY IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

On December 23, 1973, CETA was signed into law. It was the first piece of legislation to incorporate the essential principles of Special Revenue Sharing by reducing the proliferation of employment and training programs present during the sixties into a decategorized, decentralized delivery system. While the original CETA legislation did not authorize any new employment and training activities or services, it consolidated the authorization for many of the existing employment and training services, and it accomplished two significant administrative changes in the process: decentralization and decategorization of employment and training programs.

Since 1973, the basic framework of a decentralized, decategorized employment and training delivery system has been put into place. However, as employment and training policy has evolved and as CETA has been amended, we can trace both the development and partial erosion of the decentralized, decategorized delivery system without having assessed whether its theoretical framework (i.e., coordinated service delivery) tested in the administrative initiatives (e.g., CAMPS,
Comprehensive Employment Program, Comprehensive Manpower Program) are correct.

The idea that a comprehensive delivery system is better than an independent delivery system has been accepted primarily because of the obvious duplication of services provided in the past and its intuitive appeal. This study sought to answer the broad question: Which types of CETA delivery systems seem to be effective? It posed a basic question about the delivery of employment and training programs by inquiring whether more comprehensive service delivery systems provide more effective employment and training programs.

In order to answer the question, this study identified the history of employment and training policy. Specifically, Chapter I focused upon the trend toward comprehensive service delivery under CETA and recent federal efforts aimed at eroding comprehensive service delivery through the addition of categorical programs. The implementation of Title I was selected as the focus of this study because it was assumed in 1974 that Title I was where the concept of a decentralized, decategorized delivery system would be implemented since its appropriation was larger than all of the other Titles combined and it included the major institutional changes to be made in the delivery system. However, a survey of the literature supports the view that the decentralized, decategorized delivery system first envisioned under CETA is being chipped away through a series of federal initiatives (e.g.,
Title VI, STIP). This shift away from comprehensive service delivery has also been effected by the presence of categorical program service deliverers which were already in place when CETA was passed and were not easily redirected or displaced by the new prime sponsors' initiatives.

Chapter II traced the development of employment and training policy from its origins to the passage of and amendments to CETA. To understand employment and training policy development, the legislative and executive actions are traced through the development of intergovernmental relations policy. The overlapping authority model which "describes intergovernmental relations as patterned, interdependent, and bargained behavior among national, state and local officials" was used (Wright, 1978:30).

The research methodology used to collect data was discussed in Chapter III. Specifically, each hypothesis was identified and the data used to test each hypothesis was described. Chapter IV presents the findings of this study.

Summary of the Study

Of the three hundred forty-six (346) questionnaires mailed to prime sponsors, two hundred forty-seven (247) or seventy-one (71) percent completed and returned the twenty-eight (28) page item questionnaire developed for this study. The questionnaire items were selected to provide background information about the prime sponsor like number of residents; unemployment rate; program data (e.g., number of
persons served under Title I); design of the Title I delivery system; attitudes toward Title I activities; involvement of different actors in the design of the Title I delivery system and on the planning council; and attitudes toward work experience.

Six hypotheses were tested which yielded the following findings.*

1) There is no significant difference between the placement rates of prime sponsors who operate comprehensive, mixed, or independent delivery systems.

2) There is no significant difference between those prime sponsors reporting a high degree of understanding of the theory behind experiential learning and an increase in transferability of adult participants within and between Titles.

3) There is a significant difference between those prime sponsors reporting a high level of commitment to the economically disadvantaged and an increase in the successful completion of employment and training activities.

4) There is no significant difference in the distribution of decision-making in prime sponsors with high, moderate, or low placement rates.

5) There is no significant difference between those

* The .05 level of confidence was established as the required level of significance for testing the hypotheses.
prime sponsors with positive perceptions toward work experience and increased transferability of adult participants within and between Titles.

6) There is a significant difference between the factors that affect prime sponsor selection of subgrantees and placement rates.

Conclusions

In the following paragraphs, major conclusions are drawn from the hypotheses tested.

1) The type of prime sponsor delivery system does not appear to affect different placement rates. The findings regarding the type of prime sponsor delivery system and placement yielded no significant differences. However, the conclusion should not be accepted at face value, for several reasons. First, over eighty (80) percent of the prime sponsors reported that they operate a mixed delivery system. Although this finding follows the patterns appearing in the Snedeker and Snedeker (1979) and Mirengoff and Rindler (1978) studies which reported that prime sponsors are moving toward comprehensive service delivery, the distribution of responses was skewed. Therefore, it was not possible to allow for a rigorous test of the hypotheses. Thus, while the findings of this study follow the findings of other studies, the skewed distribution leads the author to conclude that the prime sponsors had difficulty in discriminating between indicators along each of the three dimensions that were
summed to categorize the type of delivery system. Secondly, because of the difficulty of collecting other indicators of success through a mail questionnaire, the definition of successful completion of employment and training programs was limited to the Title I FY 1978 placement rate. Given these two limiting factors, the author believes that the hypothesis requires additional investigation using a research methodology such as case study that might better answer the question. The case study is suggested for several reasons. Despite the limitations to this methodology (e.g., difficulties of generalizability of findings), it attempts to describe and analyze a program in qualitative and complex terms, often as it unfolds over a period of time. It is the holistic quality of the case study, i.e., its attempt to capture as many variables as possible and often to include descriptions of history and context, that is important. Since the CETA delivery system is both dynamic and complex, it became apparent in this study that prime sponsors were not able to discriminate between indicators along the three dimensions used to categorize prime sponsor delivery systems. The case study would eliminate prime sponsors' self-labeling of their activities and would allow researchers to expand the definition of successful completion of employment and training activities. Thus, by using research techniques that are often associated with the case study, such as observation and interviews, the interplay of
different factors and forces may be more clearly identified.

2) **Decision-making within prime sponsors is not distributed among critical actors.** Regardless of the prime sponsor's placement rates, the staff is reported to have the most influence in designing the Title I delivery system, followed by the planning council. Subgrantees, elected officials, and the DOL representative are reported to have some or little influence. Similarly, the staff is reported to have the most influence in the planning council. These findings confirm those of Mirengoff and Rindler (1978), who reported that the staff is at the locus of decision-making and that the move toward participatory decision-making has been slow.

These findings are not surprising. The sixties introduced a period where the initiative for social change shifted from associations dependent upon interested parties and acting outside of organized society toward professionalized social change organizations. Inherent in this shift was the rise of professional social problem experts. "Holding staff positions in established organizations, and acting without strong or decisive stimulation from the beneficiaries of the activity, these professionals became increasingly prominent, both in the identification and diagnosis of social problems and in the design and implementation of solutions for them" (Jenkins, 1977:568). Jenkins (1975) illustrated this trend in a case study of the National
Council of Churches where he found that the direction goal transformation takes within an organization is specified by the context of the elite ideology.

3) **Subgrantee prior performance is the main factor affecting the selection of subgrantees by prime sponsors with high and moderate placement rates.** Although the literature supports the view that selection of subgrantees is often a political decision (Mirengoff and Rindler, 1976; Ripley, 1977, 1978), this study found that subgrantee prior performance was reported to be a salient factor in the selection of subgrantees. This finding leads one to look at the shifts in prime sponsor program management, since it appears that more attention is being paid to this effort. Specifically, it suggests that as CETA staff acquired more expertise, the monitoring and evaluation information became integrated elements of the staff's decision-making process and affected that decision-making. Secondly, prime sponsor planning efforts (e.g., needs assessments, labor market analysis) have become more sophisticated as prime sponsors continue to operate CETA programs and acquire expertise. Thus, subgrantees' prior performance may now be measured, evaluated, analyzed, and used as an aid in judging alternatives in prime sponsor subgrantee selection. Additionally, subgrantees have developed performance "track records" over time against which their performance may be studied longitudinally.
The use of program evaluation as a management tool underlies the current body of evaluation literature (Phi Delta Kappa, 1971; Patton, 1978). Whether evaluation is used formatively and/or summatively, the design of an evaluation system into a program can provide decision-makers with useful information for judging alternatives and for accountability. While there are multiple factors that impact upon most program decisions (e.g., political considerations, economic considerations), CETA is no exception. However, the emergence of subgrantee prior performance as a salient factor affecting the selection of subgrantees indicates a trend toward more professional program management through the existence of a commitment to improving program operations through evaluation techniques and the expertise required to measure subgrantee performance.

4) **Prime sponsors with high placement rates have a different attitude toward the economically disadvantaged than those prime sponsors with lower placement rates.** Prime sponsors with high placement rates have mixed feelings about Title I serving only the economically disadvantaged, but they do believe that more funds should be expended on the economically disadvantaged, that more economically disadvantaged people should be served in public service employment programs, and that CETA was designed to serve the unemployed regardless of the length of time they have been unemployed. Prime sponsors with lower placement rates
believe that too much money is expended on the economically disadvantaged, and that a smaller percent of money should be expended on the economically disadvantaged.

In order to achieve a high placement rate, it is generally accepted that the easiest way is to institute programs with quick placement as the outcome. Proportionately, participants who are not economically disadvantaged tend to complete programs successfully at a higher rate than the economically disadvantaged. Instituting programs for the economically disadvantaged that result in a high placement rate are lengthy and expensive. Therefore, it is interesting that when a prime sponsor achieves a high placement rate, they report themselves as having a higher level of commitment to the economically disadvantaged.

5) The presence of a high degree of understanding of the theory behind experiential learning does not lead to an increase in transferability of adult participants within and between Titles. Although this hypothesis was rejected, several patterns emerged from the data. First, less than twenty-five (25) percent of the prime sponsors reported that adult Title I participants are transferred from one Title I activity to another or from Title I to an activity under Title II or VI, or that they are enrolled in two Title I activities simultaneously. The limited transferability of participants, i.e., less than twenty-five (25) percent, raises questions regarding the type of individualized
services participants are actually receiving under the de-centralized, decategorized delivery systems. Second, regardless of a prime sponsor's placement rate or the percentage of participants transferred within or between Titles, prime sponsors report that experiential learning is a key part of training. This finding raises an interesting issue. CETA was designed to allow prime sponsors the flexibility to meet the individualized employability needs of the clientele. This is the antithesis of the type of programming available under the categorical pre-CETA programs. Although prime sponsors state their agreement with the concept that experiential learning is a key part of training, they simultaneously report the limited transferability of adult participants among and within Titles. Thus, this finding raises a question as to the extent to which prime sponsors' delivery systems provide participants with the opportunity to obtain individualized employability services.

6) Work experience is not used as a supplement to other employment and training activities and services. While prime sponsors report work experience to be an appropriate, cost effective, and useful activity, it is used neither as a supplement to other activities nor as a precursor to other activities. It is, rather, perceived as a limited activity. This finding follows the traditional categorical attitude toward employment and training programming where participants
enroll in one categorical type of program and complete it without receiving other activities and services. It also raises the point that CETA prime sponsors have not followed the trends in education (e.g., career education, cooperative programs, EHSIP) whereby experiential learning is integrated into the total learning experience.

The lack of use of work experience as a supplement to other employment and training activities is not surprising. Besides the legacy of categorical programming prevalent pre-CETA, the use of work experience as a supplementary activity requires prime sponsors to have the inclination, time and perhaps ability to design a more comprehensive delivery system. The study has found a shift toward more comprehensive service delivery; however, the majority of prime sponsors identified their delivery systems as mixed. While some services appear to be more integrated under mixed systems such as intake and job development, one might conclude that the activities appear to retain a categorical flavor.

Policy Implications and Recommendations

At this point, we may raise the important question: "What is the relationship between these findings and public administration?" This study undertook to examine the implementation of a piece of federal legislation, CETA, viewed from varied perspectives. For example, the public administration community views CETA as an intergovernmental relations issue whereby a series of categorical grants has been
consolidated into a decategorized system providing local governmental units with flexibility in designing and delivering employment and training activities and services. The economists view CETA as a tool for reducing the unemployment rate in depressed areas. However, the education community focuses on CETA as a means of training the disadvantaged both within and outside of the established educational system. Opinions about the successes and failures of CETA, as well as an understanding of manner in which CETA programs are actually designed and implemented, vary. Given the above, two major policy implications will be discussed: (1) the method by which public administration studies the implementation of public policies and programs, and (2) the future development of employment and training policy.

**Studying Implementation**

Public policies and programs, especially those in the human resources area, are dynamic and complex. Many actors and events critically impinge upon the direction by which these policies are formulated, implemented, evaluated, and then reformulated. This study aimed at understanding if (and how) the design of the prime sponsor delivery system affects one of its goals: increased participant placement. However, because of the survey methodology, several primary questions were not answered completely and the opportunity to follow up primary questions with secondary ones
emanating from the response to the primary questions that might lead to an increased understanding of CETA implementation, was not available. This raises an important question for public administration: How do we study the implementation of public policies and programs to improve them as they are implemented, as well as to reformulate the policies and programs efficiently and effectively?

Evaluation efforts have traditionally been considered to be inadequate and have had no substantial impact upon policy formulation or implementation (Phi Delta Kappa, 1971; Guba, 1978; Patton, 1978; Steele, 1977; Hamilton et al., 1977). This also holds true for employment and training evaluation efforts (Scanlon et al., 1972). The literature is replete with reasons for the failure of evaluation efforts. They included the following:

a) The fact that evaluation occurs in an action setting raises many questions about using traditional research methodology (i.e., experimental design) in evaluation. The randomization of subjects is often difficult, and it may be inequitable to deny services to eligible participants in order to maintain a randomized experiment (Stahler, 1972). In addition, control groups are often difficult to obtain.

b) Programs often have unclear and/or multiple objectives stressing individualized service delivery (Guttentag, 1973). This is especially true with employment and training
programs, which implement a variety of activities and services covering a multitude of program objectives (e.g., reducing poverty, reducing unemployment, increasing productivity of human resources) which may be competitive.

c) The imposition of artificial and arbitrary restraints on the scope of a study may lead to the neglect of other information salient to the implementation question (Hamilton et al., 1977).

d) Large samples needed to make statistical generalizations may lead to insensitivity to local perturbations and unusual effects, since atypical results are seldom studied in detail (Hamilton et al., 1971).

The problems cited above hamper evaluation efforts. These concerns become more critical in the evaluation of the implementation of large-scale social programs that are both diverse and complex in their purpose and administration. The intention here is not to berate the traditional research methodology. It is still very much with us and provides useful information on some kinds of questions. Rather, the point simply is that alternatives are available. As Hamilton et al. (1977) and Patton (1978) note, the application of an agricultural-botanical paradigm to the study of innovations is often a cumbersome and inadequate procedure. "We are not, of course, arguing here against the use of experimental, longitudinal, or survey research methods as such. Rather,
for the reasons suggested, we submit that they are usually inappropriate, ineffective, or insufficient for program evaluation purposes" (Hamilton et al., 1977:9).

Several alternative paradigms have been offered (Patton, 1978; Guba, 1978; Hamilton et al., 1977). Underlying each alternative paradigm is its commitment to naturalism, whereby behavioral specimens are collected that "reflect the actual temporal sequence of the behavior under analysis and . . . show how each interactant influenced and was influenced by all others in the behavioral situation" (Denzin, 1971:168). The alternative paradigms view the program from a holistic, inductive perspective, drawing on qualitative methodology, Gestalt psychology, phenomenology, and ethnography.

Although the primary strength of the alternative paradigms has often been perceived as their utility in concept and hypothesis development, it is the richness of information provided by these methodologies that is leading them again to the forefront in the evaluation of public policies and programs. Although these methods have traditionally been accepted and used in professions such as law, medicine, and journalism, they have had limited acceptance in social science research. However, the importance in the assessment of public policies cannot be overemphasized.

Several points raised by this study support this stance. First, public programs such as CETA are designed to be
individualized by providing local governmental jurisdictions with flexibility in the design and implementation of activities and services. As a result, it is difficult to generate hypotheses that hold true for all prime sponsors when CETA was designed to allow for and to encourage individual differences in local economic, geographic, and demographic conditions. Second, the methodological diversity of the CETA programs results in the existence of individual differences that are often difficult to categorize neatly and to compile into a survey instrument format. For example, in this study it appeared that prime sponsors had difficulty discriminating along the indicators in each of the three dimensions used to identify the delivery system. Third, public programs are dynamic, complex systems with varied task environments, rules, regulations, and purposes—both stated and unstated. Traditional methodologies focus on a small segment of the system and often attempt to hold it static artificially for research purposes. The approaches advocated by the alternative paradigms may be more appropriate to understanding the implementation of public programs, since these methodologies (e.g., observing, interviewing, gathering data unobtrusively) can both complement the data collected by the researcher/evaluator by providing an understanding of how the policy or program is being implemented and locate discrepancies between the findings collected from different data sources. This can lead the
researcher/evaluator to study, weigh and analyze the findings carefully in order to understand the discrepancies (Trend, 1978).

As stated earlier, the point here is not to berate experimental research designs. However, the information obtained through its associated research methodologies has not produced useful evaluation information (Patton, 1978). This issue becomes critical as policies and programs are implemented. For example, Weiss (1970) asks: If an employment and training program operates in an area and the unemployment rate remains the same, what do we know? Or, to rephrase the question, what information is available on which to base a reformulation of the program and policy?

The evaluation of CETA implementation has begun to move toward these alternative paradigms with such studies as the eighteen-month Youthwork National Policy Study at Cornell University and a series of cross-sectional case studies (e.g., Ripley, 1977, 1978; Mirengoff and Rindler, 1976, 1978). While these studies are expensive and labor intensive, a commitment to increasing monetary and human resources expended for this type of evaluation should result in aiding our understanding of how policies and programs are implemented. If not, policies will continue to be designed and redesigned without a complete understanding of how they work or do not work, under what conditions, and why. Chapters I and II of this study reveal employment and training
legislation as a patchwork attempt at designing a public policy. It has shifted from categorical, centralized programming to decategorical, decentralized programming to partially categorized, decentralized programming by responding to political and economic factors without knowing what services are most effective for whom under what conditions (Snedeker and Snedeker, 1979). Changes in the CETA legislation have continued to follow this pattern.

**Development of Employment and Training Policy**

Chapter II traced the development of employment and training policy through five phases of intergovernmental relations development (conflict, cooperative, concentrated, creative and competitive) and illustrated the changes in intergovernmental relations in the U.S. Employment and training policy has witnessed a shift from a response to the Depression of the 1930s, to an effort to stimulate economic growth in areas of high unemployment through the Area Redevelopment Act (1961) and the provision of education and training opportunities for the unemployed under the Manpower Development and Training Act (1962). The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 targeted its funds to the economically disadvantaged through multiple categorical programs (e.g., Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Operation Mainstream). Subsequent dissatisfaction with duplication of employment and training efforts led to the Concentrated Employment Program, CAMPS, Comprehensive Manpower Program,
and CETA. Shortly after CETA was enacted it was amended by an additional public service employment program (Title VI) and several categorical type programs (e.g., YEDPA, STIP) that many perceive to be an erosion of the decategorized, decentralized concept originally designed as the foundation of CETA.

Although the current CETA legislation is authorized through 1982, several situations have occurred that have affected the implementation of CETA, and thus the balance of power between the federal, state and local governments in delivering employment and training activities. Examples of these situations include (Snedeker and Snedeker, 1978):

1) The trend back toward categorical programming by adding new programs under CETA.

2) The increasing pressure on prime sponsors to use the employment service for placement, and the increasing pressure to service WIN, federal supplemental benefit recipients, and Trade Readjustment Act beneficiaries.

3) The increased efforts from the national office to link the employment services and CETA in order to deal with some service duplication (e.g., intake, referral, job development).

4) The increasing number of administrative guidelines from the national and regional offices.

5) The increased influence of regional offices as
grant review guidelines became more detailed, federal annual performance assessments more serious, and the required potential grant modifications more frequent.

6) The national performance standards threatened prime sponsor programming flexibility and fed the tendency of some prime sponsors to rationalize short-term, quick-placement programs while focusing little attention to employability development. Local flexibility was also threatened by national office efforts such as the 1976 attempt to limit work experience to a ninety-day enrollment.

7) The enforcement of a rehire formula for public service employees.

8) The prohibition of planning council members representing subgrantees or community-based groups from participating in discussions on service issues.

The eight examples above illustrate the beginning of a movement in the delivery of employment and training activities from decentralized, decategorized service delivery, an underpinning of Wright's (1978) competitive phase, toward efforts to categorize employment and training services. Together they identify strains in the relationship between federal, state, and local governments as they vie for more control over the delivery of employment and training services. Snedeker and Snedeker (1979:259-260) illustrate some
of these strains:

Two years into the era of decentralization and decategorization, it was apparent that many were having second thoughts. Chief among them was Congress for whom local decision-making was an abnormal and uncomfortable way of doing the public's business. Decentralization and decategorization offer Congress neither power nor recognition, whereas established programs directed from Washington provided both. And CETA proved to have a low level of national visibility. Because the programs are visibly active only within local communities, the general public does not seem to identify CETA activities with the federal government. Local elected officials, rather than members of Congress, are generally given the credit for program success. Since Congress is still responsible for overall accountability, complaints of disgruntled clients or would-be clients end up in their offices. Reports of program abuses or malfunctions result in particularly intense concern by Congress. The prospect of being blamed for program failures, coupled with a lack of knowledge or identification with positive program results, push members of Congress toward tighter federal control.

While there is little question that federal employment and training initiatives will continue to be funded, the format which these initiatives will take is subject to several variations, such as (1) continuing CETA in its present form past 1982, whereby existing legislation (e.g., Vocational Education Act) authorizes programs and activities outside the CETA delivery system; (2) enacting new legislation that would alter present decategorized and decentralized design; and (3) continuing the CETA past 1982 but eliminating its categorical elements.
The dismantling by Congress of the decentralized, de-
categorized model under Title I is fairly unlikely, given the
rise of a coalition of state and local interest groups that
support decentralization. However, decentralization will
probably be marred by increased federal control. As the
eyear steps in this shift (noted above) indicate, we will
probably witness the Congress debating proposals for a new
Title I program that provides more categorical programming
and increased earmarking of funds for special purposes
under the nationally administered Titles. Also, inherent
in this discussion is the purpose or goal that will be
attributed to CETA. Currently, the Congress has authorized
many programmatic alternatives to CETA, such as vocational
rehabilitation, employment service, vocational and trade
adjustment. As the Congress continues to appropriate
limited resources, the competition among these programs will
grow. Simultaneously, CETA will be increasingly compared to
other alternative modes of providing employment and training
services.
March 12, 1979

Dear CETA Administrator:

A graduate research project is being conducted to assess the administration of the FY 1978 Title I CETA program. This information will be used to help us to better understand the operation of Title I CETA programs.

We are particularly desirous of obtaining your responses because your experience in operating CETA programs will contribute significantly toward providing us with an understanding of how CETA Title I programs are administered. The enclosed questionnaire has been tested with a sampling of prime sponsors and we have revised it in order to make it possible for us to obtain all necessary data while requiring a minimum of your time. The average time required for a prime sponsor staff member to complete the questionnaire was between 10-15 minutes. So, please take a few minutes to complete the questionnaire and have a copy of coffee on us. We have also enclosed a pencil for your convenience.

It will be appreciated if you would complete the questionnaire by Monday, March 19, and return it in the stamped envelope enclosed. Other phases of the project cannot be carried out until we complete the analysis of the questionnaire data. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Janet Spirer Weiskott
Graduate Research Associate

JSW/ml
Enclosures
March 20, 1979

Dear CETA Administrator:

Last week you received a questionnaire concerning the administration of your FY 1978 Title I CETA program. This is just a reminder to ask your help in completing and returning that questionnaire. If you have already done so, thank you. If not, your reply is needed to help us to better understand the operation of Title I CETA programs.

It will only take 10-15 minutes for you to complete the questionnaire. So, please take a few minutes to answer the questionnaire and have a cup of coffee on us. We have also enclosed a pencil for your convenience. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Janet Spirer Weiskott
Graduate Research Associate

Enclosures
Appendix C

CETA TITLE I QUESTIONNAIRE

Your cooperation in this research is kindly appreciated. Your answers are very important because they will help to increase our understanding of how CETA is administered. ALL QUESTIONS REGARDING YOUR TITLE I PROGRAM REFER TO THE FY 1978 CETA PROGRAM. The questionnaire will take 10 to 15 minutes of your time to complete. Please answer all of the questions. The confidentiality of your responses is assured.

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Please check (✓) the appropriate box.

1. This prime sponsor is a:
   - single city?
   - single county?
   - consortium?

2. The area this prime sponsor covers is generally considered to be:
   - urban?
   - rural?

3. The number of persons residing in this prime sponsorship is:
   - 100,000 to 300,000?
   - 300,001 to 500,000?
   - 500,001 to 750,000?
   - 750,001 to 1,000,000?
   - Over 1,000,000?

4. The average unemployment rate in this prime sponsorship during FY 78 was:
   - less than 4.0%?
   - 4.0% to 6.0%?
   - Over 6.0%?

II. TITLE I PROGRAMS

5. Which of these statements best describes the degree of coordination in the adult component of your Title I program? (check one)
   - 5.1 There is little coordination so each subgrantee acts independently, e.g., participants are rarely transferred from one activity (such as work experience) to another.
   - 5.2 There is occasional coordination among subgrantees, e.g., the employment service and vocational education agency coordinate in skill training.
   - 5.3 Subgrantees coordinate their programs but they operate separately, e.g., they refer participants to each other more than occasionally.
   - 5.4 All Title I activities and services are coordinated in a system operated through manpower center(s), e.g., participants frequently transfer from one Title I activity or service to another.
   - 5.5 All Title I activities and services are coordinated with Title II and VI programs, e.g., participants are often transferred from Title I to PSE programs.

6. Which of these statements best describes the range of options available to adult participants in your Title I program? (check one)
   - 6.1 All Title I activities are open to participants depending upon his/her assessed needs and available slots.
   - 6.2 More than one kind of Title I activity (but not all activities) is open to participants depending upon his/her assessed needs and available slots.
   - 6.3 Participants have only one option of a Title I activity.
7. Which of these statements best describes the type of guidance services an adult participant receives in your Title I program? (check one)

☐ 7.1 Participants are assigned to a counselor or team and are served by the counselor or team throughout the time in the program.

☐ 7.2 Participants are transferred from one activity to another and return to intake/assessment for job development and placement.

☐ 7.3 Participants are referred from intake to activity and receive services from different counselors at each phase of the program.

☐ 7.4 Participants transfer from one component to another and receive very limited counseling.

8. Who has the most to least impact on what the Title I program mix will be? (Rank from 1 to 4 where 1 = the most impact and 4 = the least impact.)

Prime sponsor staff
Elected officials
Planning council
Subgrantees

9. Which Title I activities and services are contracted out by your prime sponsor?


10. Which activities and services are not contracted out by your prime sponsor?


11. How satisfied are you with the mix of operating responsibilities?


12. Rank your prime sponsor's preferences for each of these activities under ideal conditions and under FY 1978 circumstances from 1 to 4 where 1 = most preferred and 4 = least preferred.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Under</th>
<th>Preferred Under</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Conditions</td>
<td>FY 1978 Conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.1 Classroom training
12.2 OJT
12.3 PSE (Title I)
12.4 Work experience

13. Place a check (x) in the appropriate space between the pair of words that reflects how your prime sponsor feels about each of these activities to serve adult participants in the FY 1978 Title I program.

13.1 Classroom training

Useful Ineffective Appropriate Cost effective

Useless Effective Inappropriate Cost ineffective

13.2 OJT

Useful Cost effective Effective Inappropriate

Useless Cost ineffective Ineffective Appropriate
13.3 PSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Cost effective</th>
<th>Appropriate</th>
<th>Useless</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Cost ineffective</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13.4 Work experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Appropriate</th>
<th>Cost effective</th>
<th>Useless</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Cost ineffective</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

III. TITLE I PLANNING

14. How many persons serve on your planning council? ________________

15. How often does your planning council meet? ________________

16. Do you usually have a quorum in attendance? ________________

17. How coordinated is your Title I planning with planning for other titles?
   - [ ] Not coordinated?
   - [ ] Somewhat coordinated?
   - [ ] Very coordinated?

18. How much say or influence do and should each of these groups have in designing your Title I delivery system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAVE</th>
<th>SHOULD HAVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little or no influence</td>
<td>Prime sponsor staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some influence</td>
<td>Planning council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite a bit of influence</td>
<td>Subgrantees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great deal of influence</td>
<td>Elected officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very great deal of influence</td>
<td>DOL representative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. How much say or influence do and should each of these groups have on your planning council?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prime sponsor staff</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocational education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized labor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry/business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community based organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans representative/groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. Which factors have the most to least impact in determining how your prime sponsor selects subgrantees? (Rank from 1 to 7 where 1 = the most impact and 7 = the least impact.)

   20.1 Absence of alternative subgrantees?
   20.2 Decisions to serve particular target groups?
   20.3 Economic conditions?
   20.4 Political considerations associated with the subgrantee?
   20.5 Quality of a subgrantee’s prior performance?
   20.6 Provided activities and/or services before CETA?
   20.7 Provided activities and services since CETA and therefore continues?

21. Which factors have the most to least impact in determining how changes in your Title I delivery system are made? (Rank from 1 to 4 where 1 = the most impact and 4 = the least impact.)

   21.1 Evaluation of subgrantee performance?
   21.2 Opinions of prime sponsor staff?
   21.3 Opinions of planning council members?
   21.4 Opinions of elected officials?

22. Has your Title I program changed since FY 1975? □ Yes □ No

   Note the most important changes in:

   22.1 Programs offered
   22.2 Participants served
   22.3 Subgrantees funded

23. Respond to the following statements according to the policies of your prime sponsor.

   23.1 Title I should only serve the economically disadvantaged. □ □ □ □ □
   23.2 Too large a percentage of funds are spent on the economically disadvantaged. □ □ □ □ □
   23.3 More economically disadvantaged people should be served in the PSE programs. □ □ □ □ □
   23.4 This prime sponsor should spend a larger percentage of its money on the economically disadvantaged. □ □ □ □ □
   23.5 A majority of PSE participants should be economically disadvantaged. □ □ □ □ □
   23.6 CETA was designed to serve only the economically disadvantaged. □ □ □ □ □
   23.7 CETA was designed to serve the unemployed, regardless of the length of time they have been unemployed. □ □ □ □ □
   23.8 Title I funds should be used to rehire laid off city or county workers. □ □ □ □ □
24. Respond to the following statements according to the policies of your prime sponsor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.1 Most kinds of skills are better learned through experience than in a classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.2 Learning through experience is the best learning mode for disadvantaged persons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.3 The best kind of learning occurs in the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.4 Learning through experience is a key part of training.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.5 Classroom learning is the best learning mode for disadvantaged persons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. Respond to the following statements according to the policies of your prime sponsor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25.1 Work experience primarily is intended to be a short-term activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.2 Work experience primarily is intended to be a part-time activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.3 Work experience primarily should be used as a full-time activity (i.e., not combined with other activities or services).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.4 Work experience primarily should be used simultaneously with other Title I activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.5 Work experience primarily should be used simultaneously with other Title I services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.6 Work experience primarily is intended to be an income maintenance program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.7 Work experience primarily is intended to help participants develop employment goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.8 Work experience primarily is intended to prepare participants for entering other activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.9 Work experience is primarily intended to prepare participants for job placement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.10 Work experience primarily is intended to enhance the employability of those who have never worked.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.11 Work experience primarily is intended to enhance the employability of those who have been out of the workforce.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.12 Work experience primarily is intended to serve those participants who may not successfully complete other activities (e.g., OJT).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. PROGRAM DATA

26. Using your September 30, 1978 Title I Quarterly Progress Report, complete the following information:

26.1 Total number of persons served?

26.2 Total number of persons that entered employment?

26.3 Total number of other positive terminations?

26.4 Total amount of Title I expenditures (including $112 funds)?

27. What percentage of your adult Title I participants during FY 1979 were enrolled in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less than 25%</th>
<th>25% to 50%</th>
<th>51% to 75%</th>
<th>Over 75%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.1 Classroom training?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.2 OJT?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.3 PSE (Title I)?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.4 Work experience?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. At the end of FY 79, what percentage of your adult Title I participants would you say:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less than 25%</th>
<th>25% to 50%</th>
<th>51% to 75%</th>
<th>Over 75%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.1 Transferred from one Title I activity to another Title I activity?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.2 Transferred from one Title I activity to Title II or VI?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.3 Participated in two Title I activities simultaneously?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

Please return to: Janet Spirer Weiskott
School of Public Administration
The Ohio State University
102 Haggerty Hall
1775 College Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210
Appendix D

In the collective analysis of the data, several considerations should be kept in mind. First, the data collected during the Spring of 1979 dealt with program operations during FY 1978. Although all items referred to the FY 1978 program operations, it is acknowledged that prime sponsors may have responded to the items in Sections I, II and III of the survey instrument by recalling activities that occurred during the FY 1979 program operations. Section IV of the survey instrument reemphasized that the items referred to FY 1978 program operations. Thus, the data obtained from the different sections of the survey instrument may not be truly compatible.

Over one half of the respondents represented relatively small prime sponsors (serving population areas of between 100,000 to 300,000 residents); thus it may be assumed that the persons responding to the survey instrument on each prime sponsor was either the CETA director or a person directly reporting to him or her, given the generally small number of persons retained on the prime sponsor staff.

Third is the original design of the survey instrument. It was anticipated that items 23 and 25 would be used to construct two scales using factor analysis procedures. However, in analyzing the data through factor analysis, the eight (8) sub-items under item 23 nor the twelve (12) sub-items under item 25 were able to be defined as scales.
LIST OF REFERENCES

Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations. The comprehensive employment and training act: early readings from a hybrid block grant. Washington, D.C., 1977.


Barocci, T. A., & Myers, C. A. CETA in eastern Massachusetts. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1977 (NTIS NO. PB 271 308)


