The literature review represents an initial segment of a study providing a comprehensive analysis of available data to determine the impact of institutional training on women. The literature review concerned secondary data sources such as national labor force statistics and government data relating to women as enrollees in manpower programs. Pertinent findings reflecting the analysis of previous studies in terms of women include:

1. Emphasis appeared to be placed on training for women in high demand occupations, i.e., those with high turnover rates.
2. Female trainees were seriously hampered by the lack of counseling, supportive services and flexible training schedules.
3. Male trainees had more job alternatives available to them and were therefore less dependent on the training program.

Three major sections of the document deal with:

1. Labor force status, programs, and problems of women.
2. Analysis of Manpower Development Training Act (MDTA) and other evaluation studies.
3. Interviews with Federal officials.

Appendices offer a questionnaire for Federal interviews, recommendations to address MDTA internal and external problem areas, and an eight-page bibliography.
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SUMMARY

The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, created the MDTA Institutional program, which provides occupational training for disadvantaged and low-income persons. Amendments during the sixties broadened the statute to allow still more responsiveness to the needs of the unemployed and to give the states greater control over the programs. Several other manpower programs were designed during the same decade to meet the needs of special target groups. Yet, despite the legal gains and the increased opportunities for participation in federal programs extended to male and female members of the targeted groups, the unequal status of women and the economic effects of sex discrimination persist.

The literature review was conducted to provide data to facilitate the development of a research design for assessment of institutional training program impact and effectiveness in preparing women for entry and re-entry into the labor market. Factors addressed included the labor force status and employment problems of women, as well as the design, organization and content of institutional training programs and post-training employment results.

The labor force participation of women has undergone rapid growth from 1945 to the present. By 1972, the proportion of all
Women of working age in the labor force had risen to 43.8 percent from 35.7 percent in 1945. The percentage of working wives has also increased, and while their income is smaller than that of their husbands, it is generally regarded as necessary income if the family is to reach or maintain a desired standard of living.

The entry of housewives into the labor market was facilitated by several factors:

- Increased work opportunities
- Decrease in the birth rate
- The availability of relatively inexpensive labor-saving equipment for use in the home, which has freed more of the housewife's time to seek paid employment

National labor force and MDTA studies which contain data breakouts for women fall into three general categories:

1. Those studies which focus on the dual role of women— that of supplemental wage earner and that of child raiser and household manager;
2. Those studies directed toward an investigation of institutional training program features which affect the subsequent employment of graduates; and
3. Those studies which generated findings on the question of program effectiveness and the differences between male and female graduates.

For women, the decision to work is often a function of their family status. The labor force participation of women appears to be positively related to her educational attainment and a favorable ii
attitude on the part of her spouse, but is inversely related to her husband's earnings.

Although 87 percent of the 33.3 million women in the civilian labor force in 1973 were white, black women report higher labor force participation rates than white women. Yet, the hourly pay is lower for black than white women in every educational attainment category except those with 13 or more years of schooling. The resultant pattern of downward mobility appears to be related to inadequate education as well as employment discontinuity.

When the studies which focused on program features are looked at in terms of women, pertinent findings surface: Emphasis appeared to be placed on training for women in so-called high demand occupations, i.e., those with high turnover rates. Female trainees were seriously hampered by the lack of counseling, supportive services, and flexible training schedules.

For studies on program effectiveness, the principal achievement measures utilized included: attendance, completion and placement rates, job retention rates, post-training wage rates, employment level and post-training relevance. Data indicated the following: Retention rates were lower in female dominated fields, even though initial placement rates were higher. Male trainees had more job alternatives available to them and were therefore less dependent on the training program.
As part of the literature search, interviews were conducted with federal manpower program officials in the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to obtain information and data relevant to the development of the field study research design.

Officials within the Office of Education, Office of Employment Development and the United States Employment Service who have substantial decision-making authority over the Institutional program were also interviewed.

Survey findings indicate that:

The majority of those interviewed felt that the needs of women should be spotlighted due to the prevailing patterns of sex discrimination, inequality and stereotyping.

The current neglect of women as a group was also frequently cited.

The most frequently mentioned needs of women were child care and special counseling and/or training during and after the formal training period.

Two of the most frequently mentioned explanations for the concentration of women trainees in clerical and health-related components were the attitude that these are traditional female occupations and the prevalence of jobs in these fields.

"Job satisfaction" followed by "annual income" and "placement in a training-related job" were rated by federal officials as the most significant factors in determining the success of training programs for individual women trainees.

Factors within the MDTA system that influence program outcomes for trainees fall into six major categories: legislation, guidelines, and/or regulations; funding; scope and flexibility of training programs; job placement efforts; and administration and staff patterns.
External factors affecting program outcomes included labor market conditions; sexist attitudes of society; and licensing, certification and regulatory practices. Enforcement of existing anti-discrimination laws, and the improvement of Institutional programs were the most frequently cited roles of government regarding the status of women in manpower programs. In light of the proposed decentralization of federal programs, the responsibilities of the federal government for manpower programming should include: establishing national priorities, monitoring overall performance of prime sponsors, developing models for potential use by prime sponsors and providing technical assistance.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

The role of women both in the home and in the labor force has undergone a remarkable transformation in the past thirty years. As a result of labor shortages during both World War II and the Korean War, women entered the labor force in large numbers and filled positions which formerly had been held by men. Women continued to enter the labor force in increasing numbers after mobilization efforts ceased. A comparison between men and women of the average numbers in the labor force in 1947 and 1968 illustrates this fact. The comparison reveals that the number of women in the civilian labor force increased by 75 percent (from 16.7 to 29.2 million), while that figure for men rose only 16 percent (from 42.7 to 49.5 million).1/

In the sixties, the right of women to equal opportunity became part of an emerging demand for the revision of traditional concepts of societal roles and the elimination of disadvantage status for sub-groups of the general population. The Equal Pay Act of 1963, the several amendments to the Manpower Training and Development Act of 1962, and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 set the stage for the development of national manpower and civil rights authorities which were given specific charges to eliminate job discrimination and to remove barriers to the entry and equitable participation of women in the labor force. Yet the concentration
of women remain in sex-typed occupations, such as the health, clerical and service fields, which offer low pay and little or no progress up career ladders of opportunity. Despite the attainment of legal rights of access, women have yet to see a fulfillment of the promise of the sixties.

It is against the background of these trends and developments that the following review of the research literature and relevant data of the MDTA Institutional program and its effects has been conducted. Such factors as the labor force status and employment problems of women have been assessed, as well as the design, organization and content of MDTA training programs, and post-training employment results.

The purpose of this literature review was to provide data to facilitate the development of a research design for the assessment of MDTA program impact and effectiveness in preparing women for entry and re-entry into the labor market.

Chapter II provides an examination of the national labor force position of women, manpower programs and problems encountered by female workers. Chapter III highlights several major evaluative studies of the MDTA Institutional program and other relevant studies to determine the factors, both positive and negative, which affect women in the program. Chapter IV reports the results of interviews with federal officials which were conducted as part of the data
gathering effort. A re-analysis of data from the MDTA (Outcome Study,\textsuperscript{1/} undertaken simultaneously with the literature review, is being presented under separate cover.

CHAPTER II

LABOR FORCE STATUS, PROGRAMS AND PROBLEMS OF WOMEN

This chapter first presents a profile of working women in America--their labor force and personal characteristics. Then, national manpower program offerings, women's legal status and their current employment problems will be examined.

PROFILE OF WORKING WOMEN

Although increases in labor force participation on the part of women occurred during the first four decades of this century, the years beginning with 1945 saw an accelerated rate of growth. Indeed, the 1973 Economic Report of the President assessed the marked increases since World War II as "one of the most important changes in the American economy in this century..."1/

By 1972, the proportion of all women of working age in the labor force had risen to 43.8 percent from 35.7 percent in 1945. Further, women accounted for 37.4 percent of the total work force compared with 29.6 percent in 1945.

## TABLE 2

**WOMEN IN THE LABOR FORCE, SELECTED YEARS, 1900-72**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Women in Labor Force (thousands)</th>
<th>Women in Labor Force as Percent of</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Labor Force</td>
<td>All Women of Working age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>19,270</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>18,412</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>20,584</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>23,272</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>26,232</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>31,560</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>33,320</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, and Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics

### The Working Wife

As of March, 1972, there were 21.3 million multiple-worker families\(^1\) or 55 percent of all families headed by married men in the labor force in March, 1972. Ten years earlier, multiple-worker families totaled 16.1 million, and comprised 45 percent of all such families.\(^2\) While the income of many married women is smaller than that of their husbands, it is generally regarded as necessary income if the family is to reach or maintain a desired

---

\(^1\) Statistics cited also reflect secondary earners other than the spouse.  
standard of living. "The average woman worker is a secretary who increases family income by about 25 percent, and this permits many lower middle class families to achieve middle class status, something the husband could not achieve for his family on his own." ¹/

Rapidly rising wage rates in the years during World War II served to attract increasing numbers of housewives into the labor force. After the war, entry into the labor force was facilitated by several factors: 1) increased work opportunities, particularly in the service sector where job availability increased 77 percent between 1950 and 1971; 2) changes in social values which heretofore had discouraged married women from seeking work; 3) the decrease in the birth rate which has resulted in the lowering of the age when many mothers enter or return to the labor market; and 4) the availability of relatively inexpensive labor-saving equipment for use in the home, which has freed the housewife for paid employment.

As indicated in Appendix A, Table 1, the percentage of married females (spouse present) in the labor force increased by 17.7 percent (from 23.8 to 41.5 percent) from March 1950 to March 1972. This increase is significantly larger than the

¹/ W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, Work in America, 1972, p. 43.
increase for single women (4.4 percent) or the increase for widowed, divorced or separated women (2.3 percent) during the same period of time.

Married women (husband present) with children increased their labor force participation rates from 1950 to 1972 regardless of the number of children. This increase was 18.2 percent for those with children under 6, 21.9 percent for those with children 6 to 17 and 12.4 percent for women with no children. (See Appendix A, Table 2)

Race, Age and Education

Of the approximately 33.3 million women in the civilian labor force in 1973, 29 million, or 87 percent, were white.\(^1\) However, while white women were numerically predominant, the rate at which they participated in the labor force when measured as a percentage of all white women of working age was lower than that of minority women, i.e., 43.2 percent compared with 48.7 percent, respectively.\(^2\)

There were few marked differences by race in the distribution of the work force by age group. The largest proportion of workers was in the 20-30 age category for both black and white.


\(^2\) Ibid., p. 131-132
With the exception of mothers of children under six years of age, many of whom prefer to remain at home while their children are young, the more education a woman has the more likely she is to work.¹/ While this is true for both black and white women, the overall proportion of better educated black women who seek work is higher than that of white women. This difference is most pronounced in the case of wives living with their husbands; 55 percent of the black wives were in the labor force compared to only 40 percent of white wives as of March, 1971.

**Occupational Distribution**

Within broad occupational groupings, women are more likely than men to be employed in lower-skilled, lower-paying jobs. Moreover, the broad occupational distribution of women has not changed significantly in the past decade despite the growth of technology which has diminished the role of physical strength in most occupations.

For example, more than 60 percent of all women in the 1970 labor force could be found in thirteen occupations, predominantly service or white collar. Four "clerical and kindred" occupations out of the thirteen accounted for 45 percent of the women. Further an analysis of census data conducted in 1969 indicated that 50 percent of all women in occupations classified by three-digit

DOT codes worked in only 21 of 250 possible categories, while the same percentage of men worked in 65 different occupations.1/

WOMEN AND MANPOWER PROGRAMS

The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, created the MDTA Institutional program (as well as the On-the-Job Training program). The first major piece of manpower training legislation, the act was passed as a response to anticipated high unemployment as a result of technological change and automation. Its original purpose was to "enable unemployed persons, primarily heads of families, whose skills have become obsolete, to acquire new skills which are in demand in the labor market."

The threat of widespread technological unemployment did not materialize, but the unemployment rate grew. It became apparent the disadvantaged were the primary victims of unemployment, i.e., the unskilled, undereducated, and inexperienced workers, many of whom were members of minority groups. Consequently, in 1966, the Administration established a national goal for MDTA programs, providing that 65 percent of those enrolled would be disadvantaged persons. Additional amendments during the sixties broadened

the statute to allow still more responsiveness to the needs of the unemployed, to focus more attention on the causes for their status, and to give the states greater control over the programs.

MDTA has been further interpreted and modified as the result of administrative action. In 1971, for example, a decision was made to give veterans first priority for service in all manpower programs, including the MDTA Institutional program. As a result of this decision, which was linked to changes in labor market conditions and the availability of training programs, the percentage of women in MDTA dropped to 36.8 percent in FY 1972 from a high of 44.6 percent in 1968.1/

The following table compares female enrollment percentages by major manpower programs. The data should be viewed in terms of

**TABLE 3**

TOTAL ENROLLMENT AND PERCENT FEMALE ENROLLMENT BY TRAINING PROGRAM, FY '72a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MDTA Institutional</th>
<th>PEP</th>
<th>JOB/OJT</th>
<th>JOBS</th>
<th>WIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td>150,600</td>
<td>226,100</td>
<td>82,100</td>
<td>82,800</td>
<td>120,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Female</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aMDTA Institutional includes enrollments from Skill Centers, Individual Referrals and Other Class-Size Projects.


1/ HEW Secretary's Report, FY 73, Appendix C, Table B-1.
of the goals and emphasis of the various programs. All training programs reflect the preference given to veterans by legislative or administrative action. The MDTA Institutional program is second only to WIN in percentage of female enrollees.

Female Enrollment Characteristics

Data on the characteristics of women in the MDTA Institutional program show the female enrollee to be more likely than the male to be black, disadvantaged, not a primary wage-earner, to experience longer unemployment, and to have a shorter work history.

TABLE 4
SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF MDTA INSTITUTIONAL ENROLLEES, FY 1972
N=150,600

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>95,200</td>
<td>55,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>75.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Family</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Wage-Earner</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gainfully Employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under 3 years</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-9 years</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years +</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Races</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HEW Secretary's Report 1973, Appendix C, Table B-2
Occupational Training Distribution

The occupational distribution of female enrollees in the MDTA Institutional program is presented in Table 5. Of all female enrollees in FY 1972, 96 percent were trained in only three categories: professional, clerical/sales and services. To illustrate further, 54.1 percent of female trainees were trained in clerical and sales positions, 19 percent in services and 22.9 percent in the professional, technical and managerial category, which for the most part, consists of health-related occupations. The remaining categories account for only 4 percent of all female trainees.

**TABLE 5**

**OCCUPATIONAL GROUP OF TRAINING OF PERSONS ENROLLED IN MDTA INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING IN FISCAL YEAR 1972: BY SEX**

N=150,600

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Occupational Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, technical and managerial</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and sales</td>
<td>27,100</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>14,900</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, fishery, forestry and related</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine trades</td>
<td>23,500</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchwork</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural work</td>
<td>27,300</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legal Status

The Employment Act of 1946 established in law the goals of "maximum employment" and "maximum production," which is expressed in the 1972 Economic Report of the President as follows "those who want work should be able to work in the employment in which they will be most productive." Since that time other laws have been passed and an executive order issued, which relate directly to discrimination in employment. As indicated in Table 6, they include the Equal Pay Act of 1963, which requires that men and women in the same establishment receive equal pay for equal work; Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination in employment by sex, race, color, religion, or national origin; the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972, which expands enforcement powers in discrimination cases, and extends coverage to previously excluded workers in state and local governments and educational institutions. In addition, since December 1971, federal contractors have been required under OFCC Order No. 4 (Executive Order 11246) to promote affirmative action plans to ensure all employees equal opportunities. With the passage of Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972, sex discrimination in education programs and activities is prohibited.

Certain Federal agencies, e.g., the U.S. Office of Education and the Department of Labor, have issued programs and guidelines
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law or Order</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal Pay Act</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Requires that men and women in the same establishment receive equal work for equal pay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title VII of Civil Rights Act</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Prohibits discrimination in employment by sex, race, color, religion, or national origin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunity Act</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Expands enforcement powers in discrimination cases and extends coverage to previously excluded workers in state and local governments and educational institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Order 11246</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Requires Federal contractors to promote affirmative action team plans to ensure all employees equal opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Law 92-261</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Strengthened fair employment legal sanctions applicable to private employment and state and local government, and provided greater rights for employees of the Federal Government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Law 92-318</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Prohibited sex discrimination in education programs and activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
on sex discrimination in vocational education and manpower training programs, warning local agencies of the consequences of non-compliance.

PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED BY WOMEN WORKERS

Despite the legal gains of the past decade and the opportunities for participation in federal programs extended to male and female members of targeted groups, substantial evidence exists of the unequal status of women and the persistent economic effects of sex discrimination.

For example, a major factor which limits the opportunities of women in the labor market is the widespread practice of occupational sex stereotyping, which "...occurs when there is a large majority of those in an occupation of one sex, and when there is an associated normative expectation that this is how things should be." Qualities necessary for success in sex-typed occupations are then projected to be either innate to men or women. Thus, occupations in which women predominate—nursing, clerical work, teaching, housekeeping—often are seen as an extensions of woman's traditional role as a homemaker. Similarly, occupations in which men predominate are believed to require masculine qualities. "Once such a division becomes established,

it tends to be self-perpetuating since each sex is socialized, trained and counseled into certain jobs and not into others."1/

Concentration in sex-typed occupations also influences the earning potential of women. Available evidence suggests that the higher the percentage of female employees within an occupation or industry, the lower are the hourly wages for both males and females. Moreover, the concentration of women within occupational categories characterized by low wages has a significant effect upon their incomes, as indicated in the recent analysis of census data for Washington, D. C. conducted by the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies.

About one-third of Washington's workers are among the working poor and almost a majority of these are black women employed as clerks and cleaning help in offices, stores and homes. Almost half of the low-wage workers were employed less than 50 weeks in the survey year and of these 55 percent were females. The largest occupational groups working less than full-time were in clerical, service, sales and laboring jobs. In addition, overall about 40 percent of the D. C. women working in 1969 earned less than $4,000 a year.2/

Of interest in this context are Department of Labor studies cited in the March 1973 Economic Report of the President, which report that the differential almost disappears when men's and women's earnings are compared within detailed job classifications and within the same establishment.3/ It would appear then, that

1/ Ibid, p. 54.
wage discrimination may be a less significant factor in the determination of wage rates for men and women who perform comparable work, than is job segregation.

The labor force participation of women is characterized more by discontinuity, that is, movement in and out of the labor force, than that of men. Although the length of time out of the labor force for child bearing and child rearing may be shorter today than in previous years, the interruption in work experience may also have long-term economic effects. Interrupted work history and the uneven pressures of home responsibilities may subject women to increased layoffs because of lack of seniority, may affect the amount of skill training they are exposed to, and/or may limit their eligibility for promotions. Women with breaks in employment are also at a competitive disadvantage with men of the same age because of reduced job experience.

Discontinuity must be differentiated from job instability characterized by high quit rates. U.S. Department of Labor statistics for 1972 indicated that men were unemployed primarily because they lost their last jobs and secondarily because they re-entered the labor force. On the other hand, the fact that they had lost their last job and re-entered the labor force were both reasons of equal weight for unemployed women.
The "never worked before" category accounted for a relatively small proportion of both men and women. (See Table 7.)

TABLE 7

UNEMPLOYMENT OF ADULT MEN AND WOMEN BY REASON, 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex, Age and Reason</th>
<th>Total Unemployment (thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men 20 years and over</td>
<td>1,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost last job</td>
<td>1,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left last job</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reentered labor force</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never worked before</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women 20 years and over</td>
<td>1,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost last job</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left last job</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reentered labor force</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never worked before</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Detail may not add to totals because of rounding.

Source: Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

It is traditionally socially acceptable for a woman to decide not to participate in the labor market, while the reverse is true for a man. This is a further impediment to the full participation of women in the labor market.
Other factors also limit the employment and earnings potential of women as compared to men. Married women are not as mobile as men; women may have to choose a job based on location, working hours, the availability of shifts, or the availability of child care rather than the job which offers the highest hourly wage or greatest potential for promotion.

Of the 42.6 million women not in the labor force in 1972, about 1.6 million reported that they "want a job now." Of this number approximately two-thirds gave "home responsibilities" as their reason for non-participation in the labor market. (refer to Table 8). It is reasonable to assume that the presence of children was a major "home responsibility" of this group. Equally significant were the 525,000 women who were not in the labor force because they think they cannot get a job. These persons may be characterized as "discouraged workers" or the "hidden unemployed."
TABLE 8

WOMEN 16 YEARS AND OVER NOT IN THE LABOR FORCE
BY DESIRE FOR A JOB AND REASONS FOR NON-PARTICIPATION
1972

(Numbers in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Non-Participation:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Not in Labor Force</td>
<td>42,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want Job Now(^a)</td>
<td>1,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Responsibilities(^b)</td>
<td>1,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think Cannot Get a Job</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men and Women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In school</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ill health, disability</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other reasons</td>
<td>766</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Excludes women in the following categories for whom no separate data were available.

\(^b\)Breakdown by sex not shown. Those reported in this category are assumed to be women.

The proportion of women at work who are not fully employed was also greater than that of men, with almost 4 percent of the women in the civilian labor force underemployed in December, 1972 compared to about 2 percent of the men.

TABLE 9

PERSONS 16 THROUGH 64 YEARS OLD
EMPLOYED PART-TIME FOR ECONOMIC REASONS,a
AND PERCENT OF CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE,
BY SEX AND WOMEN, BY RACE
DECEMBER, 1972
(Numbers in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Number Employed Part-Time for Economic Reasons</th>
<th>Percent of Civilian Labor Force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex:</strong> Total:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>1,012</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Color:</strong> Total:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black and others</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Detail may not add to totals because of rounding.

aIncludes persons who worked less than 35 hours during the survey week because of slack work, job changing during the weekend, material shortages, unavailability of full-time work, etc.

There is an additional problem of increasing significance and impact which should be considered. Fifty-four percent of women heads of households were in the labor force in 1971. The unemployment rate for these women in March 1973, was 7.1 percent, the highest rate since 1969.\footnote{BLS, "Marital and Family Characteristics of the Labor Force," Special Labor Force Report 144, March, 1971, p. 10.} Approximately two-thirds of these families had children under eighteen.

The disadvantaged status of women is not only apparent in the labor force, but is also reflected in federal programs. For example, a special task force report issued in 1972 took the U.S. Office of Education to task for its performance concerning sex discrimination in manpower training programs.

"As we indicated in Part I, vocational and manpower training programs, wittingly or unwittingly are helping to channel the bulk of the Nation's female workers into low paying jobs. OE's own programs are no different. The agency's programs have reinforced rather than counteracted a strong tradition of sex bias in vocational training."\footnote{Commissioner's Task Force on the Impact of Office of Education Programs on Women, A Look at Women in Education: Issues and answers for HEW, November 1972, DHEW/CE, p. 26.}
The report went on to cite errors of omission and commission:

"The limited career aspirations many girls acquire early in life are certainly an important factor in problems of sex-typing in vocational training. But OE's vocational and manpower training programs must take their share of the blame. They have clearly failed to encourage girls to seek training for occupations promising more pay or better opportunities. In many cases, vocational and manpower training programs have actively discouraged both sexes from training for careers dominated by the other sex."

An example of the degree to which separation of the sexes is taken for granted in vocational and manpower training programs is provided in the aforementioned Upjohn Institute report:

"When States (education agencies) were asked to identify their best vocational education projects serving disadvantaged and handicapped students, 14 listed projects serving only one sex."

Finally, it should be observed that while the representation of women in the MDTA Institutional program has generally reflected their proportion within the total labor force, the percentage has not kept pace with the representation of women among MDTA's disadvantaged target population, estimated as high as 60 percent.

1/ Ibid., p. 19
CHAPTER III
ANALYSIS OF MDTA AND OTHER EVALUATION STUDIES

This chapter presents a summary of research findings from three groups of selected studies of women in the labor force and in MDTA programs which address the following:

DUAL CAREERS

Four studies are directly concerned with the “dual career” concept, which is the judgement that women function simultaneously as supplemental wage earners and as child raisers and household managers.

There are, of course, other options available to women such as refraining from being in the labor force, not pursuing a career as a primary objective, postponing entry or reentry until child care is no longer a responsibility, or remaining single or without children.

These are the choices that confront women deciding to enter the labor market. As we shall see subsequently, the decision made is often a function of the family status of women, i.e., whether they are heads of household or not, the relative contribution made to family income and the value placed on assuming personal responsibility for the care of children and household management.
A major 5-year longitudinal study is currently being conducted at Ohio State University on the labor market experience of women. A number of other studies have been conducted using this longitudinal data base. Of interest to the current review are those by Roderick and Davis, John Shea, and Sookon Kim. The study conducted by Roderick and Davis is an investigation of the employment of women in occupational categories that are atypical, i.e., positions which are traditionally male and/or blue-collar. The investigation of data by John Shea concerning welfare mothers represents an assessment of the discouraged worker or "no career" women and of the requisite conditions for their entry into the labor force. Finally, Sookon Kim's study of the cross-substitution between husbands and wives is an econometric investigation of the positive and negative factors affecting the supply of labor man-hours for women.

Longitudinal Study

The "dual careers" concept underscores the fact that a significant number of married women who work are homemakers as well. Factors examined in a five-year study currently underway include labor force participation, unemployment, job mobility and work attitudes. These factors were examined in light of such personal characteristics as age, race, family background, marital

characteristics, education, health, financial characteristics, attitudes toward child care and housekeeping.

The following summarizes principal characteristics of the Dual Careers study sample:1/

- About 50 percent of married white women who work had children, while nearly 75 percent of black women who work had children.

- White women appeared to have fewer health limitations than black women. Married women appeared to have fewer health limitations than others, although the differences are not significant in either case.

- Nearly 60 percent of the black women failed to complete high school. Less than 33 percent of the white women in the sample did not complete high school.

- Of all the women who were no longer in school full-time, 33 percent had taken some type of refresher course.

- About 15 percent of the white women and 15 percent of the black women in the study had received certificates for professional* and trade certification (refer to Table 10).

- Of the women in the study who were living with at least one other family member, one in six was in a household in which family income, excluding her own earnings was less than $3,000 in 1966.

- Of nonmarried women, 66 2/3 percent of whites and 75 percent of blacks were the heads of their households.

- In the case of both whites and blacks, never-married women without children tended to have somewhat more tolerant attitudes toward working mothers than women who were or had been married.

---

1/ The sample size consisted of 5,083 individuals, of whom 3,456 were white.

* "professional" refers to those courses where certification is necessary, e.g., licensed practical nursing.
TABLE 10

PROPORTION OF MARRIED RESPONDENTS AND PROPORTION
OF RESPONDENTS WITH WORK EXPERIENCE HOLDING
PROFESSIONAL OR TRADE CERTIFICATES, BY AGE
MARITAL AND FAMILY STATUS, AND COLOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected characteristic</th>
<th>Total Number (thousands)</th>
<th>Percent with trade certificates</th>
<th>Percent with professional certificate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHITES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>4,186</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>4,522</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>4,851</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital and family statusb</td>
<td>14,928</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married, no children</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married, with children</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever married, no childrenc</td>
<td>1,441</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever married, with children</td>
<td>12,784</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total or average</td>
<td>15,559</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLACKS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age³</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital and family statusb</td>
<td>2,035</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married, no children</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married, with children</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever married, no children</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever married, with children</td>
<td>1,607</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total or average</td>
<td>2,107</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Includes only married respondents, spouse present and absent
b Includes only respondents with work experience.
c "Ever" married includes all respondents who were married at any time. Therefore, those who are separated or divorced, as all those currently married, will be included in this category.

Source: Herbert Parnes, John R. Shea, Ruth Spitz, Dual Careers Center for Human Resource Research, the Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, May, 1970.
Labor Force Participation - In general, labor force participation appeared to be positively related to educational attainment of the woman and a favorable attitude on the part of the spouse, but inversely related to a husband's earnings. In the case of the latter factor, white women whose husbands reported attitudes favorable to their wives working were employed an average six months more in 1966 than those whose husbands reported unfavorable attitudes. Overall, black women reported higher labor force participation rates than white women.

Employment Patterns - Employed women in the targeted age range were distributed among the major occupational groups in substantially the same proportions as the total labor force. Although black women were less than half as likely as white women to be employed in white-collar occupations (30 versus 63 percent) those who were employed in such occupations had higher educational attainments, than their white counterparts. However, the hourly rate of pay was lower for black than white women in every educational attainment category except those with 13 or more years of schooling.

Among never-married women with children, approximately 73 percent worked in occupations different from those in which they started their work careers. In general, more women who had never married had moved downward than had moved upward occupationally.
This pattern of downward mobility appears to be related to employment discontinuity and to inadequate education.

In addition to those already noted, there were several important differences between white and black women:

- Black women had been less mobile geographically than their white counterparts.
- Blacks were more likely than whites to have moved downward occupationally.
- Within all but the highest educational attainment category, black women started their careers in lower level occupations than those available to white women.

Child Care - Two-fifths of working mothers in the study with children under 18 found it necessary to make child care arrangements. The cost of this service to them varied widely by type of arrangement, the race of the mother, and the mother's hourly rate of pay. (See Table 11)

No fees were paid by over half of the women whose children were cared for in their own homes by relatives. With few exceptions, the higher the mother's hourly wage the more she paid for the care of her child. Consistent with this pattern, minority group mothers, whose wages are on the average lower than those of their white counterparts, paid less than whites for this service.

Of those in the labor force, the children of 36 percent of poor and 22 percent of non-poor black women were cared for in a relative's home.
### TABLE 11
DAILY COST OF CHILD-CARE ARRANGEMENTS
USED BY EMPLOYED WOMEN RESPONDENTS* (AGE 30-44)
WITH SUCH ARRANGEMENTS, BY RATE OF PAY ON CURRENT JOB AND RACE
(Percentage distribution)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily cost of child-care arrangement</th>
<th>Total or average</th>
<th>Less than $1.50</th>
<th>$1.50 to $1.99</th>
<th>$2.00 to $2.49</th>
<th>$2.50 to $2.99</th>
<th>$3.00 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number (Thousands)</strong></td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median</strong></td>
<td>$2.45</td>
<td>$.63</td>
<td>$7.20</td>
<td>$3.20</td>
<td>$3.08</td>
<td>$3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total percent</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No cost</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$.01 to 1.99</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 to 3.99</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00 or more</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whites</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number (Thousands)</td>
<td>1,487</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median</strong></td>
<td>$2.76</td>
<td>$1.83</td>
<td>$2.24</td>
<td>$3.11</td>
<td>$3.11</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total percent</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No cost</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$.01 to 1.99</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 to 3.99</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00 or more</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negroes and others</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number (Thousands)</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median</strong></td>
<td>$1.05</td>
<td>$.50</td>
<td>$1.31</td>
<td>$2.64</td>
<td>$2.76</td>
<td>$2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total percent</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No cost</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$.01 to 1.99</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 to 3.99</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00 or more</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes only wage and salary workers.

*Computed from grouped data.

Source: Herbert Parnes, John R. Shea, Ruth Spitz, Dual Careers, Center for Human Resource Research, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, May, 1970.
Work Attitudes, Satisfaction, and Job Attachment - The working women in the targeted age group not only had positive attitudes toward work, but substantial majorities reported that they like their jobs very much.

Job satisfaction appeared to be related systematically to several other attitudinal variables. The data supported the hypothesis that married women with jobs which are convenient in terms of their location, their work schedule, or both, are particularly reluctant to leave them for others which might pay more but lack these special characteristics.

Other Studies on Dual Careers

Special studies, which have been conducted using the dual careers data base, are discussed below. These studies statistically examined questions on the job preferences of welfare mothers, sex typing in atypical occupations for women and the effects of the women's labor participation on the relative income of husbands and wives.

Barriers to Labor Force Entry

A study by John Shea of labor force barriers to welfare mothers analyzed the reactions to a hypothetical job offer by

those women who were out of the labor force in 1967. His analysis showed that the desired rate of pay and/or willingness to take a hypothetical job are systematically related to marital status, receipt of AFDC, poor health, family income less respondent's earnings, and attitudes toward the propriety of mothers working.

The findings indicated that:

- For black and white women the poor more frequently than the non-poor cited both location and hours as a factor in job acceptance.

- Over 66 percent of the poor who responded positively to the job offer and over 50 percent of the non-poor indicated they would have to make special arrangements for child care.

- Although an attitude in opposition to the idea of women of school-age children working was found to be a strong predictor among both black and white, there was no correlation between the willingness to work and the presence of one or more children under six.

**Atypical Occupations**

In 1968, Roderick and Davis studied a sample of young women aged 18-24, not enrolled in "regular school," who had acquired work experience. The definition of "atypical occupations" was based on the occupational distribution of women in the labor force as shown in the 1960 census. At that time 50 percent of the women working were employed in occupations in which 70 percent or more of the incumbents were women. Examples of atypical occupations found in the sample were draftsmen, welders, and electric technicians.

---

1/ Roger Roderick and Davis, Correlates to Atypical Occupational Assignment, June, 1972.
The authors cited three dominant themes from the literature on occupation choice and aspiration:

- The effect of formative environmental influence on the occupational destiny of young women whereby atypical occupational assignment may be (a) the function of a background lacking in socialization in the traditional feminine role, and (b) socialization which includes but is not limited by that role.

- Failure to have internalized the norms of the traditional feminine role irrespective of formative influences.

- A situation in which a woman finds herself propelled into one occupation or another, primarily because of the exigencies of the circumstances affecting her at any given time rather than as the result of deliberate planning or choice.

In assessing these motivational factors, the authors observed:

Atypical occupations while shown here to bear some relation to formative influences and attitudinal stances, are at the same time shown not to be severely constrained by either; they are not restricted to persons within narrow ranges of family background or educational experiences or to persons with extreme deviant attitudinal stances. This suggests that the critical interdictory force inhibiting the entrance of women into certain occupations may be ideological support that develops for the definition of jobs appropriate for female occupancy, the auxiliary rather than the institutionalized traits of occupations.1/

Cross Substitution

An analysis, conducted by Sookon Kim,2/examined the cross substitution between incomes of spouses as one of the factors

1/ Roger Roderick and Davis, Correlates to Atypical Occupational Assignment, June, 1972, p. 30.

2/ Sookon Kim, Cross-Substitution Between Husband and Wife as One of the Factors Determining the Number of Hours of Labor Supplied by Married Women, June, 1972.
determining the number of hours of labor supplied by married women. He found that the supply of labor is positively related to a woman's hourly wage rate, her health, permissive attitude toward propriety of women working on the part of herself and her husband, and to the demand for female labor in the local labor market. The supply of labor was negatively related on the other hand, to the amount of income available to the family without her working, her home wage (a measure of child care burden), and to the husband's annual earning capacity relative to the wife's. The measure of the home-wage scale (the age of and number of children) was statistically significant for both whites and non-whites and the percent of variance in hours of labor supply explained by the home wage was larger than that explained by any other variable.1/

The author concluded as a result of this analysis, that "it is not only the absolute level of the wife's market wages but also her earning capacity relative to her husband's earning capacity which determines the number of hours of labor she supplies to the market."2/


2/ Ibid.
PROGRAM OPTIONS

A second group of studies evaluated MDTA program features which affected subsequent employment of MDTA graduates. Generally, the information derived dealt with recruitment, selection and course assignment procedures, occupational biases of program offerings and importance of employer and trainee preferences.

Two of the MDTA evaluation studies provided some insights into the question of the relative effectiveness of employment versus job skills training. They are the MENTEC Corporation's Evaluation of the Relevance and Quality of Preparation for Employment in the MDTA Institutional Program and the Olympus Research Corporation's Evaluation of MDTA Institutional Individual Referral Program.

Findings include:

- Placement for both women and men graduates was highest in programs conducted by employers who could eventually hire them or who had expertise in the development of job skills.

- Women trainees drawn from the ranks of those not previously in the labor market, generally tended not to enter the labor force.

- Because of the importance of training-related placement as a success indicator, for the most part women have been trained in so-called "high demand occupations," such as health, clerical and service occupations. Many such jobs offer low pay and little or no career mobility opportunities.
Female trainees were seriously hampered by the lack of counseling, supportive services (particularly child care) and flexible training schedules. For example, 96 percent of women enrolled in MDTA Institutional training in 1972 were enrolled in either professional, clerical, or service occupations.\(^1\)

While employers interviewed generally considered federal manpower programs wasteful or inefficient, they rated more than 70 percent of their employed men and women MDTA graduates as having average or above promotion potential, and were satisfied with their performance.

PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS MEASURES

The third group of studies are also MDTA program evaluations. (See Table 12.) These generated findings on the question of program effectiveness and the differences between male and female graduates. Three of the studies discussed the specific achievement experience of women. An Olympus Research Corporation study examined the performance of female trainees in health, clerical, sales and food services program offerings, while a survey on national attitudes conducted by the Institute for Social Research (ISR) drew inferences from the experiences of women trained as typists, stenographers and practical nurses. The study by Prescott and Cooley, analyzed MDTA Institutional program data and offered aggregate findings on male-female patterns of achievement, drawing inferences regarding sex differences and trends.

\(^1\) HEW Secretary's Report, 1972, Appendix C, Table C-2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Conducted By</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National MDTA Program Data Analysis</td>
<td>Prescott and Cooley</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Analyze 1968 tapes with MDTA Institutional and OJT data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Relate occupational training categories to completion rates, employment rates, training-related average ways and by sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A National Attitude Study of Trainees in MDTA Institutional Programs</td>
<td>Institute for Social Research,</td>
<td>August, 1970</td>
<td>- Conduct longitudinal study of 6,000 trainees from over 300 MDTA Institutional Classes = 1964-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Relate attitudes to success criteria, i.e., drop-out post-training wage rate, unemployment and job relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Institutional Manpower Training</td>
<td>Olympus Research Corporation</td>
<td>June, 1972</td>
<td>- Identify occupation where skill shortage exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Meeting Employee's Needs in Skills Shortage Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Assess MDTA Institutional training effectiveness in meeting employer needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Identify factors inhibiting progress effectiveness of 19 Skill Centers in 16 states</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The MDTA Outcomes Evaluation Study completed by Decision-Making Information in 1972 will not be reviewed in this volume because a detailed analysis is being presented under separate cover.*
In discussing effectiveness indicators, principal achievement measures utilized in these studies included: attendance, completion and placement rates, job retention rates, post training wage rates, employment level and post training relevance. The following conclusions drawn from the ISR study summarize the impact of the program on reduction of sex discrimination in women's employment.

With respect to the issue of female disadvantage, the findings on sex differences present a paradoxical picture. On measures of commitment to the program, women clearly do better—they more often complete the program and they more often get training relevant jobs. However, in the economic payoff for this commitment, the women do less well. That they have more unemployment is partly attributable to their own decision to withdraw from the labor market. But their disadvantage in the wage rates they command is clear and unambiguous and seems to occur even in those classes that were attended by both men and women.

In a sense, the paradox heightens the discriminatory position for women—they do less well in spite of their greater tendency to stay with the program and utilize the training it has provided.1/

**Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Institutional Manpower Training in Meeting Employee's Needs in Skills Shortage Occupation**

The top three ranking occupational areas in performance ratings were health occupations, LPN/RN, and clerical/sales. The ranking was based on completion and placement rates, as well as job retention rates determined from follow-up investigations made at three and six month intervals.

The LPN/RN group had the highest completion rate, but the lowest placement rate of all occupational groups. The rate of
those placed in training-related jobs however was high (70 percent). Three months after training, the employment status of LPN/RN enrollees was very much improved (69 percent employed), but the training-related figure decreased to 42 percent. Six months after training, the employment rate remained the same, but the training-related rate climbed to 87 percent.

Data concerning performance criteria indicated the following:

- The lowest absentee rate (13 percent) was observed in food services, which is a female-dominated offering.

- The overall completion rate for 18 of the 19 centers in the sample was found to be 61.8 percent. However, the 38.2 percent dropout rate included enrollees who achieve certain training objectives, as well as early completers who left to take a job. Pregnancy was the only reasons given for dropping out that could definitely be unique to women. However, only 1.5 percent of dropouts gave this reason.

- The overall placement rate for 13 selected centers in the sample was 71.5 percent. Health occupations, which have predominantly female enrollees, had the highest placement rate, 82.4 percent of which 98.6 percent were training-related.

- Employment Service follow-up information indicated that 60 percent of completers placed in jobs remained employed six months after graduation. The study pointed out that retention rates were lower in female-dominated fields, even though initial placement rates were higher.

National Attitude Study of Trainees in MDTA Institutional Programs
(Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan)

The study used four success criteria: (1) whether the trainee dropped out or remained in the program; (2) the post-
training wage rate; (3) training relevance of post-program jobs; and (4) the degree of unemployment in the post-program period.1/

Wage Rate - The findings showed that training had more impact on post-program earnings of women than men. Female program graduates and those with training-related jobs were somewhat better paid than the dropouts and than those who were not placed in jobs for which they had been trained. This was particularly true of white women.

On the other hand, male trainees who completed the program did not have higher wages than those who dropped out. Men who obtained training-relevant jobs did not have higher wages than those whose jobs were not training-related.

The male-female difference was shown to be related to a difference between the level of skill represented in the training and the skills and experience the trainees brought to the program rather than any special characteristics of the training programs or instructors. Given their more extensive work background and experience, the male trainees in the semi-skilled classes had more options than the women and could earn as much by obtaining jobs that did not utilize their course training.

1/ Data used in this study was collected in the period preceding 1966, when priority was given to the recruitment of the disadvantaged as MDTA trainees.
Male and female trainees did not differ in the relationship between the wage rate of their first post-program job and whether they were referred to the job by one of the formal agencies responsible for job placement. In fact, most of the trainees obtained their first post-program jobs on their own and received wages just as high as those who were referred by the training class or the Employment Service.

Employment Level - The data suggests that the training program may have more impact on employment level than on wage rate. For both men and women, trainee satisfaction with the training showed little relationship to wages but a clear relationship to employment level.

Program Completion - Three types of dropouts were distinguished in order to delineate the significance of the occurrence: trainees who dropped out voluntarily to take a job; those who dropped out for other reasons; and those who were terminated by the project. The authors of the study questioned the significance of the dropout rate as a criterion of failure and success since neither completion nor termination represented alternatives with clearly different consequences. Completion was not clearly related to success in terms of greater payoffs.

Training Relevance of Post-Program Jobs - Attitudes toward work and commitment to training expressed by the trainee when
he entered and left the program were found to have a positive relationship to the securing of training-related jobs. Attitudes about the program itself were related only to employment level and only for the women trainees.1/

The findings based on racial differences showed that when compared to the white trainees, black men and women had more unemployment in the post-program period; a larger proportion of black men were terminated by the program whereas more white men dropped out by their own choice; and when compared with the white women trainees, black women had lower wage rates and less often obtained jobs that utilized their training.

In terms of sex difference, the findings suggested that male trainees dropped out more often, were less satisfied with their program experience and less often that it had had an important impact on them. Men had more job alternatives available to them and were therefore less dependent on the training.

Analysis of MDTA Institutional and OJT Data Tapes

An analysis of the MDTA Institutional and On-the-Job Training 1968 data tapes by Prescott2/ related the occupational training category to completion rate, employment rate, training-related

1/ Most of the women in the survey were trained as typists, stenographers and practical nurses.

employment, average wage, and average wage change by sex. His findings for female enrollees of the institutional program follow.

Generally, females in structural and metal fabrication professional occupations had the highest estimated completion rate, average wage, employment rate, and labor force participation rate. Women professionals ran a close second, yet surprisingly only four-fifths (79 percent) worked full time. (See Table 13)

Of those reporting, females had a slightly higher completion rate than males and had a higher employment rate in training-related jobs. However, they did not have higher average wages: $2.75 per hour for males compared with $2.23 for females. Table 17 shows average hourly post-training earnings by sex and type of training program. In all cases, males earned more than females. The post training earnings for female graduates of Institutional programs were higher than those for females in the other programs shown. This was not the case for the employed males trained in MDTA Institutional programs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Category</th>
<th>Est. Completion Rate</th>
<th>For Completers Employed</th>
<th>Labor Force Participation Rate</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>For Employed Completers</th>
<th>Training Related</th>
<th>Working Full Time</th>
<th>Average Wage</th>
<th>% Wage above Poverty</th>
<th>Average Wage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional &amp; Technical</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry &amp; Farming</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine-Metal</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine-Mechanical</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine-Other</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchwork</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural-Other</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural-Metal Fab.</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous &amp; Multi Skills</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Occupations</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Edward C. Prescott, Analysis of MDTA Institutional and OJT Data Tapes for 1968, Table X.
TABLE 14

AVERAGE POST TRAINING HOURLY EARNINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>MDTA Institutional</th>
<th>On-the-Job</th>
<th>CEP</th>
<th>WIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Trainees</td>
<td>$2.49</td>
<td>$3.16</td>
<td>$2.24</td>
<td>$2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race or ethnic group:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish-speaking</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Manpower Report of the President, DOL, 1973, p. 56

The post training earnings for female graduates of Institutional programs were higher than those for females in the other programs shown. This was not the case for the employed males trained in MDTA Institutional programs.

Males, both black and white, posted higher average pre-training and post-training wages than females. Black males appeared to make the greatest average pre-post training hourly earnings gain: $.37; followed by white females, $.36; white males, $.31; with black females having the lowest increase, $.28. Of particular
interest is the fact that after completing training, women earned less on the average ($2.15) than males earned prior to training ($2.28). Refer to Table 15.

TABLE 15

MEDIAN HOURLY WAGE RATE OF EMPLOYED GRADUATES
MDTA INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS BY SEX,
FISCAL YEAR 1972
TOTAL N=17,664

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race and Sex</th>
<th>Pre-Training</th>
<th>Post-Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$2.28</td>
<td>$2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Other Relevant Analyses

According to a Washington Post article,1/ attempts to evaluate the impact of MDTA Institutional training on changes in post-

training earnings using Social Security data have produced differing results. The article cites one such study which matched the earnings of more than 60,000 trainees from 1968 against a weighted control group of 76,000. "The average earnings increased for everyone but men and women who received no help."

A study conducted by Prescott and Cooley at the University of Pennsylvania compared 1968 enrollees to a different group—those who were eligible for MDTA training but withdrew at the last minute.1/ According to this investigation, those who completed training in both Institutional and OJT programs increased their 1969 earnings more than did non-trainees, an average of $500 to $800. The difference between the trainees and the non-trainees lessened when comparing 1970 earnings.

Prescott and Cooley also showed that OJT training had greater impact on earnings than did Institutional training. For Institutional enrollees, the estimated impact of MDTA training on 1969 earnings was less for women than for men: $576 contrasted with $652. The estimated impact of training on 1970 earnings was smaller than on 1969 earnings, suggesting the possibility that the impact of training declines over time or that there was a change in labor market conditions for men. The change in earnings impact between 1969 and 1970 was less for women than for males: $564 versus $488.

The impact of marital status on earnings difference for female trainees in 1969 was $414 for heads of households, $593 for singles, and $719 for married females. Yet in 1970, the impact on earnings for females showed heads of households increasing their earnings difference, while the difference in married and single female earnings diminished.

CONCLUSION

None of the studies mentioned in this chapter had as their primary purpose an assessment of the status of women. The present study, "The Evaluation of the Availability and Effectiveness of MDTA Institutional Training," of which this literature review is a part, has as its focus the development of a synthesis of current information concerning women which will be useful to MDTA planners and administrators.
CHAPTER IV

INTERVIEWS WITH FEDERAL OFFICIALS

INTRODUCTION

The first goal of the interviews was to update and extend the information available to the study team by identifying studies, directives, memoranda, reports and other data which had not surfaced during the literature search. The second goal of the interview process was to obtain information and data relevant to the development of the field study research design.

SELECTION OF INTERVIEWEES

Thirty persons were interviewed by the study team. Although no effort was made to construct a scientific sample, representation was obtained from all offices playing a role in regard to MDTA programming in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and in the Department of Labor.

In addition, an attempt was made to interview persons within the Office of Education, Office of Employment Development and the United States Employment Service who had substantial decision-making authority concerning the MDTA Institutional program. ¹/

¹/ This group has been identified as the MDTA Institutional Decision-Makers (MID) group throughout the balance of this Chapter.
The study team selected persons who could provide insight and information concerning the status of women in federally-funded programs.

ANALYSIS OF INTERVIEW RESULTS

The survey explored several topics and issues of relevance to the overall study. These included a discussion of the needs of women; data concerning women in MDTA Institutional programs; current and future occupational offerings available to women; outcomes or indicators of program success; factors both internal and external to the MDTA system which may affect outcomes; the role of government; the impact of the proposed decategorization of MDTA programs; the role of women in MDTA decision-making; and the MDTA evaluation contract itself.

Highlights of Survey Findings

Highlights of survey findings and a discussion of potentially significant results are presented in this section.

Women's Needs

An overwhelming number of persons felt needs of women should be spotlighted in federal programs. The following reasons were given as rationale for this:

- Present patterns of inequity, sex discrimination and stereotyping
Current neglect of women as a group
Unique needs and problems of women
Large representation of women among the target groups of federal programs
The responsibility of the Federal Government as a leader and pace-setter
Possible differing outcomes of programs for men and women

In discussing whether or not women should be treated as a group with special needs, several interviewees responding affirmatively expressed concern over the potential misuse of the "special needs" label. Yet this group was prepared to incur the "risk" in order to meet those needs they perceived to be unique to women. Persons replying in the negative, on the other hand, expressed the opinion that the needs of individual trainees should be dealt with on an individual basis. They either rejected the notion that solutions should be designed to address the collective problems of women, or they denied the assumption that women in fact constituted a group. Interestingly, all persons maintaining this position were employees of the Department of Labor. Of considerable importance, moreover, is the fact that MDTA Institutional Decision-Makers were at variance with the total sample, as shown in Table 19.

The following needs of women were most often mentioned by respondents:

- Day care/child care for younger and older children (including provisions for pregnancy)
Special counseling, orientation and/or training during and following formal training period

More support services in general

Elimination of sex discrimination by employers

Flexibility of working hours

Transportation

Safety

Increased representation on decision-making bodies and staff

**Occupational Offerings**

In addressing the concentration of MDTA women trainees in certain occupational categories, explanations for patterns of concentration are listed as follows:

- These are traditional female occupations, a reflection of the stereotyping of the female's role.

- Jobs are there; there is high turnover and demand.

- These categories lead to easy placements, requiring little effort of the MDTA system.

- Enrollees are steered to these training slots by recruiters and counselors.

- Women themselves want these placements.

- Women don't know of other opportunities available.

**Outcomes**

The assessment of MDTA program outcomes for women is an issue of central importance to the overall study. This issue was
addressed to ascertain from respondents which outcomes they considered most significant in determining the success of training programs.

Although the sample is quite small, an effort was made to further analyze responses by agency, sex and decision-making responsibility for MDTA Institutional programs. Responses to Question 6 by sub-groups are presented in Tables 1-4 in Appendix A.

Of interest is the emphasis placed upon the contribution of MDTA to an improvement of the "quality of life" of the individual trainee and her family, as measured by the changes observed (e.g., family stability) at the end of training in contrast with the baseline situation. Sixty percent (60%) of the respondents who mentioned such outcomes were OE personnel.

Factors Affecting Program Outcomes

Two questions dealt with factors, within the MDTA system and external to it, which can influence program outcomes for trainees. Answers concerning internal impediments fell into several major categories as follows:

- Legislation, guidelines and/or regulations, e.g., they prohibit provision of needed supportive services with MDTA funds and restrict training to preparation for available jobs in a given locality.
- Funding, e.g., too limited, one year at a time.
Training programs, e.g., range of training opportunities is too narrow, not enough flexibility in scheduling and structuring.

Job placement, e.g., inadequate placement effort, reliance on job order system.

Outcomes, e.g., lack of significant outcome measures including those important to trainees.

Administration and staffing, e.g., rigidity of state agencies, lack of female representation in management.

Significant external factors were:

- Labor market conditions
- Society's attitudes (sexism)
- Licensing, certification and regulatory practices
- Union practices
- Status and reputation of MDTA as a federal program
- Attitudes in business and industry
- Racism
- Politics
- Lack of planning for women in the CAMPS system

An analysis of responses regarding relevant factors external to the MDTA system provides a clear example of the differing perspectives of MDTA-related federal agencies. It is interesting to note that not one of the MID officials interviewed in the OE cited the economy as a significant external factor affecting program outcomes; on the other hand, four out of five of the DOL members of this group felt that this was a significant if not "overriding consideration."
The Role of Government

The government's role regarding the status of women in MDTA Institutional and other programs was addressed. A continuum of responses was generated as interviewees defined roles for government ranging from the establishment of quotas to inaction. The following answers were most frequently cited by interviewees:

- Enforce existing anti-discrimination laws (e.g., Revised OFCC Order #4, Educational Amendments of 1972)
- Improved MDTA Institutional programs (e.g., broader training opportunities, review testing procedures, make programs more relevant to women).
- Advocate for women, intervene as third party.
- Use funding leverage with state and local government, business, contractors, etc.
- Provide opportunities for women, eliminate existing barriers.
- Build models, support pilot projects and provide technical assistance.
- Promote the issue, provide publicity, disseminate information about the working woman and her role in society.

More specific suggestions were obtained in follow-up questions. These recommendations are attached to this report as Appendix B.

The MDTA Institutional Evaluation Contract

This survey sought to ascertain the opinions and suggestions of interviewees concerning both the study and issues relevant to it.
Key recommendations included the following:

- The study should catalyze action and should recommend constructive ways of resolving problems identified.

- The parameters of the study should be expanded to include a consideration of women in other manpower programs (e.g., OJT, WIN). This is particularly true in view of the proposed decentralization of MDTA Institutional programs.

- The questionnaire should be reworded for improved comprehension and interpretation of survey results.

The Future of MDTA Institutional Programs

Anticipated changes in the role and function of the Federal Government as the result of the proposed decentralization of federal programs were discussed. Responsibilities of the Federal Government for MDTA programming under these new organizational arrangements were seen by respondents as the following:

- Establish national priorities.

- Monitor in terms of the overall performance of prime sponsors, primarily with regard to performance standards concerning financial accountability and reporting requirements.

- Develop models for potential use by prime sponsors.

- Provide technical assistance.

Regarding women, there appeared to have been little discussion to date concerning the government's role as enforcer of anti-discrimination directives and laws, once decentralization has been achieved. Nor was there great optimism that, given the
shifts in authority and responsibility to regional and local
decision-makers, laws and guidelines concerning women and other
targeted groups would be vigorously enforced.

SIGNIFICANT TRENDS AND FINDINGS FOR GROUPS OF INTERVIEWEES

The responses of three groups of MDTA interviewee were
identified for closer analysis.

Institutional Decision-Makers

Although the responses did not always lend themselves to
further partition, some differences in emphasis could be discerned
between the MID group and the interviewees as a whole. For
example, 70 percent of the former responded in the negative when
queried concerning women as a group with special needs, while
the majority of the total group were in agreement that MDTA
Institutional and other manpower programs should treat women as
a group with special needs.

Office of Education vs. Department of Labor

In view of their respective departmental purposes and mandates,
it might be expected that there would be contrasts in the per-
spectives of DOL and OE personnel. For example, DOL personnel
gave higher priority to annual income and labor force participation
than did OE respondents. The latter, on the other hand, tended to emphasize employment stability and potential for upward mobility as being more important.

Males vs. Females

Despite expectations, no major differences could be determined between the responses of males and females interviewed except in regard to the assessment of outcomes. Men tended to give greater priority to hourly wage and placement in a training-related job, while women assigned employment stability slightly greater importance in comparison.
APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE
FOR
FEDERAL INTERVIEWS
INTERVIEWER: ____________________________________________

DATE: __________________________________________________

INTERVIEWEE: ____________________________________________

POSITION: _________________________________________________

AGENCY: ___________________________________________________

ADDRESS: _________________________________________________

PHONE: ___________________________________________________

YEARS OF SERVICE IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT: ___________

YEARS IN PRESENT POSITION: _________________________________

QUESTIONS FOR ALL INTERVIEWEES

1. Some people feel that the needs of women in federal programs should be spotlighted.

   Do you agree? Yes ___ No ___

   Why? ____________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
2. Should MDTA institutional and other manpower programs treat women as a group with special needs?

Yes _____  No _____

a. If yes, what are those needs?________________________________________
                                           __________________________________________
                                           __________________________________________
                                           __________________________________________
                                           __________________________________________
                                           __________________________________________
                                           __________________________________________
                                           __________________________________________
                                           __________________________________________

b. How can these needs you have identified be met?____________
                                           __________________________________________
                                           __________________________________________
                                           __________________________________________
                                           __________________________________________
                                           __________________________________________
                                           __________________________________________
                                           __________________________________________
                                           __________________________________________

C. If no, why not?________________________________________
                                           __________________________________________
                                           __________________________________________
                                           __________________________________________
                                           __________________________________________
                                           __________________________________________
                                           __________________________________________
                                           __________________________________________
                                           __________________________________________
3. What kind of data on women in MDTA programs is available for your use?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

a. How do you use these data?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

b. What other data on women in MDTA programs would you find useful?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
c. What changes would you like to see in the data collection and reporting system in order to get the data you need?

4. Available reports show that 70% of all women in MDTA institutional programs are placed in clerical and health-related occupations.
   
a. In your opinion, why is this the case?
b. Do you perceive this concentration of women in a few occupational categories as a problem?

Yes ___  No ___

c. If yes, what can be done about it? ____________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

__________________________

d. If no, why not?

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

5. Do you feel that MDTA institutional and other training programs should be expanded to include new occupational categories which hold particular promise for women?

Yes ___  No ___

a. If yes, what are they? ____________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________
b. If no, why not?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

6. Which of the following outcomes are most significant in determining the success of training programs for individual women trainees?

   __ Hourly wage
   __ Annual income
   __ Employment stability
   __ Potential for upward mobility
   __ Labor force participation or employment rate
   __ Job satisfaction
   __ Placement in training-related job

a. Are there others not listed above?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

b. If so, describe and define.

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
c. Would you rank these outcomes in order of priority?

________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________


d. Do you have any comments regarding the ranking?

________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________


7. Are there any impediments within the MDTA system which influence the outcomes specified in No. 6 (e.g., enrollee selection and placement procedures, relevance and quality of training, quality of placement effort, quality of labor market data, quality of facilities and equipment, availability and quality of supportive services)?

Yes ___ No ___

a. If yes, what are they?

________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________
b. What is being done about them? Are there other things you think should be done?


8. Are there any factors external to the MDTA system which can influence the outcomes identified in (#7) (e.g., nature of job market, licensing requirements, sex discrimination, civil service regulations, union practices, racism)?

Yes _____ No _____

a. What are they?


b. What is being done about them? Are there other things that should be done about them?
9. What should be the role of government in ensuring equitable outcomes for women in MDTA institutional and other programs?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

a. Have federal efforts in this area to date been adequate and effective?

Yes ___ No ___

b. If no, why not?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

10. Have women been involved in policy-making for MDTA institutional programs at the national level?

Yes ___ No ___

Please describe.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
11. Are you familiar with policy directives, research studies, reports, memoranda, etc. which address the status of women in national manpower and related programs?

   Yes _____  No _____

a. If yes, please describe.

   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________

b. Can we gain access to this information?

   Yes _____  No _____

c. Of this information, what has been generated by your office?

   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
d. How are these materials disseminated to other offices concerned with MDTA programs?

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

12. Are there any current government-funded programs that have been particularly effective in providing training for women?

Yes ____  No ____

a. If yes, what are they?
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

b. Where can the study team find out more about them?
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
13. What are other issues not covered in this discussion which you feel are relevant to a consideration of the impact of MDTA institutional programs on women? Do you have any recommendations concerning this study?
FOLLOW UP QUESTIONS FOR SPECIFIC GROUPS

Office of Employment Development Programs/DMDT

1. What changes in the role and functions of the national office can be anticipated in the near future as the result of the anticipated decentralization and decategorization of federal programs?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Re MDTA programming? ______________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Re guidelines on sex discrimination? __________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
2. According to our information, MDTA institutional guidelines were written in 1966 and reprinted in 1968. Have any additional guidelines been published since?

Yes ____  No ____

a. If yes, what are they?

b. If no, why not?

Employment Service

1. Would women accept placements in training programs for traditionally "male" occupations if they were available?

Yes ____  No ____

If not, why not?
2. Should women be referred to MDTA institutional training components usually filled by men?

   Yes _____   No _____

   Why? ________________________________

   ________________________________

   ________________________________

   ________________________________

3. Some people are of the opinion that employer attitudes are primarily responsible for outcome inequities noted for women in DOL sponsored studies. Do you agree?

   Yes _____   No _____

   a. If yes, what can be done by government to affect employer attitudes?

   ________________________________

   ________________________________

   ________________________________

   ________________________________

   ________________________________

   ________________________________

   ________________________________

   ________________________________

   ________________________________

   ________________________________

   ________________________________

   b. If no, why not?

   ________________________________

   ________________________________

   ________________________________

   ________________________________

   ________________________________

   ________________________________

   ________________________________

   ________________________________

   ________________________________
Jaffee (or other Health Expert)

In a final report to the Manpower Administration entitled Occupational Licensing and Public Policy (Education Testing Service, October 1973, authored by Benjamin Shimberg, Barbara Esser and Daniel Krueger), reference was made to an exemplary HEW study on licensing. Can you refer the team to someone who might be knowledgeable about the latter study?

Yes ____  No ____

Office of Financial and Management Information Systems and Related Offices

1. How do data re MDTA institutional programs collected at national, regional, state and local levels differ? ________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________
Are these differences based upon differing purposes and uses for the data at each level?

2. Who decides what computer runs are made and for what reasons?

3. What measures are available, if any, to show the impact of MDTA institutional programs on enrollees by the occupational type of training and the length of training?
4. How do you explain the limited data available for MDTA institutional enrolles as reflected in the decreasing rate of return of forms (MDA) 101, 102, 103, and 104? How does this phenomenon affect program analysis? ____________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

5. In an April 1971 report which analyzes data from 1968 MDTA Institutional and OJT data tapes, the following statement can be found: "We doubt whether the non-response bias is a serious problem for the institutional program." As a person familiar with the requirements of program analysis, would you agree with that statement?

Yes ____  No ____

Why? ____________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

6. In the same study, there are some tables which present effectiveness indicators by sex and length of training, which are of particular interest to the study team. How were these tables constructed?

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
If as the result of a special run, why isn't this type of analysis used more widely?

If not a special run, where are the source data for these tables?

Can the study team have access to them?
7. The following questions relate to specific DOL data tables as indicated for Enrollees in FY 1972, MDTA Institutional Data:

a. In Table 40 (Enrollee Characteristics), barriers to employment are given. 95% of enrollees cited reasons which fell in the category of lack of training, education and experience. In view of these disproportionate returns, why is this question asked?

What information is desired and for what purpose?

b. Table 20 gives reasons for non-completion, but no occupational breakdown for type of training is provided. Why aren't data related to the type of occupational training received?
c. Table 90 reports outcomes for terminated trainees. Again, there is no relation cited by type of occupational training. Why not?


d. Table 5 is a table which shows by three digit DOT code number pre-training characteristics of enrollees by the type of occupational training by sex and social characteristics. For 28,373 out of a total of 132,736 enrollees reporting, no job titles are known. Why is this the case for over 21% of all trainees?


e. For Table 6, showing trainees enrolled by race or ethnic group and training occupation based on a one digit code, there is no coding available for 40,200 enrollees. Why?
f. Table 5 gives percentage calculations per occupational group for total enrollees. Raw figures are given by sex. Why are the figures by sex not calculated in percentages?

---

g. Table 33 records straight time average hourly earnings of employed trainees by major industry-occupation group and post-training earnings. Data are available by race, sex, head of household and disadvantaged status, but not type of training occupation. Why not?

---

h. Table 70 (completers vs. non-completers) similarly show no categorization by type of training. Why not?
8. If DOT code numbers were more faithfully recorded, training outcomes could be assessed in terms of pre- and post-training job status by occupational group (i.e., shifts from one occupational category to another could indicate upward mobility). Would this be a meaningful index of the MDTA institutional program's impact?

Yes ____  No ____
## TABLE 1

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF FEMALE POPULATION\(^a\) IN THE LABOR FORCE, BY MARITAL STATUS, SELECTED MONTHS, 1950-72

(Numbers in Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th></th>
<th>Married, Spouse Present</th>
<th></th>
<th>Widowed, Divorced, Separated</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage of Population</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage of Population</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage of Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March, 1950</td>
<td>5,621</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>8,550</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>3,624</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March, 1960</td>
<td>5,401</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>12,253</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>4,861</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March, 1970</td>
<td>6,965</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>18,377</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>5,891</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March, 1972</td>
<td>7,477</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>19,249</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>6,213</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Civilian population (including institutional) 14 years and over, March 1950 - March 1960; March 1970 and 1972, 16 and over; beginning 1972 to relate to civilian non-institutional population.

**Source:** Manpower Report of the President, USDOL, March, 1973, p. 164-165.
TABLE 2

LABOR FORCE STATUS AND LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATESa OF MARRIED WOMEN, HUSBAND PRESENT, BY PRESENCE AND AGE OF CHILDREN, SELECTED MONTHS, 1950-72

(Numbers in Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Children 6 to 17 years Only</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Children under 6 years</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Children under 18 years old</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1950</td>
<td>8,550</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,946</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>2,205</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1960</td>
<td>12,253</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,692</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>4,087</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1970</td>
<td>18,377</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,174</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>6,289</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1972</td>
<td>19,249</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,797</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>6,706</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aOf civilian noninstitutional population in the labor force.

Source: Manpower Report of the President, USDOL, March 1972, p. 168
Additional manpower programs were designed during the decade as outlined in Table 3. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and subsequent amendments gave birth to the Neighborhood Youth Corps, New Careers (later subsumed under Public Service Careers), Operation Mainstream, the Job Corps, and the Special Impact Program. The Concentrated Employment Program (CEP) was developed in 1967 as a means to coordinate manpower services within a defined geographic area. J.O.B.S. began in 1968 in an attempt to involve private industry actively in federally subsidized on-the-job training in conjunction with supportive services. The JOBS-Optional program began in 1971 to focus on on-the-job training in private industry with minimal provision of supportive services. The Work Incentive program (WIN) was created by an amendment to the Social Security Act in 1967 to provide a job training program specifically for welfare recipients. And finally, the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 created the Public Employment Program (PEP), a program to subsidize public service jobs.

As the MDTA program has evolved during the eleven years since enactment of the legislation, certain groups have been singled out for focus: youth, older workers, inmates, veterans, the disadvantaged and heads of households. Although they can be found in all of these categories, women to date have not been specifically targeted by MDTA.
The Work Incentive program, on the other hand, was created as a reaction to Congressional concern over the growing welfare rolls and the need to train AFDC (Aid For Dependent Children) recipients for employment. The Talmadge amendment required all welfare recipients capable of working to register for work or job training or lose their welfare subsistence.1/ Although the first priority of the WIN Program is AFDC fathers, the majority of its enrollees are AFDC mothers. Therefore, "women's problems" in terms of employment, child care, and job training have been a major concern in the development and implementation of the WIN program. This has not occurred in the MDTA Institutional program because of its different legislative history.

1/ Those exempted from this requirement include: young people under 16 years of age and full-time students in school or vocational training; ill or aged persons; those living beyond reasonable commuting distance from a WIN project; mothers of children under 6 (though they may volunteer); persons who must care for ill or incapacitated members of the household; and the mother or other female caretaker of a child if the father or another male relative is in the home and has registered. Manpower Report of the President, 1973, p. 37.
### TABLE 3

**FEDERAL MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MDTA Institutional Training</td>
<td>Manpower Development &amp; Training Act, Title 11B</td>
<td>DOL; HEW; Two Years Authorization</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIN</td>
<td>SSA Title 11C</td>
<td>Job Training; DOL Support Services; HEW - One Year</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEP</td>
<td>EOA Title 1B, Sec. 123, MDTA Title 11</td>
<td>DOL; One Year Money</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.O.B.S.</td>
<td>EOA, Title 1B, MDTA Title 11, Sec. 204, 301</td>
<td>DOL; Two Year</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation Mainstream</td>
<td>EOA, Titles 1B, 1F, MDTA Sec. 123a, 162a</td>
<td>Title 1B: DOL-One Year Money; Title 13: DOL Six Months</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Corps</td>
<td>EOA Title 1A</td>
<td>DOL; One Year</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Youth Corps</td>
<td>EOA Title 1B, Sec. 123a</td>
<td>DOL; One Year</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Careers</td>
<td>EOA Title 1B, MDTA Title 1E</td>
<td>DOL and HEW (MDTA) Two Year Money, DOL (EOA); One Year</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journeyman Training</td>
<td>MDTA</td>
<td>DOL</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeship Outreach</td>
<td>MDTA</td>
<td>DOL</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National O.J.T.</td>
<td>MDTA, Sec. 204a</td>
<td>DOL</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs Optional</td>
<td>MDTA, Title 11A</td>
<td>DOL</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RECOMMENDATIONS TO ADDRESS MDTA INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL PROBLEM AREAS

Internal Impediments

In responding to follow-up questions concerning impediments within the MDTA system, most respondents described actions which had been or should be undertaken by the federal government. Accordingly, the listing below identifies both the impediment and the full range of responses suggested to address it. Because of the wide variety of replies, no attempt was made to rank order these responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impediment</th>
<th>Proposed Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislation, guidelines and/or regulations</td>
<td>- Propose legislative amendments concerning available job requirements, restrictions on provision of supportive services, the mandate re: training for entry level employment and/or seek changes in administrative guidelines (e.g., regarding reasonable expectations of employment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Request authority to offer services to trainees on a long-term basis, e.g., offer upgrading and refresher training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Encourage and respond to pressure from private women's organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Make placement of female heads of households a priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>- Seek long-term funding on other than project-by-project basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increase funding levels for operations and E&amp;D efforts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Training programs

- Develop individualized occupational plans for trainees, diagnosing current needs and projecting needs over time
- Develop a more formalized yet flexible approach to the counseling of women trainees
- Expand and improve upon the cluster approach of the Skill Centers, to facilitate vertical and horizontal mobility for trainees
- Expand the use of job analysis techniques in developing training options
- Structure a more gradual transition from training to work, with less emphasis upon training in institutional settings
- Make greater use of IR's and private trade schools
- Revise tests with anti-female biases (e.g., GATBE) used to screen MDTA trainees
- Establish relationships and linkages with community colleges
- Provide federal support for innovative programs encouraging industry to hire women (e.g., JOBS)
- Subcontract with private women's organizations and groups to develop individualized approaches to the counseling and placement of women
- Provide information and technical assistance to employers
- Support experimentation with entire training systems, not just with components

Job placement
Job placement (continued)

- Hire a contractor to structure a series of seminars and conferences to sensitize MDTA personnel to women and minority issues
- Develop uniform criteria for assessing staff performance
- Conceal the sex of applicants for administrative positions in the MDTA system
- Develop either process or guideline oriented controls, or police federal grants to states to see that antidiscrimination laws are enforced

**External Factors**

Most action steps proposed to address the external factors identified as significant influences upon program outcomes fell within the province of the federal government. The full range of relevant responses is identified below in relation to the primary external factors named.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Factors</th>
<th>Proposed Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor market conditions</td>
<td>• Improve information and forecasting system by decreasing reliance upon trend and historical analysis and making long-range projections at local levels with employer participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Create jobs, e.g., provide support for public employment on a permanent basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support passage of pending legislation regarding relocation assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor market conditions (continued)</td>
<td>Society's attitudes (sexism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Anticipate training needs (e.g., through coordination between DOL and DOD regarding anticipated defense installation shutdowns)</td>
<td>• Enforce existing laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Link manpower with educational legislation requirements, so that trainees can be exposed to wide career options</td>
<td>• Conduct public information campaigns (e.g., &quot;Hire the Vet&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Offer inducements to firms to remain in cities so that potential jobs are not lost</td>
<td>• Support enactment of pending Constitutional Equal Rights Amendments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Status and reputation of MDTA as a federal program (continued)

Attitudes of business and industry

- Encourage closer communication between MDTA programs and surrounding community (e.g., Skill Centers)
- Encourage industry through incentives, JOBS-like programs, etc. to make innovations re: hiring and promotion of women
- Sponsor a series of seminars which focus on industry's role in retooling for the greater involvement of women
- Develop explicit counter-policies to deal with the problems caused by past discrimination
- Attach strings to federal funds
- Promote institutional training rather than OJT since employer acceptance of female enrollees in the former program is higher
- Encourage business and industry to recruit from WIN and other MDTA programs
- Continue and expand the involvement of EEO officers in the program
- Ethnic and racial makeup of the staff should compare proportionately with that of clientele
- View placement as a means of assuring occupational parity among racial/ethnic groups
- Work with prime sponsors to ensure the presentation of women in the CAMPS system

Racism

Lack of planning for women in the CAMPS system
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