THE EFFECTS OF A SUMMER YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM
FOR SCHOOL ALIENATED AND ADJUDICATED YOUTH

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Ann Marie Ellis, M.A.
Denton, Texas
December, 1984

This research was a reanalysis of an extant data set on a Youth Employment Demonstration Projects Act (YEDPA) summer program. The ten week, seven site program combined classroom training with a worksite experience and was targeted to drop-outs, potential drop-outs and adjudicated youth. Eligible youth were randomly assigned to participant and control groups and were measured at pre- and postprogram and three and eight month follow-up. The data set included information on 1901 participant and 978 control youth.

The present research modified and extended the initial analysis in the following ways: (1) controls who participated in another federally sponsored summer program were deleted from the analysis, (2) outcome variables of job knowledge and vocational skills were residualized creating a set of orthogonal dependent measures, (3) five additional or redefined outcomes were specified, and (4) additional covariates, including level of program participation and site location, were included in the regression analysis.

The analysis produced no significant difference between participants and controls on residualized, postprogram measures of job knowledge, job holding and job seeking skills. Participants experienced significantly less
trouble with police over the program summer and had significantly higher full-time employment rates at eight month follow-up. When the "in school" outcome was redefined to eliminate participation in another CETA training or apprenticeship program, the difference between participants and controls favored controls.

Three sites were significantly and positively associated with achieving some program outcome(s), however, no exemplary site, positively associated with all postprogram outcomes, emerged from this analysis.

In four of eight regressions, a positive, nonlinear function for level of program participation was significant, however, beyond 220 program hours the effect of increased participation brought diminishing returns.

The strength of the relationships between predictor models and outcomes in this research, as in the initial analysis, was low ranging from .0761 to .3154. A search for factors which would enhance the predictive ability of the models was suggested for further research.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In August 1977, Congress and the Carter Administration reached a consensus that the problem of youth unemployment had reached crisis proportions. At that time, the national unemployment rate for all workers was 6.9 per cent; for youth (aged 16 to 19) the rate was 17.3 per cent. For minority youth the problem was acute: 40.9 per cent were unemployed.

In response to this crisis, Congress passed the Youth Employment and Demonstrations Projects Act (YEDPA). This act authorized a wide range of demonstration projects and accompanying evaluations which were intended both to address the problem of youth unemployment and to answer very basic questions about the efficacy of youth employment and training programs.

In their implementation of YEDPA, the Office of Youth Programs of the Department of Labor provided funding for a series of projects which aimed at enhancing the job prospects and career planning potential for youth. This compliment of programs was the Youth Employment and Training Programs (YETP). One YETP project was developed by a national minority manpower training organization and was
funded in FY 1979 and 1980. This demonstration was targeted to youth between the ages of sixteen and twenty-one, identified by local education agencies as dropouts or potential dropouts or youth who had come into contact with some phase of the juvenile justice system.

The objectives of this summer training program were to provide an opportunity for vocational exploration and to provide youth with skills that would promote their future employability (7). Specific objectives were

- To improve participants' career planning abilities to the extent that they could assess their own skills and abilities and formulate a realistic career plan;
- To improve participants' career knowledge base so that over the course of the program, participants gained increased insight into a range of specific careers;
- To improve participants' ability to utilize career related resource materials;
- To increase the likelihood that participants who were dropouts would return to school.

The program combined classroom skill development, motivational training and personal counseling for two hours each weekday morning with a four hour worksite experience each afternoon. Youth were matched with public and private
sector jobs based on their interests, and they observed and participated at these supervised worksites (11). The summer program ran six hours per day, five days per week for ten weeks. The national organization provided a certificate of achievement for youth who completed 200 hours of the 300 maximum hours of program participation.

After the ten week summer component a 240 day follow-up program began. During this follow-up period, program coordinators maintained contact with participants through counseling and referral services, review classes, telephone contacts, a newsletter and home visits. The purpose of the follow-up activities was two-fold: to reinforce the summer program curriculum, and provide counseling and information on employment opportunities (11).

Youth who volunteered for the project and who met its eligibility requirements were randomly divided into participant and control groups. Both groups were measured at the beginning and end of the summer project period and again at three and eight months following the summer program.

The program ran simultaneously in seven regional site locations across the United States. During the summer of 1980, the national organization collected data on 1901 participants and 976 control youth for all seven sites.

An important and relatively unique aspect of all the Youth Demonstration Projects was a systematic evaluation
using the same assessment system. The Standardized Assessment System (SAS) was developed by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) under contract with the Department of Labor (DOL), Office of Youth Programs, and was intended to assess the relative effectiveness of alternative program approaches (8). The System included standardized pretest and posttest instruments for demographic, process, and social-psychological data collection. In addition to instruments, the SAS included data collection procedures, guidelines for development of experimental and control groups and formats for data analysis and reporting.

The Standardized Assessment System was used with forty projects at 190 sites in the United States. Robert Taggart, the administrator at Office of Youth Programs who supervised the development of the SAS noted that, "Standardized comprehensive information about hundreds of local projects and tens of thousands of participants and controls clearly offers unparalleled opportunity to improve our knowledge of youth employment problems and how they can be overcome" (8, viii–ix).

In November of 1981, the Center for Studies in Social Policy (CSSP) in McLean, Virginia, completed an evaluation of this particular YEDPA project using guidelines established by ETS under subcontract to DOL (7). This analysis investigated a number of program outcomes
including the development of work related skills and attitudes and immediate and longer term changes in status among participants and controls at program completion and follow-up. While CSSP researchers found that the demonstration project did effect some positive changes in participant behavior, their analysis produced generally insignificant differences between participants and controls on measures of work-relevant skills and attitudes. In addition, at three months following the program, their analysis yielded no significant difference between participants and controls on the important outcomes of return to school and full-time employment. Both of these areas, the development of work-related skills and attitudes and encouraging participants back to school or into full-time employment after their schooling were important program outcomes for YEDPA projects.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this research was to reexamine the effects of a nationwide training program for disadvantaged youth which ran in the summer of 1980. An extant data set was used with information on 1901 participants and 976 controls associated with this program.

The present research modified and extended the initial analysis in the following ways.

(1) Nearly one-fifth of the youth who applied for this
program and who were randomly assigned to a control group went on to find openings in other government sponsored training programs during the experimental program period. These youth continued to be part of the "control" group in this study even though they may have received a very comparable treatment over the experimental period. In the present analysis, these youth were deleted from the data set.

(2) Three pencil and paper tests of job knowledge and vocational skills were used as outcome measures in the original evaluation. The present analysis removed the common variance from these measures and created a set of orthogonal dependent measures for the regression analysis.

(3) The effects of four covariates not included in the original analysis were included in the present research. These were subjects': a) age, b) disadvantaged status, c) previous employment history and d) previous CETA experience.

(4) In the original analysis, no provision was made to investigate the effects of number of hours completed in the program and program outcomes. Preliminary analysis revealed that nearly one-fourth (24.1%) of all participants did not
complete at least 200 hours of the 300 hour program. The present research introduced program hours as a covariate in the regression analysis.

(5) In the original analysis, the effect of site on outcomes was not analyzed. Because this experimental program ran simultaneously at seven sites across the country, it was possible that one or more particularly ineffective sites could have moderated what would otherwise have been a significant and positive overall effect for the program. Site location was introduced as an independent variable into the regression analysis.

(6) The present research analyzed the effects of program participation on three outcomes which were not analyzed in the original research. These outcomes included reported trouble with police at program completion, and school status at three and eight months follow-up. For the purposes of this analysis, "in school" status was redefined to exclude participation in another CETA training or apprenticeship program.

(7) In the original research, there was no investigation of the interaction effects of program participation and participants' characteristics. The present research analyzed the interaction
effects of program participation and the following characteristics on all outcome measures: gender, race, STEP reading score, economic status, offender status, dropout status, age, previous employment, previous CETA experience, disadvantaged status, and site location of program.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to reexamine an extant data set on a summer training program for school alienated and adjudicated youth in order to more precisely measure its effectiveness.

Hypotheses

In order to measure the effectiveness of this demonstration project, the following hypotheses were tested.

(1) Participation in the summer youth employment program will result in higher postprogram scores on a measure of Job Knowledge for participants when compared to controls.

(2) Participation in the summer youth employment program will result in higher postprogram scores on a measure of Job Seeking Skills for participants when compared to controls.

(3) Participation in the summer youth employment pro-
gram will result in higher postprogram scores on a measure of Job Holding Skills for participants when compared to controls.

(4) Participation in the summer youth employment program will result in less reported trouble with police for participants during the summer program period when compared to controls.

(5) Participants in the summer youth employment program are more likely than controls to be employed full-time during the postprogram period.

(6) Participants in the summer youth employment program are more likely than controls to have returned to school during the postprogram period.

Significance of Study

YEDPA program strategy was based on the assumption that the school-to-work transition could be greatly facilitated for the disadvantaged by socializing youth into basic work attitudes and skills and by increasing youths' labor market awareness. Numerous studies documented the impact of labor market knowledge and work attitudes on the effect of this transition (1, 6, 12, 13). Becker and Hills (3) linked attitudinal and motivational differences among teenagers with subsequent success or failure in the labor market. Studies by Andrisani (2), Brito and Jusenius (4) and Grasso
and Kohen (9) on National Longitudinal Survey data found that labor market experiences early in work careers were associated with occupational aspirations of youth and that early unsuccessful work experience led to discouragement and reduced aspirations.

If increased labor market awareness plus socialization into basic work attitudes and favorable early work experience are components in the successful school-to-work transition, the question arises as to whether these goals can be achieved through short-term interventions.

In reviews of YEDPA summer programs by Taggart (14) and from the Center for Employment and Income Studies, Brandeis University (6) the efficacy of summer training programs has been clearly challenged:

From the Brandeis review:

While these enriched (summer) programs demonstrate positive effects on participants, they did not influence work attitudes...Neither in the case of the OIC and SER program did participants gain more on tests of work attitudes and job knowledge than did comparison group youth. (6, p.16)

And from Taggart:

(these summer programs) did not, apparently, have a major impact on employability skills and attitudes. (14, p.122)

Both of these reviews included evaluations based on preliminary analyses of the data set that is the focus of this research.

The present research sought to more precisely document
the effects of this YEDPA program in order to answer the question of whether a short-term intervention could be successful in achieving socialization goals in the school-to-work transition and to answer specific questions of who gained most from this demonstration effort.

In 1982, a new chapter in federal involvement in employment and training began when the 97th Congress passed the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). While the primary objectives for JTPA participants are increased employment and reduced welfare dependency, Congress did recognize the special needs of disadvantaged youth (10). Basic education and pre-employment skills are competencies which can be included in a broad definition of "positive termination" by Service Delivery Areas for JTPA funded programs. How best to achieve these competencies in this new generation of federally subsidized training programs will draw, in part, from the knowledge developed out of the YEDPA experience.

In the period since the 1977 YEDPA legislation, the problems of youth and minority youth unemployment have not abated. The current unemployment picture is distressing overall, but the picture for minority youth is particularly grim. In June 1984, with an overall unemployment rate of 7.4 per cent, the youth (16-19 years) rate was 15.5 per cent and the black youth rate was 34.3 per cent (15). Clearly, the need for approaches to deal effectively with youth
unemployment is as acute today as it was seven years ago.

Definition of Terms

**YEDPA.** Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act. Legislation, passed in August 1977, that authorized an array of projects and accompanying program evaluations to measure the efficacy of youth employment and training programs.

**YETP.** Youth Employment and Training Programs. One of six program components funded by YEDPA legislation for the purpose of enhancing the job prospects and career preparation of low income youth. In this cluster of programs, participants were paid a wage or training allowance. Programs could last no longer than twelve months.

**OYP.** Office of Youth Programs within the Education and Training Administration of the Department of Labor. This Office was charged with the responsibility for implementing the YEDPA legislation and subsequent evaluation of programs and dissemination of evaluation results.

**SAS.** The Standardized Assessment System is a set of instruments with accompanying instructions and an analysis plan developed by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) under contract to the Department of Labor for use in evaluating the diverse youth employment and training projects funded by YEDPA.
School Alienated Youth. Youth who were identified by local education agencies as either school dropouts or potential dropouts and were referred to this program.

Adjudicated Youth. Approximately one-third of the youth involved in this research was referred by local court authorities. These youth had contact with some phase of the juvenile justice system and may have been on probation or parole or had received some other court determination.

Economically Disadvantaged Youth. A special designation defined by the Department of Labor, a youth was identified at intake as economically disadvantaged if he/she belonged to any of the following categories: (a) a member of a family which received public assistance; (b) a member of a family whose income during the previous six months, on an annualized basis, was such that the family would have qualified for public assistance if they had applied for such assistance and/or if the family income did not exceed the OMB poverty level of 70 per cent of the lower living standard income level (c) a foster child on whose behalf state or local government payments were made; (d) a client of a sheltered workshop; (e) a handicapped individual with a family income of 100% or less of the lower living standard income level; (f) a person confined to an institution or facility providing 24-hour support such as in a prison or hospital; (g) a regular out-patient of a mental hospital,
rehabilitation facility or similar institution.

Limitations of the Study

The experimental design used in this research was the pretest-posttest control group design. Campbell and Stanley (5) cite an inherent limitation in this design, in that internal validity may be threatened by the interaction of the pretest and the experimental treatment.

A second limitation in this particular design existed in the selection of subjects. While random assignment was made to participant and control groups, the original pool of subjects was not randomly selected from the universe of disadvantaged youth. These youth volunteered for the program, therefore, generalization of these findings to the universe of disadvantaged school-alienated or adjudicated youth cannot be made.

There was some reported difficulty by local sites in following the randomization procedures. While local sites were supervised during the intake phase to assure random assignment of youth to participant and control groups, at one site the intake process was not complete when the summer program had to begin. At that site, participants were randomly selected from the available pool of subjects and the control group was completed by the next available volunteers.
Beyond these limitations, the present research relied on an extant data set collected at seven different sites around the country. While the data collection procedures were specified by the Department of Labor, errors may have occurred in the administration of tests or follow-up measures, or in the coding of responses.

Basic Assumptions

It was assumed that disadvantaged youth who volunteered for a summer training program would represent a comparable universe of disadvantaged youth who would participate in such a program, if available. It was also assumed that random assignment of youth to participant and control groups assures equivalency of these groups.

The use of multiple regression analysis allowed the partialling out of factors which may have acted differentially to affect outcomes. The use of inferential statistics allowed for probabilistic assumptions to be made.

Summary

The present research was a reanalysis of an extant data set on a YEDPA summer training program. The program which ran in FY 1980 was targeted to youth aged 16-21 who were dropouts, potential dropouts, or adjudicated youth. Some 1901 participants and 976 controls are represented in the
The objectives of the program were to improve participants career planning abilities, to improve their career knowledge base and to encourage dropouts back to school.

The ten week program had a daily classroom component for skills and motivational training and an on-site work component. Following the experimental summer, there was an eight month follow-up program to reinforce program learnings and provide counseling and information on employment opportunities.

Unique to the YEDPA projects was a standardized assessment system which provided pretest and posttest instruments, data collection procedures and formats for data analysis. The original analysis on this data set used this standardized assessment system developed by the Educational Testing Service under subcontract to the Department of Labor.

The objective of this research was to modify and extend the original analysis of this data set in a number of ways: youth who were inappropriate controls for the experiment were deleted, new covariates were added to the regression analysis, and the effects of the program on additional outcomes were measured.

Program effectiveness was measured by testing eight research hypotheses. These specified that significant
differences existed between participants and controls on posttest measures of job knowledge, job seeking skills, job holding skills, amount of trouble with police at program completion, and level of full-time employment and school participation at three and eight months following the program.

The significance of this study rests on the assumption that job training programs for youth aim to achieve basic socialization goals vis-a-vis work attitudes and skills and increased labor market awareness. In recent evaluations of CETA programs, the efficacy of short-term interventions to achieve these goals has been challenged.

Today, through the Job Training Partnership Act, funding continues for summer employment and training programs for disadvantaged youth. The effort to determine "what works best for whom" is still a significant policy issue.

The experimental design and the execution of this design presented several limiting factors. These include: the threat to internal validity posed by the interaction of the pretest and the experimental treatment, violation of procedures for random assignment of subjects to participant and control groups, and the possibility of measurement errors in the data collection process.
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CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

Before the Great Depression there were no employment and training programs for youth sponsored by the federal government. In the 1930's, two programs served youth: the National Youth Administration, an early work-study program, and the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) which had a limited training component but was largely a means of putting young men to work on conservation projects (16).

From the time of the New Deal to the 1960's War on Poverty, no federal youth employment program was instituted (19). While the Employment Act of 1946 set as its goal the promotion of maximum employment "for those able, willing and seeking to work" it did so solely through manipulation of monetary and fiscal policy (35). During four recessional troughs occurring in 1949, 1954, 1958 and 1961, policymakers provided financial cushions for unemployed workers but developed no employment and training programs to ameliorate the problem (32).

In 1959, the Area Redevelopment Act and, in 1962, the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) were passed which initiated institutional and on-the-job training
efforts targeted to displaced workers in depressed areas of the country (32). With MDTA the Secretary of Labor was directed to begin a comprehensive program of research and development in order to establish a better understanding of the labor market and how it operated (35). Because the MDTA was not targeted to youth, subsequent amendments to the Act in 1963, focused on youth and provided for a series of experimental and demonstration projects (38).

With the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Congress authorized an array of programs targeted to the "hard core" disadvantaged and provided for research and development to be directed by the Department of Labor on the efficacy of these and other programs (19). This Act created the Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) a program targeted to low income youth with objectives of increasing employability of youth while decreasing their school dropout rates. The Act also created Job Corps, a residential program offering vocational training and basic education to the most disadvantaged youth.

The War on Poverty included a Work Incentive (WIN) program and Jobs Opportunities in the Business Sector (JOBS) both of which encouraged private sector participation in employing and training the disadvantaged, and the Concentrated Employment Program which provided comprehensive services, including training and placement assistance, for
the poor and unemployed in ghetto areas (19).

In 1971, in response to rising unemployment, the Emergency Employment Act included programs for summer and in-school training for youth, and temporary jobs for the hardest to employ (32). These programs were reorganized, augmented and a new strategy in federal programs emerged in 1973 with the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA).

CETA authorized a full range of employment and training services including classroom and on-the-job training, work experience, basic and remedial education, counseling, job search assistance and payment of allowances. The purpose of the Act was to consolidate federal programs and to decentralize the federal training effort by placing the responsibility for planning and implementation at the local level with "prime sponsors" with funding from the federal budget (7). The largest of the youth programs launched under CETA was the Summer Program for Economically Disadvantaged Youth (SPEDY) which emerged from the Neighborhood Youth Corps of the 1960's. Between 1978 and 1982, one out of every twenty employed youth, aged fourteen to twenty-one, held subsidized jobs funded through this summer jobs program (14).

In 1977, an amendment to CETA was passed which was the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act (YEDPA).
YEDPA created four new programs: Young Adult Conservation Corps (YACC), Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects (YIEPP), Youth Community Conservation and Improvement Projects (YCCIP), and Youth Employment and Training Programs (YETP). In addition, YEDPA doubled the size of Job Corps and increased funding of the Summer Youth Employment (SYEP) Program (formerly SPEDY). The Office of Youth Programs was established by the legislation to oversee demonstration, research and evaluation activities for each of these program areas (35). In FY 1978-1979, approximately one half billion dollars was spent on basic research, national demonstration projects, technical assistance and evaluation and assessment efforts in trying to answer questions on the efficacy of these programs (14).

Soon after the 1980 election, the Reagan Administration began to disengage the federal government from employment and training programs. CETA legislation and programs were replaced by the Job Training Partnership Act which became effective on October 1, 1983. The Act places new responsibilities with state governors, encourages private sector participation in jobs programs and at the same time greatly reduces federal funding for employment and training programs (25).

While an enormous array of data was collected on YEDPA projects in the period from 1977 to 1980, little funding was
available after that period for the analysis of this data and publication of findings. The following section reviews those findings which have been made public. The outcomes of interest reviewed in this section are the development of employability skills, employment outcomes, school retention, and involvement with the criminal justice system.

**Employability Skills**

Part of the knowledge development task mandated by YEDPA legislation involved reviews and synthesis of previous research to aid in program development of YEDPA projects (38). Among the major reviewers of previous research there appeared a consensus that the extent of youth's knowledge about the world of work had a significant and positive effect on subsequent wages and occupational status (2, 5, 19, 26, 38).

Building on this, YEDPA projects sought to enhance the employability skills of youth it served. Programs cited specific objectives of improving the job knowledge, job seeking skills and job holding skills of the youth (33). Through the Standardized Assessment System, YEDPA participants were tested to measure program effectiveness in achieving gains in these areas (10).

The YEDPA demonstration project which met with the greatest reported success in this area was the Youth Career
Development Projects (YCD), a program run by six different community-based organizations at thirty different site locations. The YCD program objectives included improving youths' career and occupational information and job search skills (9). The program ran a full school year, twenty hours per month, with a follow-up component. No stipends were paid to youth. YCD program evaluations indicated significant gains by participants when compared to controls on measures of job holding skills and job seeking skills and a nonsignificant gain for participants in job knowledge (29). Further, research indicated that for those working full-time at follow-up, these gains were positively related to the status level of their full-time jobs (13).

The Jobs for Delaware Graduates (JDG) program was a variant of YCD. The program focused on youth who wanted to make the transition from school to work immediately after graduation and who were likely to encounter difficulties in making this transition. Program objectives were focused on specific employability skills. Evaluations indicated that participants gained significantly more than controls on measures of job seeking skills and job holding skills, two areas where the program placed its greatest emphasis (32).

The most intensive and most costly program funded through the YEDPA legislation was Job Corps which offered a full range of services for disadvantaged youth including
residential treatment centers (38). While Job Corps would prove to be successful in other important areas, gains for participants were not significant in the area of employability skills (17, 18, 1). When a sample of 1975 through 1977 Job Corps participants were compared to controls at preprogram and eighteen months postprogram, significant gains were found for both groups in the area of job seeking skills; no change was found for both groups in job holding skills and the control youth, but not participants, gained significantly in job knowledge (1).

The Vocational Exploration Projects (VEPS) were YEDPA career development projects co-sponsored by labor groups and business organizations from 1971 to 1973. VEPS program data (23) revealed some absolute gains in employability skills for participants from pre- to posttesting, however, the research design did not include control youth for comparison purposes.

In studies of the effects of the Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP), no significant differences were found between participants and controls on measures of employability skills (24, 23).

In summary, research on youth employment programs using the Standardized Assessment System to measure gains in employability skills produced mixed results. The poorest results came from shorter term (SYEP) summer programs. Job
Corps produced mixed results, with more positive findings appearing as the program matured. The most positive results came from those programs (YCD) which focused on specific employability skills as their objectives and which maintained contact with program youth over a sustained period of time.

Employment Outcomes

The primary goal of youth employment and training programs is to facilitate the transition from school to work (38). While there is some disagreement as to whether or not employment gains, placement rates, postprogram job status or wage gains should be the expected outcome(s) for youth programs given the complex nature of the youth unemployment problem (32, 15, 27) most program evaluations have reported findings on employment outcomes. The following section reviews three different program approaches: comprehensive, short-term, and highly focused training programs.

Job Corps was a full-time, comprehensive program with residential centers targeted to economically disadvantaged youth aged sixteen to twenty-one. When the 1977 cohort of Job Corps participants was compared to controls eighteen months after leaving the program, Job Corps participants showed greater employment rates and significant earnings gains over controls and lower rates of receiving financial
assistance (18). Earnings gains among participants were due to increased labor force participation rather than higher wages. In two years subsequent to the program, Corpsmen were earning 10.7 per cent more than controls but they worked 15.6 per cent more hours (18). In the most recent study of Job Corps outcomes covering a four year postprogram period (after 1976), net earnings gained in constant 1980 dollars persisted for four years after program participation (21).

Participants from the Youth Career Development (YCD) Program, a school year intervention, were compared to control youth at three and eight months postprogram (13). Favorable impacts were found for participants in the following areas: higher status jobs for those who obtained full-time employment, a greater likelihood of obtaining full-time employment among those who did not go on to post-secondary school, and a greater likelihood of participants engaging in some form of "useful activity" (school and/or work, full or part-time).

Jobs for Delaware Graduates (JDG) was a school year program for high risk youth that provided career counseling, and job placement assistance. At three months postprogram participants were more likely working full-time when compared to a comparison group of nonparticipating high school students but there was no difference in the quality
of the jobs held (14).

Shorter term interventions produced mixed results. The Cambridge Job Factory was a four week job search assistance program for out of school youth which aimed at improving job seeking skills by developing knowledge of the labor market and by working with youth in simulated and actual job search activities (5). Youth who succeeded in finding unsubsidized jobs were paid a supplemental bonus for each hour of employment during the first twelve weeks of their job (14). Four postprogram comparisons of participants and controls were made. Findings indicate that at first follow-up, six weeks postprogram, the job finding rate for experimental youth was significantly higher than for controls (5). However, the job finding rate at subsequent follow-ups was much smaller until at fourth follow-up, forty-five weeks postprogram, controls did better than participants. Apparently, while the program increased short-term employment gains for participants, these gains were lost over time.

When interventions were highly focused on the job search process and when placements were more readily available because of public/private sector collaboration or between programs and labor groups, postprogram employment and earnings gains were more nearly assured (28, 19, 38, 32). Three such programs were "Project Build", Ventures in
Community Improvement and Vocational Exploration in the Private Sector.

An early preapprenticeship training project, "Project-Build", trained inner city youth to enter the building trades. At program completion, 87 per cent of the participants had entered apprenticeships and 53 per cent were still in apprenticeships at one year follow-up. The program reduced unemployment by ten per cent and boosted participants' hourly earnings by 60 per cent. The program's specific focus and the commitment by local labor unions to make apprenticeships available to youth were among the reasons cited for program success. (28).

Taggart (32) suggested similar reasons for the success of Ventures in Community Improvement (VICI) demonstration which provided youth with intensive vocational skills training and linked labor unions and employment groups to help disadvantaged youth make the transition to construction jobs and apprenticeships. While postprogram employment rates for participants were approximately the same as the control group at follow-up, hourly wages for VICI participants were significantly higher than controls because they were more likely in unions and construction jobs (8).

A joint demonstration linked the Department of Labor, the National Alliance of Businessmen and the Office of Education in the development of the Vocational Exploration
Program in the Private Sector (VEPS). This program was targeted to Neighborhood Youth Corps in-school youth identified as potential dropouts. VEPS included career exploration, counseling, remedial education and on-the-job training. The program began in the summer and continued through the school year. Analysis of the VEPS program revealed significant gains in postprogram employment rates for participants when compared to youth with similar backgrounds (12).

While the Summer Youth Employment Program was a shorter duration and less focused intervention, it was still successful in increasing the postprogram employment rate of participants working part-time when compared to controls (24). In their reanalysis of this data set Hahn and Lerman (14) found no significant difference in full-time employment at three months postprogram, but they noted that part-time employment would have been more in keeping with SYEP goals.

In reviews of the employment effects of supported work, no evidence was found for improved employability or improved earnings after limited duration work experience in the absence of education and training activities (22, 20, 32). While supported work experiences may contribute to a cumulative work experience that can, over several years, improve employability, Taggart concluded that short-term impacts were absent (32).
In their comprehensive review of FY 1976 CETA trainees, Westat (37) found that on-the-job training rather than classroom training had the greatest positive impact on employment outcomes. Fade out of gains in the second year was greatest for those participants with the largest first year gains, and for subgroups with the most severe problems such as low earners and black and younger participants.

A data base has been developed by the National Longitudinal Survey of Labor Market Experience (NLS) which has allowed for extensive long-term evaluation of CETA youth from a wide range of programs. In the 1980-81 survey, CETA youth did significantly worse than a matched group on the outcome of unsubsidized employment (3).

In summary, those programs which were more likely to produce positive results in employment gains for participants were programs of longer duration with objectives which focused on the job search process or on enhancing job skills. Successful programs included work experiences or on-the-job training, provided a basic educational component, and had linkage to private industry and/or the trade unions.

Return to School

Two of the six program components of YEDPA, the Youth Employment and Training Program (YETP) and the Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP) had age eligibility requirements
which included participants who were fourteen and fifteen years of age. Thus, return to school would have been a legitimate and expected outcome of these programs. The other four programs had a minimum age requirement of sixteen, and return to school as an outcome, while less likely, would still have been an appropriate outcome for a minority of participants (36).

In an analysis of the noneconomic impacts of Job Corps, Mallar and associates (18) found that at seven month following the program, Corpsmen were forty per cent more likely than controls to have a high school diploma or GED and had sixty per cent higher enrollments in college and training programs. In the eighteen to twenty-four month postprogram period, Job Corps participation more than tripled the number of youth receiving a high school diploma or equivalent degree (18). In addition, in this same follow-up period, Corpsmen spent six times more time in college and vocational or technical school, when compared to controls.

Improvements in rates of return to school were found in VEPS (30) and SYEP (24) programs. However, high school graduation rates and post high school and vocational training were not improved by participation in other CETA programs (19, 38, 32) nor by YEDPA programs precursor, the Neighborhood Youth Corps (31, 11). In a reanalysis of SYEP data, Hahn and Lerman (14) report that 87 per cent of
participants compared to 84 per cent of controls were in school or training activities at three months postprogram. However, this finding was reported as significant only at \( p < .10 \).

In summary, on the outcome of return to school, youth employment and training programs predictably produced mixed results. Where programs were targeted to younger participants and where program goals included encouraging youth back to school, then postprogram rates of high school or vocational school attendance showed gains for participants. Where programs were designed as short term job search or job training programs with postprogram placement in the work force as an objective, no significant gains in return to school were expected or found.

**Criminal Justice System Involvement**

In the U.S., rates of offending reach a peak at about age twenty for males and seventeen for females and then diminish with age (34). It would then be predictable, that youth employment and training programs, especially those that kept participants off the streets during the summer months, would result in decreased rates of delinquent activity. The degree to which participants have less criminal justice system contact at postprogram is an outcome measured by many youth employment and training programs.
Mallar (18) reported that during the first year after participation in Job Corps, participants were a third less likely to be arrested than controls and a fifth less likely to have been arrested for theft. Maynard reported that youth in supported work programs had fewer arrests and convictions than a comparison group (22).

In his review of the Summer Youth Employment Program and other program data, Taggart concluded that "the type of trouble with the law which occurs for young teenagers during summer idleness can be deterred by constructive options" (32, p. 140). However, one of the three studies cited in this review lacked controls and another used only descriptive statistics in analyzing postprogram data.

Summary

In reviewing the effectiveness of CETA programs targeted to youth, the record is mixed. In the area of employability skills, measured by tests of job knowledge, job holding skills and job seeking skills, the most positive results were produced from longer term interventions with program objectives that focused on improving skills in these areas. Most projects reported no significant differences between participants and controls (or comparison groups) in this outcome area.

Longer term interventions that focused on the job
search process or enhancing job skills were most likely to effect positive results for participants in employment outcomes. Those programs that had a work experience component or on-the-job training and that also provided basic education skills or had linkages to private industry or union apprenticeship programs achieved greater success on employment outcomes.

On the return-to-school outcome, programs produced mixed results. When programs were targeted to younger participants and their focus was to encourage dropouts back to school, then more positive rates on this outcome were evidenced. Predictably, short-term job search and job training programs did not produce significantly high postprogram rates of return to school.

No clear picture emerges on the outcome of amount of trouble with police. The longer term Job Corps program produced lower rates of offending during the program. In general, program effects on rates of offending has not been clearly articulated in the literature.
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CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES FOR DATA COLLECTION AND DATA ANALYSIS

Data for this analysis were collected by a national manpower organization at seven site locations under guidelines developed by the Educational Testing Service (ETS). Data collection began in June 1980 and was completed in March 1981.

The following chapter describes the population used in this research, reviews the research instruments developed by ETS, and presents the variables, design, and research hypotheses used in the present analysis.

The Population

The original data set included 1901 participants and 976 control youth. The recruitment process, development of applicant pools and random assignment to participant and control groups were specified by the Department of Labor. A review of this process and a brief description of participant and control group characteristics follows.

Selection Process

There were four stages in the original selection process: linkages with schools and courts for recruitment
of youth to the program, intake and verification, development of applicant pools and random assignment of youth to participant and control groups.

This demonstration program was targeted to disadvantaged school alienated (dropouts and potential dropouts) and adjudicated youth. To that end, the program coordinators relied on the school and juvenile justice communities for recommendations of youth who would benefit from the program. Court officials, juvenile probation and parole officers and school counselors assisted in the recruitment process. Once identified, youth were given information about the program and those who volunteered completed standardized intake forms. Information from this intake document was verified to assure that youth met the program’s income eligibility requirements. When verified, their names were added to one of two applicant pools: recruits from schools and those from the courts. The size of each applicant pool was determined by three factors: the optimum number that each site could handle for the summer program, the need to compensate for expected attrition from the program and the need for a control group. There were five sites which could accommodate 300 participants and two smaller sites which could accommodate one hundred and fifty youth each. At all seven sites the ratio of school-referred to court-referred was 75:25. Randomized assignment of youth to participant
and control groups was completed with the use of a table of random numbers. The ratio of participants to controls among school youth was 3:1, and among the court referred youth was 1:1. Table I in Appendix A describes the composition of sites, and the number of youth needed from schools and courts for participant and control groups.

**Characteristics of Participants and Controls**

The purpose of this section is to briefly describe background characteristics of participants and controls used in this analysis and to discuss any significant differences between these groups. The intake instrument for this data was the Individual Participant Profile, a 49 item instrument which was completed by project personnel on each participant and control youth at the beginning of the program. See Appendix B for all Standardized Assessment System Instruments.

One modification was made to the original data set with regard to the study population. One hundred eighty nine youth from the control group (19 per cent) were eliminated for the present analysis. These youth volunteered for the program but were assigned to the control group. Subsequently, they found a place in another federally sponsored training program while they maintained their status as "controls" in the present study. It was possible that
these youth received a comparable experimental treatment. For this reason they were eliminated from the present analysis.

Data on 1901 participants and 787 control youth are presented in the following section. The characteristics reviewed are subjects' age, gender, education status, economic status, disadvantaged status, race/ethnicity, offender status, previous employment and previous CETA participation. This discussion draws on data presented in tables found in Appendix A, Characteristics of Participants and Controls.

Age.--- Subjects' age ranged from fifteen to twenty-six, however, some ninety per cent were between the ages of fifteen and eighteen. The distribution of ages for participants and controls was comparable and the chi square statistic of 5.15 was not significant (p = .641).

Gender.--- The proportion of males to females in the participant group was roughly equivalent, however, there were proportionately more males (63 per cent) than females (37 per cent) among controls. This is reflected in a significant chi square of 29.48 (p = .000).

Education Status.--- Subjects were divided into five
categories of education status: high school student, high school dropout, received a GED, high school graduate or post high school attendee. There were more high school students (75.3 per cent) in the participant group when compared to controls (65.8 per cent). Conversely, there were fewer high school dropouts among participants than controls (18.9 and 29.1 per cent, respectively). There were slightly more high school graduates among the participant group making it higher overall in education status when compared to controls. This is reflected in a significant chi square of 36.29 (p = .000).

Economic Status.— Since family income level determined eligibility for this program, it is not surprising that nearly all (99 per cent) of the youths' family income was no higher than 85 per cent of the Lower Living Standard Income Level (LLSIL) as established by the Office of Management and Budget. There was no significant difference between participants and controls on this variable as evidenced by a chi square statistic of .523 (p = .769).

Disadvantaged Status.— Nearly all (99.1 per cent) of the youth were categorized as disadvantaged by standards established by the Department of Labor. There was no significant difference between participants and controls on this variable as revealed by a chi square of .656 (p = .418).
Race/ethnicity.— The majority of participants and controls, 77.5 and 69.5 per cent respectively, were black (non-Hispanics). Hispanics represented 12.8 per cent of the sample and 9.7 per cent were white, non-Hispanic. In the participant group there was a larger proportion of blacks and a smaller proportion of white, non-Hispanic when compared to controls and this contributed to a significant chi-square of 39.02 (p = .000).

Offender Status.— The ratio of offenders to nonoffenders in participant and control groups was predetermined in the research design. In the control group this was 1:1, and in the participant group it was 1:3. These proportions were reflected in the data.

Previous CETA Experience.— There was a somewhat higher proportion of participants who had previous CETA experience (31.6 per cent) when compared to controls (25.1 per cent). This produced a significant chi-square of 10.80 (p = .001).

Previous Employment.— Over half of both the participant and control group had worked either full or part-time, while approximately 40 per cent of each group had never worked. There was no significant difference between participants and controls on this variable as reflected by a chi-square of
In summary, an analysis of the differences of participants and controls on selected demographic and other status variables indicated that on the variables of age, economic status, disadvantaged status and prior employment there were no significant differences between participants and controls. On the variables of gender, education status, race/ethnicity and previous CETA participation, significant differences did exist. There was a higher proportion of blacks, females, high school students and youth with prior CETA experience among the participant group when compared to controls.

In the original analysis of this data set, the Center for Studies in Social Policy examined participant and control characteristics at posttest and three and eight month follow-up to determine comparability of groups and to examine any differences in rates of attrition (2). The results of their analysis indicated that at follow-up, participants and controls had not significantly changed on these demographic characteristics. One exception was that, at posttesting, the higher proportion of blacks in the participant group had diminished through differential attrition.

The Instruments

The Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act
(YEDPA) was designed, in part, as an experimental effort to develop a knowledge base needed to design new and improved national youth policies and programs (6). Because there were hundreds of demonstration projects, DOL supervised the development of a Standardized Assessment System (SAS). Such a system of research design, data analysis, and instrumentation was intended to allow findings to be compared and contrasted across a variety of demonstration projects (3).

The measures within the Standardized Assessment System that were used in this research will be described in the following section. Copies of each SAS instrument are included in Appendix B.

**Background Measures**

Two measures of participant and controls' characteristics, the Individual Participant Profile (IPP) and STEP Reading Scale, were made at the beginning of the summer program.

**The Individual Participant Profile (IPP).**— The IPP is a forty-nine item instrument which was completed by project personnel on each participant and control youth. The first twenty-nine items were demographic in nature and were completed for both participants and controls. The last twenty items of the instrument were completed for participants only and indicated their status at the time of
program completion or termination.

The **STEP Reading Scale (STEP)**.— The twenty items of this reading scale were drawn from the STEP Locator Tests developed by ETS in 1978 (3). The test measured fourth through ninth grade reading levels which was deemed appropriate for this population. The test yielded a reading achievement grade level score for each participant and control group member and this was used to statistically equate these groups on the variable of verbal (academic) skill level.

**The Psychometric Battery**

The Office of Youth Programs, Department of Labor, identified a series of objectives that they believed would be common to the majority of YEDPA projects. From these objectives they specified two areas of trainee performance outcomes that would be measured by a psychometric battery. These areas, work related skills and attitudes, were measured by seven tests which composed the psychometric battery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Areas</th>
<th>In-Program Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Related Skills</td>
<td>Job Knowledge Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Holding Skills Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Seeking Skills Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Related Attitudes</td>
<td>Vocational Attitude Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Relevant Attitudes Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self Esteem Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex Stereotypes of Adult Occupations Scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The psychometric battery was administered to participants and controls at pre- and postprogram periods in order to estimate the impact of the program in the competency areas (2).

To overcome the difficulties of pencil and paper tests for low achieving youth, provision was made to administer the tests in small groups with administrators orally presenting each item. In addition, respondents were allowed to mark their answers directly into the test booklets.

The present research will utilize the subtests which measure the work related skills: job knowledge, job holding skills, and job seeking skills. The following section will briefly describe these three tests and will include information on the measures' reliability and validity. A copy of the complete battery is included in Appendix B.

**Job Knowledge Test.**—This thirty-three item measure contains both verbal and pictorial material which deals with various job qualifications, requirements and tasks.

Analyses of the reliability and validity of this measure have used samples of youth in work experience and training programs for out of school youth. Reliability of the measure averaged in the mid .70s for a series of studies based on CETA, vocational school and other community training program samples (4, 5). ETS and OYP found these reliabilities in keeping with similar composite measures.
Validity, both concurrent and predictive, was measured using CETA and community based organizations' program samples. The predictive validity criterion information was based on longitudinal data from three to twelve months following test administration. The measure exhibited its best predictive validity ($r = .32$) for worksite supervisor ratings (3).

**Job Holding Skills Test.**—This eleven item test measured respondents' awareness of appropriate on-the-job behaviors. Using verbal and pictorial materials, respondents were asked to select one of three alternatives that best described how he/she would respond in the situation described. The situations depicted worker-worker and worker-supervisor interactions.

Measures of reliability and validity were made using the same samples as those used for the Job Knowledge Test.

The measured reliabilities (internal consistency) of this instrument ranged from .60 to .74 which ETS judged to be moderate, given the nature of the measure and its relatively short length (3).

Reasonably good predictive validity for this measure was found with such criteria as training program adjustment ($r = .34$ and .36), proficiency ratings by worksite supervisors ($r = .34$ and .31) and overall social and
vocational adjustment following training (r = .29) (3).

**Job Seeking Skills Test.**--This seventeen item multiple choice test measured the level of skill of respondents to initiate an employment search, interpret information about jobs from newspaper advertisements, and understand information requirements for completing a job application.

Reliability and validity measures used the same samples as described in the discussion on the Job Knowledge Test.

Measures of reliability (internal consistency) ranged from mid .60s to low .70s. ETS judged these levels useful for the purposes this test was intended (3).

OYP and ETS reported that the Job Seeking Skills Test had the greatest predictive validity of all of the seven subtests within the Psychometric Battery (3). The measure had moderate levels of concurrent validity (r = .32 and .35) with counselor and work supervisor ratings and had predictive validities of r = .31 and .22 for those ratings. The measure showed its best predictive validity for post-program employment with a CETA sample (r = .36).

**Performance Outcome Measures**

Four instruments were developed by ETS to measure performance outcomes. One pair of instruments was used for program participants and controls immediately following the summer training program period. Another pair of instruments
was used for participants and controls at three and again at eight months following the program. A brief description of each of these instruments follows. A copy of each instrument can be found in Appendix B.

Program Completion Survey.— This forty-eight item instrument was administered to program participants when they left or completed the program. The instrument assessed level of program participation, attitude toward the program, postprogram employment, education aspirations and expectations and social and community adjustment. Two other proficiency rating scales, The Counselor Rating Form (eleven items) and the Work Supervisor Rating (ten items) were also completed at this time for participants.

Control Group Status Survey.— This forty-eight item "parallel" questionnaire contains items comparable to the Program Completion Survey. In lieu of questions regarding program participation, controls were asked about their activities over the preceding six months.

Program Follow-up Survey.— Three and eight months following program completion, participants were administered this fifty-eight item questionnaire which covered their postprogram employment and education experiences, social and community adjustment and future plans.

Control Group Follow-up Survey.— This fifty-five item parallel instrument for control youth contains items comparable to the Program Follow-up Survey.
Variables

The variables that were used in this research are identified in Table I (below). A review of the influences of control variables on employment and related outcomes is included in Appendix C. Since variables were entered hierarchically into the regression equation, the ordering of the covariates varied somewhat. The ordering of the independent variables in Table I was used in the first three regression equations where the outcomes were posttest measures of job knowledge and vocational skills.

Research Design

This study was designed to measure the effects of a summer employment and training program. Data were collected at four points in time: prior to the program, at postprogram, and at three and eight months following the program summer.

The research design used was described by Campbell and Stanley as a true experimental design: the pretest-posttest control group design with random assignment (1). This experimental design controls for the eight threats to internal validity: history, maturation, testing, instrumentation, statistical regression, biases from selection, experimental mortality and interaction of selection and maturation. However, the external validity of this design may be affected by the interaction of the pretest and experimental treatment. The overall design and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y</th>
<th>(dependent variable)</th>
<th>Posttest Job Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Posttest Job Seeking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JSS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Posttest Job Holding Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JHS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Reported trouble with police during treatment period:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=no trouble with police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2=in trouble just once</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3=in trouble a couple of times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4=in trouble with police more than a couple of times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Reported school activity at three and eight month follow-up:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=not in school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2=in school part-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3=in school full-time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Reported employment status at three and eight month follow-up:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=presently working full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2=not working full-time but have worked full-time since program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3=have never worked full-time since program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>(independent variable)</th>
<th>Pretest Job Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pretest Job Seeking Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest Job Holding Skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>STEP Reading Score,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range: 0–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Education Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1= Dropout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2= High School Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3= Post High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>Offender Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1= Offender/ 0= Nonoffender</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1= Female/ 0= Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1= Nonminority/ 0= Minority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>Previous CETA experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1= Yes/ 0= No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Subjects' age in years at beginning of program summer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>Disadvantaged Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1= No/ 0= Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>Economic Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bureau of Labor Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Index of Family Income based on Lower Living Standard Income Level (LLSIL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1= -70% LLSIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2= 70-85% LLSIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3= above 86% LLSIL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>Previous Employment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1= Worked full-time on previous job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2= Worked part-time on previous job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3= Never worked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>Site Location:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Site 8 (1=yes/0=no)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| X | Site 9 (1=yes/0=no) |
TABLE I—Continued

<p>| X | 14.  | Site 10 (l=yes/0=no) |
| X | 15.  | Site 11 (l=yes/0=no) |
| X | 16.  | Site 12 (l=yes/0=no) |
| X | 17.  | Site 13 (l=yes/0=no) |
| X | 18.  | Site 14 (l=yes/0=no) |
| X | 19.  | Number of Hours in Program |
|   |      | Range 0–300, where |
|   |      | Controls = 0 |
| X | 20.  | Group Membership |
|   |      | 1= Participants |
|   |      | 2= Controls |
| X | 21.  | (P/C x STEP) |
|   |      | 20 2 |
| X | 22.  | (P/C x Education Status) |
|   |      | 20 3 |
| X | 23.  | (P/C x Offender Status) |
|   |      | 20 4 |
| X | 24.  | (P/C x Gender) |
|   |      | 20 5 |
| X | 25.  | (P/C x Race) |
|   |      | 20 6 |
| X | 26.  | (P/C x Previous CETA) |
|   |      | 20 7 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(P/C x Age)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(P/C x Disadvantaged Status)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(P/C x Economic Status)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(P/C x Previous Employment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(P/C x Site 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(P/C x Site 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(P/C x Site 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(P/C x Site 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(P/C x Site 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(P/C x Site 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(P/C x Site 14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
data gathering sequence can be diagrammed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Follow-up (3 mos.)</th>
<th>Follow-up (8 mos.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants: X X X X X

Controls: X X X X

Figure 1: Design No. 4, Campbell and Stanley, Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design with Random Assignment

Statistical Procedures

The first task in the reanalysis of this data set was a summary of single-variable descriptive statistics. Measures of central tendency and variability, including mean and standard deviation, frequency counts, and measures of skewness and kurtosis were generated in order to assess the normal or symmetrical distribution of variables. The three outcome measures of job knowledge, job holding skills and job seeking skills were residualized, creating a set of orthogonal dependent measures. Bivariate analysis, each independent variable against each dependent variable was completed and reexpressions of independent variables were made to allow the data to assume a quadratic form.

The method used in testing the research hypotheses was hierarchal regression analysis. The basic statistical design of the multiple linear regression is on the formula:
An assumption in this model is that $Y$, the dependent or criterion variable, will be linearly related to the independent or predictor variables $x_1, x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_n$.

Testing of the Hypotheses

In the following section, each of the research hypotheses is stated and this is followed by the regression equation that was used to test each hypothesis. The independent variables were entered into the regression model in hierarchal fashion. Following the model, a definition of each of the variables is made.

**Hypothesis 1**: No significant difference exists between participants and controls on the posttest measure of Job Knowledge.

Model

$$Y = a + b_{x_1} x_{JK} + b_{x_2} x_1 + b_{x_3} x_2 + \ldots + b_{x_{44}} x_{44} + e$$

where,

$Y$ = Posttest measure of Job Knowledge

$X = Pretest measure of Job Knowledge$

$X = Pretest$
X = STEP
X = Education Status
X = Offender Status
X = Gender
X = Race (Minority/Nonminority)
X = Previous CETA experience
X = Age
X = Disadvantaged Status
X = Economic Status
X = Previous Employment
X = Site 8 (yes/no)
X = Site 9 (yes/no)
X = Site 10 (yes/no)
X = Site 11 (yes/no)
X = Site 12 (yes/no)
X = Site 13 (yes/no)
X = Site 14 (yes/no)
X = Hours in Program
X = Participant/Control
\[ X = X \cdot X \quad (P/C \times \text{STEP}) \]
\[ X = X \cdot X \quad (P/C \times \text{Education Status}) \]
\[ X = X \cdot X \quad (P/C \times \text{Offender Status}) \]
\[ X = X \cdot X \quad (P/C \times \text{Gender}) \]
\[ X = X \cdot X \quad (P/C \times \text{Race}) \]
\[ X = X \cdot X \quad (P/C \times \text{Previous CETA}) \]
\[ X = X \cdot X \quad (P/C \times \text{Age}) \]
\[ X = X \cdot X \quad (P/C \times \text{Disadvantaged Status}) \]
\[ X = X \cdot X \quad (P/C \times \text{Economic Status}) \]
\[ X = X \cdot X \quad (P/C \times \text{Previous Employment}) \]
\[ X = X \cdot X \quad (P/C \times \text{Site 8}) \]
\[ X = X \cdot X \quad (P/C \times \text{Site 9}) \]
\[ X = X \cdot X \quad (P/C \times \text{Site 10}) \]
\[ X = X \cdot X \quad (P/C \times \text{Site 11}) \]
\[ X = X \cdot X \quad (P/C \times \text{Site 12}) \]
\[ X = X \cdot X \quad (P/C \times \text{Site 13}) \]
\[ X = X \cdot X \quad (P/C \times \text{Site 14}) \]
Hypothesis 2: No significant difference exists between participants and controls on the posttest measure of Job Seeking Skills.

Model

\[ Y = a + b_{1}x + b_{2}x + \ldots + b_{n}x + e \]

NJSS 1 1 2 2 44 44

where,

* Y = Posttest measure of Job Seeking Skills, 
  NJSS residualized (scores range from 0–17),
* X = Pretest measure of Job Seeking Skills, 
  \( X_{1} \) \( \ldots \) \( X_{n} \) = Same as Hypothesis 1.

Hypothesis 3: No significant difference exists between participants and controls on the posttest measure of Job Holding Skills.

Model

\[ Y = a + b_{1}x + b_{2}x + \ldots + b_{n}x + e \]

NJHS 1 1 2 2 44 44

where,

* Y = Post-test measure of Job Holding Skills, 
  NJHS residualized (scores range from 0–11),
* X = Pretest measure of Job Holding Skills, 
  \( X_{1} \) \( \ldots \) \( X_{n} \) = Same as Hypothesis 1.
Hypothesis 4: No significant difference exists between participants and controls on reported trouble with police during the program summer.

Model

\[ Y = a + b_1 x + b_2 x + \ldots b_4 x + e \]

where,

\[ Y = \text{Reported trouble with police} \]
\[ X \ldots X = \text{Same variables listed for Hypothesis 1 identified as } X \ldots X \]

Hypothesis 5: No significant difference exists between participants and controls on rates of return to school at three month follow-up.

Model

\[ Y = a + b_1 x + b_2 x + \ldots b_4 x + e \]

where,

\[ Y = \text{Reported school activity at three month follow-up} \]
\[ X \ldots X = \text{Same variables listed for Hypothesis 1 identified as } X \ldots X \]
Hypothesis 6: No significant difference exists between participants and controls on rates of return to school at eight month follow-up.

The same regression as Hypothesis 5 was run, however, data for the dependent variable came from eight month follow-up data.

Hypothesis 7: No significant difference exists between participants and controls on employment status at three month follow-up.

Model

\[ Y = a + b_1 x_1 + b_2 x_2 + \ldots + b_{43} x_{43} + e \]

where,

\[ Y = \text{Reported employment status at three month follow-up}, \]

\[ X_1 \ldots X_{43} = \text{Same variables listed from Hypothesis 1 identified as } X_1 \ldots X_{44}. \]

Hypothesis 8: No significant difference exists between participants and controls on employment status at eight month follow-up.

The same regression as Hypothesis 7 was run, however, data for the dependent variable came from eight month
follow-up data.

In equations four through eight above, all of the independent variables labeled \(X \ldots X\) entered the regression equation, however, the ordering of the variables for each regression varied somewhat.

Summary

The population in this study was comprised of youth who volunteered for a YEDPA demonstration project and who met income eligibility requirements. Youth were divided into applicant pools and randomly assigned to participant and control groups. Some 1901 participants and 787 controls were used in this analysis.

Inspection of subjects background characteristics revealed that on the variables of age, economic status, disadvantaged status and prior employment there were no significant differences between participants and controls. On the variables of gender, education status, race/ethnicity and previous CETA experience, a significant difference between groups did exist. Among participants there was a higher proportion of blacks, females, high school students and youth with prior CETA experience.

The instruments used in the original data collection were designed by the Educational Testing Service under contract with the Department of Labor. These included two
measures of subjects' background characteristics: the Individual Participant Profile and STEP reading test; a psychometric battery which included pre- and posttest measures of job knowledge, job seeking skills and job holding skills; and performance outcome measures taken at postprogram and at three and eight months following the program.

There were eight dependent measures in this analysis. The independent variables included eleven covariates plus a quadratic reexpression of these, site location, and the interaction of participant/control group membership with the eleven covariates and site.

The research design was described by Campbell and Stanley (1) as a true experimental design: the pretest-posttest control group design with random assignment. This research design also included two posttest follow-up measurements.

Hierarchal regression analysis was used to test the eight research hypotheses. These specified no significant difference between participants and controls on outcome measures of job knowledge, job seeking skills, job holding skills, trouble with police at program completion, and employment and school status at three and eight months following the program.
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Eight research hypotheses were tested using hierarchal regression analyses. The criterion variable for the first three hypotheses were measures of vocational skills, using pencil and paper tests designed by the Educational Testing Service to measure Job Knowledge, Job Seeking Skills and Job Holding Skills. These outcome measures were hierarchically residualized forming a set of orthogonal dependent variables. The five other criterion variables were posttest status measures: trouble with police during the program summer, school status and employment status at three and eight months following the program.

Eight regressions were run to test the research hypotheses. There were twenty-seven independent variables entered for the first three regressions and twenty-five independent variables entered for the remaining five regressions. Each variable was entered hierarchically, followed by a quadratic re-expression. In addition to these variables, the group variable (participant/control) was interacted with each of the independent variables and these interaction variables were then entered.

In the following section, for each of the eight
research hypotheses, a summary table arrays the results of the regression analysis and includes the incremental $b$, Beta and $R^2$, the cumulative $R^2$, incremental $t$ and $p$ statistic, simultaneous $b$ and Beta, simultaneous partial $R^2$, simultaneous $t$ and $p$ statistic.

Those variables which, when entered into the regression equation, explained a significant proportion of the variance in the dependent measure were further analyzed. Predicted posttest scores were calculated for various levels of the significant, nonlinear independent variables and a series of graphs depicting these effects are presented in this chapter. Predicted posttest scores were calculated for the interaction variables and a series of interaction effects tables were constructed from these calculations (see Appendix D). Data from these tables is presented in this chapter.

The .01 level of significance was used in this analysis. Using a one-tailed test, all variables with a $p$ statistic of less than .03 were treated as statistically significant and presented in this section.

Tests of the Hypotheses

**Hypothesis 1:** No significant difference exists between participants and controls on the posttest measure of Job Knowledge.
When the effects of all preceding independent variables were held constant, the effect of participant/control group membership on the posttest measure of Job Knowledge was not significant (t = .554; p = .5795). The null hypothesis was accepted. Table 2 arrays the data for the regression analysis.

A series of significant relationships did emerge from this analysis. Four independent variables explained a significant proportion of the variance in the dependent measure when entered into the regression equation. These were the Job Knowledge pretest, STEP reading test, offender status, and number of hours completed in the program. In addition, five interaction variables were significant: the interaction of participant/control group membership with STEP reading test, gender, race, economic status, and previous employment. Data on each of these variables will be presented in the following section.

**Job Knowledge pretest.** There was a significant, positive relationship between the thirty item Job Knowledge pretest and the posttest measure (t = 18.555; p = .0000). The pretest explained 11.36 per cent of the variance in the posttest measure.

**STEP reading test.** When the STEP reading test was used as the predictor variable, there was a significant, positive
### TABLE II

**Y = JOB KNOWLEDGE, POST-TEST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Incr. b (1)</th>
<th>Incr. B (2)</th>
<th>Incr. R2 (3)</th>
<th>Incr. t (4)</th>
<th>Incr. p (5)</th>
<th>Simult. t (6)</th>
<th>Simult. p (7)</th>
<th>Part. t (8)</th>
<th>Simult. t (9)</th>
<th>Part. t (10)</th>
<th>Simult. t (11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JKPR</td>
<td>.3262</td>
<td>.3371</td>
<td>.1136</td>
<td>.1136</td>
<td>18.555</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.1200</td>
<td>.1241</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>1.184</td>
<td>.2364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JKPR2</td>
<td>.0033</td>
<td>.1273</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>.1141</td>
<td>1.221</td>
<td>.2222</td>
<td>.0039</td>
<td>.1545</td>
<td>.0008</td>
<td>1.467</td>
<td>.1424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP</td>
<td>.0962</td>
<td>.1183</td>
<td>.0106</td>
<td>.1247</td>
<td>5.696</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.1498</td>
<td>.1842</td>
<td>.0015</td>
<td>2.022</td>
<td>.0432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP2</td>
<td>.0028</td>
<td>.0830</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.1251</td>
<td>1.048</td>
<td>.2948</td>
<td>.0024</td>
<td>.0716</td>
<td>.0003</td>
<td>.918</td>
<td>.3586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSSTAT</td>
<td>.3321</td>
<td>.0400</td>
<td>.0015</td>
<td>.1266</td>
<td>2.206</td>
<td>.0275</td>
<td>.2822</td>
<td>.0340</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.7744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSSTAT2</td>
<td>-.1554</td>
<td>-.0675</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.1268</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>.4309</td>
<td>-.0996</td>
<td>-.0433</td>
<td>-.0001</td>
<td>-.431</td>
<td>.6664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFSTAT</td>
<td>-.6679</td>
<td>-.0752</td>
<td>.0049</td>
<td>.1317</td>
<td>3.860</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>-.0114</td>
<td>-.0013</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.9833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>.2063</td>
<td>.0248</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>.1322</td>
<td>1.298</td>
<td>.1944</td>
<td>1.5283</td>
<td>.1840</td>
<td>.0040</td>
<td>3.243</td>
<td>.0012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td>-.0861</td>
<td>-.0062</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.1322</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.7412</td>
<td>2.3904</td>
<td>.0997</td>
<td>.0011</td>
<td>1.700</td>
<td>.0893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRVCETA</td>
<td>.2087</td>
<td>.0231</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>.1328</td>
<td>1.276</td>
<td>.2020</td>
<td>.7758</td>
<td>.0858</td>
<td>.0007</td>
<td>1.405</td>
<td>.1601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>.0294</td>
<td>.0129</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.1329</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td>.5152</td>
<td>.0419</td>
<td>.0183</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.6830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE2</td>
<td>.0010</td>
<td>.0299</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.1331</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.4876</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.0058</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.8902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSSSTAT</td>
<td>.4032</td>
<td>.0090</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.1331</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>.6180</td>
<td>-.4475</td>
<td>-.0099</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.8513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECO</td>
<td>-.2650</td>
<td>-.0317</td>
<td>.0010</td>
<td>.1341</td>
<td>1.713</td>
<td>.0867</td>
<td>1.1218</td>
<td>.1341</td>
<td>.0008</td>
<td>1.445</td>
<td>.1484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECO2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECO2</td>
<td>(No variable entered, tolerance = 0.010 limits reached)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRVEMP</td>
<td>-.1120</td>
<td>-.0226</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.1345</td>
<td>1.104</td>
<td>.2699</td>
<td>1.1919</td>
<td>.2401</td>
<td>.0009</td>
<td>1.578</td>
<td>.1147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRVEMP2</td>
<td>-.2189</td>
<td>-.1808</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>.1350</td>
<td>1.282</td>
<td>.2000</td>
<td>-.2364</td>
<td>-.1953</td>
<td>.0007</td>
<td>1.375</td>
<td>.1692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>.5796</td>
<td>.0399</td>
<td>.0013</td>
<td>.1364</td>
<td>2.039</td>
<td>.0416</td>
<td>2.5564</td>
<td>.1762</td>
<td>.0030</td>
<td>2.838</td>
<td>.0046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>-.1.2625</td>
<td>-.1.1181</td>
<td>.0101</td>
<td>.1465</td>
<td>5.631</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>3.7898</td>
<td>.3545</td>
<td>.0069</td>
<td>4.281</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>.3109</td>
<td>.0259</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.1470</td>
<td>1.169</td>
<td>.2423</td>
<td>1.5815</td>
<td>.1319</td>
<td>.0015</td>
<td>2.010</td>
<td>.0445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>.4157</td>
<td>.0388</td>
<td>.0010</td>
<td>.1480</td>
<td>1.782</td>
<td>.0749</td>
<td>-.3033</td>
<td>-.0283</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>.7303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>-.0829</td>
<td>-.0072</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.1480</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.7784</td>
<td>.2815</td>
<td>.0246</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.7603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>.4886</td>
<td>.0335</td>
<td>.0013</td>
<td>.1483</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>.3372</td>
<td>.2518</td>
<td>.0173</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>.6145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>(No variable entered, tolerance = 0.010 limits reached)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HXNPR</td>
<td>.0007</td>
<td>.0400</td>
<td>.0015</td>
<td>.1498</td>
<td>2.176</td>
<td>.0296</td>
<td>.0019</td>
<td>.1005</td>
<td>.0018</td>
<td>2.156</td>
<td>.0312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HXNPR2</td>
<td>-.0000</td>
<td>-.0757</td>
<td>.0021</td>
<td>.1519</td>
<td>2.562</td>
<td>.0105</td>
<td>-.0000</td>
<td>-.0752</td>
<td>.0013</td>
<td>1.873</td>
<td>.0612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>-.1445</td>
<td>-.0159</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.1520</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>.5795</td>
<td>4.3437</td>
<td>.4785</td>
<td>.0046</td>
<td>3.480</td>
<td>.0005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE II—Continued

Regression Coefficients and t Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCSTEP</td>
<td>-.1179</td>
<td>-.2566</td>
<td>.0043</td>
<td>.1562</td>
<td>3.660</td>
<td>.0003</td>
<td>-.0916</td>
<td>-.1995</td>
<td>.0030</td>
<td>2.806</td>
<td>.0051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCEDSTAT</td>
<td>.4320</td>
<td>.1076</td>
<td>.0006</td>
<td>.1568</td>
<td>1.346</td>
<td>.1783</td>
<td>.0672</td>
<td>.0167</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.8443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCOFFSTAT</td>
<td>-.1047</td>
<td>-.0188</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.1568</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>.7755</td>
<td>-.2709</td>
<td>-.0485</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.718</td>
<td>.4732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCEGENDER</td>
<td>-1.1203</td>
<td>-.1845</td>
<td>.0032</td>
<td>.1600</td>
<td>3.170</td>
<td>.0015</td>
<td>-.1.0414</td>
<td>-.1.715</td>
<td>.0033</td>
<td>2.977</td>
<td>.0029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCRACE</td>
<td>-2.1209</td>
<td>-.2301</td>
<td>.0052</td>
<td>.1652</td>
<td>4.082</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>-.7431</td>
<td>-.0806</td>
<td>.0007</td>
<td>1.361</td>
<td>.1735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCEPVCETA</td>
<td>-.6045</td>
<td>-.0902</td>
<td>.0009</td>
<td>.1661</td>
<td>1.644</td>
<td>.1002</td>
<td>-.4869</td>
<td>-.0727</td>
<td>.0006</td>
<td>1.217</td>
<td>.2237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCAGE</td>
<td>(No variable entered, tolerance = 0.010 limits reached)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCDISSTAT</td>
<td>.4176</td>
<td>.0137</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.1661</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.7987</td>
<td>.5863</td>
<td>.0193</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.7184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCECOSTAT</td>
<td>-.9854</td>
<td>-.2407</td>
<td>.0029</td>
<td>.1690</td>
<td>3.021</td>
<td>.0025</td>
<td>-.8512</td>
<td>-.2079</td>
<td>.0010</td>
<td>1.592</td>
<td>.1115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCPRVEMP</td>
<td>-.5390</td>
<td>-.1971</td>
<td>.0021</td>
<td>.1710</td>
<td>2.569</td>
<td>.0102</td>
<td>-.1.406</td>
<td>-.0514</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>.5099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS8</td>
<td>-.6727</td>
<td>-.0656</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.1714</td>
<td>1.110</td>
<td>.2670</td>
<td>1.5803</td>
<td>-.1.540</td>
<td>.0022</td>
<td>2.437</td>
<td>.0149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS9</td>
<td>-.3.7930</td>
<td>-.5028</td>
<td>.0200</td>
<td>.1914</td>
<td>8.086</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>-.3.5968</td>
<td>-.4.768</td>
<td>.0133</td>
<td>5.976</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS10</td>
<td>-1.0230</td>
<td>-.1184</td>
<td>.0009</td>
<td>.1923</td>
<td>1.788</td>
<td>.0738</td>
<td>1.0068</td>
<td>-.1.165</td>
<td>.0012</td>
<td>1.750</td>
<td>.0804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS11</td>
<td>.7868</td>
<td>.1013</td>
<td>.0008</td>
<td>.1931</td>
<td>1.581</td>
<td>.1139</td>
<td>.6685</td>
<td>.0860</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>1.133</td>
<td>.2572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS12</td>
<td>-.2361</td>
<td>-.0276</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.1931</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.7087</td>
<td>-.2.361</td>
<td>-.0276</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.7087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS13</td>
<td>(No variable entered, tolerance = 0.010 limits reached)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS14</td>
<td>(No variable entered, tolerance = 0.010 limits reached)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MR2 = 0.1931
F = 16.25
p = .0000
DF = 39; 2648
relationship between STEP test and the posttest measure of Job Knowledge \( (t = 5.696; p = .0000) \). The STEP test explained one per cent of the variance in the dependent measure.

**Offender status.** When entered into the regression equation, previous offender status was significant \( (t = 3.860; p = .0001) \); however, the variable explained only one half of one per cent of the variance in the criterion measure. Youth who were nonoffenders had higher predicted posttest Job Knowledge scores than youth who were offenders prior to the program.

**Hours in program.** A positive, nonlinear monotonic function for number of hours completed in the program was significant \( (t = 2.562; p = .0105) \) in predicting postprogram scores on the test of Job Knowledge; however, less than four tenths of one per cent of the variance in the dependent measure was explained by this variable. Figure 2 graphs the relationship between program hours and the outcome measure. The greatest gain on the outcome measure came for those participants who had completed up to 220 hours. There were diminishing returns for increased program hours after that point.

**Interaction of participant/control group membership and STEP reading test.** This constructed interaction variable was significant \( (t = 3.660; p = .0003) \); however, the variable explained only four tenths of one per cent of the variance in
Fig. 2—Y = Job Knowledge Posttest, X = Hours in Program.
the dependent measure. The highest predicted posttest score on Job Knowledge was among participants with the highest STEP reading test score, followed by controls with the lowest preprogram reading scores. Participants tended to increase on postprogram Job Knowledge scores with increasing reading test scores, while control youth tended to decline on predicted outcome scores with a corresponding increase on reading achievement. Calculations for predicted outcomes for all interaction variables are found in Appendix D.

**Interaction of participant/control group membership and gender.** This constructed interaction variable was significant in predicting postprogram scores on the test of Job Knowledge ($t=3.170; p=.0015$) but only accounted for three tenths of one per cent of the variance in the outcome measure. The highest predicted outcome was for males in the control group and the lowest for males in the participant group.

**Interaction of participant/control group membership and race.** This variable was significant in explaining the variance in the criterion variable ($t=4.082; p=.0000$); however, the variable explained only one half of one per cent of the variance in the outcome measure. Minority controls and nonminority participants had the highest predicted posttest scores on Job Knowledge, while minority participants had the lowest predicted outcome scores.
Interaction of participant/control group membership and economic status. Economic status of subjects was divided into three categories: high, medium and low, based on Office of Management Budget's lower living standard income level. The variable of group membership interacted with economic status was significant in explaining the variance in posttest scores of Job Knowledge (t = 3.021; p = .0025). However, only three tenths of one percent of the variance in the criterion measure was explained by this variable. The predicted posttest scores of participants increased as economic status increased, while the predicted posttest scores of controls decreased with increasing economic status. Control youth in the lowest economic status group had the highest postprogram predicted outcome, while the lowest predicted score was for participants in the lowest economic status group.

Interaction of participant/control group membership and previous employment status. This interaction variable was significant in explaining the variance in the outcome measure (t = 2.569; p = .0102). The variable explained only two tenths of one percent of the variance in the outcome measure. For both participants and controls, the lowest predicted outcome was among those youth who had previously worked full-time and the highest predicted outcome was among those who had never worked prior to the program summer.
Control youth who had never previously worked had the highest predicted outcome score, while participants who had previously worked full-time had the lowest.

**Hypothesis 2:** No significant difference exists between participants and controls on the posttest measure of Job Seeking Skills.

The common variance between the dependent variables of Job Knowledge and Job Seeking Skills tests was removed forming a new, orthogonal dependent measure of Job Seeking Skills. When the effects of all previous independent variables were held constant, the effect of participant/control group membership on this new posttest measure of Job Seeking Skills was not significant (t = .807; p = .4199). The null hypothesis was confirmed. Table 3 arrays the data for the regression analysis.

Five significant relationships emerged from this analysis. The independent variables: Job Seeking Skills pretest, STEP reading test, offender status, economic status, and number of hours in program contributed significantly to explaining the variance in the outcome measure.

**Job Seeking Skills pretest.** There was a significant, positive and nonlinear relationship between the seventeen item Job Seeking Skills pretest and the posttest measure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSPR</td>
<td>.2767</td>
<td>.3355</td>
<td>.1126</td>
<td>.1126</td>
<td>18.457</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>- .0300</td>
<td>- .0364</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.6958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSPR2</td>
<td>.0121</td>
<td>.2947</td>
<td>.0035</td>
<td>.1160</td>
<td>3.237</td>
<td>.0012</td>
<td>.0124</td>
<td>.3035</td>
<td>.0040</td>
<td>3.260</td>
<td>.0011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP</td>
<td>.0513</td>
<td>.0996</td>
<td>.0066</td>
<td>.1226</td>
<td>4.494</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0322</td>
<td>.0627</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>.4985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP2</td>
<td>.0027</td>
<td>.1261</td>
<td>.0008</td>
<td>.1234</td>
<td>1.559</td>
<td>.1193</td>
<td>.0036</td>
<td>.1674</td>
<td>.0016</td>
<td>2.087</td>
<td>.0370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSTAT</td>
<td>.0009</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.1234</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.9923</td>
<td>-1.4742</td>
<td>-2.2809</td>
<td>.0021</td>
<td>2.345</td>
<td>.0919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSTAT2</td>
<td>.2655</td>
<td>.1823</td>
<td>.0015</td>
<td>.1249</td>
<td>2.118</td>
<td>.0343</td>
<td>.3039</td>
<td>.2087</td>
<td>.0016</td>
<td>2.060</td>
<td>.0395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFSTAT</td>
<td>-.2872</td>
<td>-.0511</td>
<td>.0022</td>
<td>.1271</td>
<td>2.614</td>
<td>.0090</td>
<td>-.4226</td>
<td>-.0751</td>
<td>.0006</td>
<td>1.214</td>
<td>.2250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>.2158</td>
<td>.0411</td>
<td>.0015</td>
<td>.1286</td>
<td>2.139</td>
<td>.0325</td>
<td>.1172</td>
<td>.0223</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.6971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td>-.2545</td>
<td>-.0280</td>
<td>.0008</td>
<td>.1294</td>
<td>1.558</td>
<td>.1194</td>
<td>-.0721</td>
<td>-.0882</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.8899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRVCETA</td>
<td>.0603</td>
<td>.0105</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.1295</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>.5614</td>
<td>.3405</td>
<td>.0595</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>.3338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>-.0108</td>
<td>-.0075</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.1295</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.7060</td>
<td>.0300</td>
<td>.0208</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>.6467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG2</td>
<td>-.0007</td>
<td>-.0337</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.1297</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>.4351</td>
<td>-.0006</td>
<td>-.0309</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>.4680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISSTAT</td>
<td>-.7253</td>
<td>-.0256</td>
<td>.0007</td>
<td>.1304</td>
<td>1.416</td>
<td>.1570</td>
<td>-.2226</td>
<td>-.0785</td>
<td>.0008</td>
<td>1.462</td>
<td>.1440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOSTAT</td>
<td>-.5943</td>
<td>-.1123</td>
<td>.0119</td>
<td>.1423</td>
<td>6.096</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.3355</td>
<td>.0634</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>.4981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOSTAT2</td>
<td>(No variable entered, tolerance = 0.010 limits reached)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRVEMP</td>
<td>-.0067</td>
<td>-.0021</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.1423</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.9163</td>
<td>-.0450</td>
<td>-.0143</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.9256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRVEMP2</td>
<td>-.0784</td>
<td>-.1023</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.1425</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.4673</td>
<td>.0459</td>
<td>.0599</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>.6761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>1.0035</td>
<td>.1093</td>
<td>.0101</td>
<td>.1526</td>
<td>5.644</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>-.4227</td>
<td>-.0460</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>.4622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>-.3305</td>
<td>-.0489</td>
<td>.0017</td>
<td>.1543</td>
<td>2.345</td>
<td>.0191</td>
<td>-.2239</td>
<td>-.3310</td>
<td>.0059</td>
<td>3.966</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>-.0869</td>
<td>-.0115</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.1544</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>.6036</td>
<td>-.1056</td>
<td>-.1393</td>
<td>.0017</td>
<td>2.103</td>
<td>.0355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>-.6490</td>
<td>-.0958</td>
<td>.0062</td>
<td>.1606</td>
<td>4.438</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>-.3184</td>
<td>-.4700</td>
<td>.0120</td>
<td>5.663</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>.2123</td>
<td>.0294</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.1610</td>
<td>1.145</td>
<td>.2521</td>
<td>-.1726</td>
<td>-.2387</td>
<td>.0032</td>
<td>2.929</td>
<td>.0034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>-.6591</td>
<td>-.0715</td>
<td>.0013</td>
<td>.1623</td>
<td>2.064</td>
<td>.0391</td>
<td>-.6611</td>
<td>-.0717</td>
<td>.0016</td>
<td>2.072</td>
<td>.0384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>(No variable entered, tolerance = 0.010 limits reached)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINPR</td>
<td>-.0008</td>
<td>-.0695</td>
<td>.0046</td>
<td>.1670</td>
<td>3.820</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>-.0000</td>
<td>-.0002</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.9966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINPR2</td>
<td>-.0000</td>
<td>-.0579</td>
<td>.0012</td>
<td>.1682</td>
<td>1.977</td>
<td>.0480</td>
<td>-.0000</td>
<td>-.0744</td>
<td>.0013</td>
<td>1.840</td>
<td>.0659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>.1317</td>
<td>.0229</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.1684</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td>.4199</td>
<td>-.0396</td>
<td>-.0069</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.9604</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE III**

Y = JOB SEEKING SKILLS POST-TEST, RESIDUALIZED

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Increment b</th>
<th>Increment R2</th>
<th>Increment t</th>
<th>Increment p</th>
<th>Cumulative b</th>
<th>Cumulative R2</th>
<th>Cumulative t</th>
<th>Cumulative p</th>
<th>Simultaneous b</th>
<th>Simultaneous R2</th>
<th>Simultaneous t</th>
<th>Simultaneous p</th>
<th>Particular b</th>
<th>Particular R2</th>
<th>Particular t</th>
<th>Particular p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCSTEP</td>
<td>-.0374</td>
<td>-.1287</td>
<td>.0011</td>
<td>.1694</td>
<td>1.849</td>
<td>.9645</td>
<td>-.0468</td>
<td>-.1609</td>
<td>.0019</td>
<td>2.243</td>
<td>.0250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCDINSTAT</td>
<td>.0217</td>
<td>.0085</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.1694</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.9141</td>
<td>.1721</td>
<td>.0678</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>.4307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCOFFSTAT</td>
<td>.0998</td>
<td>.0203</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.1695</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>.6654</td>
<td>.1546</td>
<td>.0438</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>.5215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCGENDER</td>
<td>.0737</td>
<td>.0192</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.1695</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.7404</td>
<td>.1457</td>
<td>.0379</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td>.5141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCRACE</td>
<td>-.0167</td>
<td>-.0028</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.1695</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.9595</td>
<td>-.0904</td>
<td>-.0155</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>.7952</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCPRVCETA</td>
<td>-.1210</td>
<td>-.0285</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.1696</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>.6023</td>
<td>-.1637</td>
<td>-.0386</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>.5212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PCAGE

-----

PCAGEN

-----

PCVRM

-----

PCS

-----

PCS10

-----

PCS11

-----

PCS12

-----

PCS13

-----

PCS14

-----

\[ MR2 = .1788 \]
\[ F = 14.78 \]
\[ p = .0000 \]
\[ DF = 39; 2648 \]
The pretest explained 11.60 per cent of the variance in the posttest measure. Figure 3 graphs the monotonic relationship between the pre- and posttest measures. Greatest predicted postprogram gains on the outcome came for those youth between the tenth and thirtieth centiles on the pretest.

**STEP reading test.** There was a significant and positive relationship between the STEP reading test and the posttest measure of Job Seeking Skills ($t = 4.494; p = .0000$). The variable explained less than seven tenths of one per cent of the variance in the dependent measure.

**Offender Status.** When entered into the regression equation, previous offender status was significant ($t = 2.614; p = .0090$); however, the variable explained only two tenths of one per cent of the variance on the outcome measure. Nonoffenders had higher predicted posttest scores when compared to youth who were offenders prior to the program.

**Economic Status.** There was a significant, inverse relationship between subjects' economic status and their posttest Job Seeking Skills test scores ($t = 6.096; p = .0000$). Economic status explained only one per cent of the variance in the posttest measure.

**Hours in program.** There was a significant, inverse relationship between program hours and the residualized posttest measure of Job Seeking Skills ($t = 3.820;$
Fig. 3—\( Y = \text{Job Holding Skills Posttest, Residualized, } X = \text{Pretest}^2 \)
Hypothesis 3: No significant difference exists between participants and controls on the posttest measure of Job Holding Skills.

After a new, residualized, Job Holding Skills dependent measure was created, the regression analysis produced an incremental $t$ for participant/control group membership of 1.038 (see Table 4, column 5) which was not significant. The null hypothesis was confirmed.

From the analysis, a number of significant relationships did emerge. Seven independent variables contributed significantly to explaining the variance in the criterion measure. They were: the Job Holding Skills pretest, STEP Reading Test, offender status, gender, race, economic status, and number of hours of program participation.

**Job Holding Skills pretest.** There was a significant, positive relationship between the Job Holding Skills pretest and the posttest measure ($t = 9.853; p = .0000$). The pretest explained only three and a half per cent of the variance in the residualized dependent measure.

**STEP test.** There was a significant, negative and nonlinear, monotonic relationship between reading ability as
**TABLE IV**

**Y = JOB HOLDING SKILLS POST-TEST, RESIDUALIZED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHPR</td>
<td>.1649</td>
<td>.1868</td>
<td>.0349</td>
<td>.0349</td>
<td>9.853</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.1519</td>
<td>.1720</td>
<td>.0251</td>
<td>8.250</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHPR2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(No variable entered, tolerance = .010 limits reached)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP</td>
<td>-.0248</td>
<td>-.0537</td>
<td>.0025</td>
<td>.0873</td>
<td>2.617</td>
<td>.0089</td>
<td>.0791</td>
<td>.1715</td>
<td>.0012</td>
<td>1.795</td>
<td>.0727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP2</td>
<td>-.0048</td>
<td>-.2480</td>
<td>.0034</td>
<td>.0408</td>
<td>3.093</td>
<td>.0020</td>
<td>-.0004</td>
<td>-.2113</td>
<td>.0026</td>
<td>2.628</td>
<td>.0086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSTAT</td>
<td>.1887</td>
<td>.0401</td>
<td>.0016</td>
<td>.0423</td>
<td>2.104</td>
<td>.0355</td>
<td>-.1087</td>
<td>-.2312</td>
<td>.0013</td>
<td>1.830</td>
<td>.0673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSTAT2</td>
<td>.0197</td>
<td>.0151</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0424</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.8664</td>
<td>.2635</td>
<td>.2019</td>
<td>.0013</td>
<td>1.891</td>
<td>.0586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFSTAT</td>
<td>-.2424</td>
<td>-.0481</td>
<td>.0020</td>
<td>.0443</td>
<td>2.346</td>
<td>.0191</td>
<td>.2268</td>
<td>.0450</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>.4908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>.5469</td>
<td>.1161</td>
<td>.0117</td>
<td>.0560</td>
<td>5.765</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.8858</td>
<td>.1880</td>
<td>.0036</td>
<td>3.114</td>
<td>.0019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td>-.4018</td>
<td>-.0508</td>
<td>.0025</td>
<td>.0585</td>
<td>2.644</td>
<td>.0083</td>
<td>.0549</td>
<td>.0069</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.9111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRVCETA</td>
<td>-.1286</td>
<td>-.0251</td>
<td>.0006</td>
<td>.0591</td>
<td>1.330</td>
<td>.1831</td>
<td>-.4692</td>
<td>-.0915</td>
<td>.0007</td>
<td>1.410</td>
<td>.1588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>-.0485</td>
<td>-.0375</td>
<td>.0012</td>
<td>.0603</td>
<td>1.822</td>
<td>.0685</td>
<td>-.1146</td>
<td>-.0885</td>
<td>.0013</td>
<td>1.854</td>
<td>.0638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE2</td>
<td>.0015</td>
<td>.0754</td>
<td>.0010</td>
<td>.0613</td>
<td>1.682</td>
<td>.0927</td>
<td>.0011</td>
<td>.0582</td>
<td>.0006</td>
<td>1.299</td>
<td>.1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISSTAT</td>
<td>-.3054</td>
<td>-.0120</td>
<td>.0010</td>
<td>.0614</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>.5220</td>
<td>1.3450</td>
<td>.0529</td>
<td>.0003</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>.3504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOSTAT</td>
<td>-.3139</td>
<td>-.0662</td>
<td>.0042</td>
<td>.0656</td>
<td>3.451</td>
<td>.0066</td>
<td>.0469</td>
<td>.0858</td>
<td>.0003</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td>.3846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOSTAT2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(No variable entered, tolerance = .010 limits reached)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRVEMP</td>
<td>.0204</td>
<td>.0073</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0656</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.7327</td>
<td>.0073</td>
<td>.0026</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.9872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRVEMP2</td>
<td>-.0141</td>
<td>-.0205</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0656</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.8887</td>
<td>.0011</td>
<td>.0016</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.9915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>-.4042</td>
<td>-.0491</td>
<td>.0020</td>
<td>.0676</td>
<td>2.417</td>
<td>.0157</td>
<td>-.8318</td>
<td>-.1011</td>
<td>.0009</td>
<td>1.531</td>
<td>.1260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>-.5439</td>
<td>-.0897</td>
<td>.0059</td>
<td>.0735</td>
<td>4.116</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>-.3728</td>
<td>-.0615</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>.4849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>.0982</td>
<td>.0144</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0737</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>.5322</td>
<td>-.0438</td>
<td>-.0065</td>
<td>.0009</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.9265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>.1421</td>
<td>.0234</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.0740</td>
<td>1.034</td>
<td>.3005</td>
<td>-.9568</td>
<td>-.1576</td>
<td>.0012</td>
<td>1.803</td>
<td>.0715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>-.1094</td>
<td>-.0169</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0742</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.5296</td>
<td>-.15230</td>
<td>-.2349</td>
<td>.0028</td>
<td>2.737</td>
<td>.0062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>.3446</td>
<td>.0417</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>.0746</td>
<td>1.147</td>
<td>.2517</td>
<td>.3248</td>
<td>.0393</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>1.078</td>
<td>.2812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(No variable entered, tolerance = .010 limits reached)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINPR</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>.0447</td>
<td>.0019</td>
<td>.0765</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>.0197</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0137</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.7815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINPR2</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0009</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0765</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.7636</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0278</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>.5145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>-.1600</td>
<td>-.0311</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.0769</td>
<td>1.038</td>
<td>.2993</td>
<td>.3438</td>
<td>.0668</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>.6481</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE IV—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCSTEP</td>
<td>-.0078</td>
<td>-.0299</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0770</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>.6837</td>
<td>-.0004</td>
<td>-.0168</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCEDSTAT</td>
<td>.2384</td>
<td>.1047</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>.0775</td>
<td>1.253</td>
<td>.2104</td>
<td>.1214</td>
<td>.0533</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCOFFSTAT</td>
<td>-.1501</td>
<td>-.0474</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.0777</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>.4910</td>
<td>-.1861</td>
<td>-.0588</td>
<td>.0003</td>
<td>.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCGENDER</td>
<td>-.3311</td>
<td>-.0961</td>
<td>.0009</td>
<td>.0786</td>
<td>1.579</td>
<td>.1145</td>
<td>-.2746</td>
<td>-.0797</td>
<td>.0006</td>
<td>1.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCRACE</td>
<td>-.3879</td>
<td>-.0742</td>
<td>.0006</td>
<td>.0791</td>
<td>1.254</td>
<td>.2098</td>
<td>-.1290</td>
<td>-.0247</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCPRVCETA</td>
<td>.1498</td>
<td>.0394</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.0793</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>.4940</td>
<td>.3403</td>
<td>.0896</td>
<td>.0008</td>
<td>1.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(No variable entered, tolerance = 0.010 limits reached)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCDISTAT</td>
<td>-1.0964</td>
<td>-.0636</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.0797</td>
<td>1.124</td>
<td>.2611</td>
<td>-.1.1596</td>
<td>-.0673</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>1.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCECOSTAT</td>
<td>-.1875</td>
<td>-.0807</td>
<td>.0003</td>
<td>.0800</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.3356</td>
<td>-.6397</td>
<td>-.2755</td>
<td>.0015</td>
<td>1.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCPRVEMP</td>
<td>.0145</td>
<td>.0093</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0800</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.9081</td>
<td>.0555</td>
<td>.0358</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS8</td>
<td>.2604</td>
<td>.0448</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.0802</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>.4718</td>
<td>.3240</td>
<td>.0557</td>
<td>.0003</td>
<td>.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS9</td>
<td>-.7159</td>
<td>-.1673</td>
<td>.0022</td>
<td>.0824</td>
<td>2.527</td>
<td>.0115</td>
<td>.0525</td>
<td>.0123</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS10</td>
<td>-.0022</td>
<td>-.0005</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0824</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.9950</td>
<td>.1331</td>
<td>.0272</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS11</td>
<td>.3447</td>
<td>.0782</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>.0829</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td>.2520</td>
<td>.9756</td>
<td>.2213</td>
<td>.0028</td>
<td>2.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(No variable entered, tolerance = 0.010 limits reached)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(No variable entered, tolerance = 0.010 limits reached)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MR2 = .0866  
F = 6.61  
p = .0000  
DF = 38; 2649
measured by the STEP Test and the residualized criterion variable (t = 3.093; p = .0020). The variable explained less than six tenths of one per cent in the variance on the outcome measure. Figure 4 graphs the relationship between these two variables. The sharpest decline on postprogram scores were for those youth who scored between six and eleven points on the eleven item STEP test.

Offender status. There was a significant, negative relationship between the criterion variable and offender status (t = 2.346; p = .0191). Only two-tenths of one per cent of the variance in the dependent measure was explained by offender status of youth. Nonoffenders had higher predicted postprogram scores on the outcome measure than did offenders.

Gender. When entered into the regression equation, gender explained a significant proportion of the variance in the criterion measure (t = 5.765; p = .0000). The variable explained little more than one per cent of the variance in the posttest measure. Females had higher predicted posttest scores when compared to males.

Race. When minority status was used as the predictor variable, it was significant (t = 2.644; p = .0083); however, the variable accounted for less than three tenths of one per cent of the variance in the dependent measure. Minority youth had higher predicted posttest scores when compared to nonminority youth.
Fig. 4—Y = Job Holding Skills Posttest, Residualized, X = STEP Test^2
Economic status. When entered into the regression equation, economic status was significant ($t=3.451; p=.0006$), but the variable explained only four tenths of one per cent of the variance in the criterion measure. The relationship between economic status of subjects and predicted posttest measure of Job Holding Skills was negative, such that youth in the highest economic status level had the lowest predicted posttest scores.

Hours in Program. There was a significant, positive relationship between the number of hours of participation in the program and the criterion variable ($t=2.333; p=.0197$). The variable explained less than two tenths of one per cent of the variance in the dependent measure.

Hypothesis 4: No significant difference exists between participants and controls on amount of trouble with police at program completion.

When the effects of the preceding independent variables were held constant, the effect of participant/control group membership on amount of trouble with police over the program summer was significant ($t=2.292; p=.0220$). The null hypothesis was rejected. Table 5 arrays the data for this regression. The positive relationship between these two variables indicates that participants had less trouble with police at program completion.
### TABLE V

**Y = TROUBLE WITH POLICE AT END OF PROGRAM SUMMER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFSTAT</td>
<td>.1535</td>
<td>.1904</td>
<td>.0363</td>
<td>.0363</td>
<td>10.052</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0907</td>
<td>.1125</td>
<td>.0011</td>
<td>1.719</td>
<td>.0858</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSTAT</td>
<td>-.0499</td>
<td>-.0663</td>
<td>.0040</td>
<td>.0403</td>
<td>3.357</td>
<td>.0008</td>
<td>-.2011</td>
<td>-.2673</td>
<td>.0017</td>
<td>2.111</td>
<td>.0348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSTAT2</td>
<td>.0463</td>
<td>.2219</td>
<td>.0021</td>
<td>.0424</td>
<td>2.407</td>
<td>.0162</td>
<td>.0647</td>
<td>.3100</td>
<td>.0032</td>
<td>2.895</td>
<td>.0038</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP</td>
<td>-.0053</td>
<td>-.0714</td>
<td>.0050</td>
<td>.0474</td>
<td>3.758</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>-.0107</td>
<td>-.1443</td>
<td>.0009</td>
<td>1.509</td>
<td>.1315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP2</td>
<td>-.0000</td>
<td>-.0173</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0474</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.8291</td>
<td>-.0001</td>
<td>-.0494</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>.5402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOSTAT</td>
<td>.0281</td>
<td>.0370</td>
<td>.0013</td>
<td>.0487</td>
<td>1.922</td>
<td>.0548</td>
<td>-.1795</td>
<td>-.2365</td>
<td>.0022</td>
<td>2.392</td>
<td>.0168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOSTAT2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(No variable entered, tolerance = 0.010 limits reached)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td>.0137</td>
<td>.0109</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0488</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>.5743</td>
<td>-.0017</td>
<td>-.0013</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.9831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>-.0744</td>
<td>-.0987</td>
<td>.0086</td>
<td>.0574</td>
<td>4.953</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>-.0384</td>
<td>-.0510</td>
<td>.0003</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>.3995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>-.0068</td>
<td>-.0328</td>
<td>.0009</td>
<td>.0583</td>
<td>1.597</td>
<td>.1103</td>
<td>-.0141</td>
<td>-.0683</td>
<td>.0008</td>
<td>1.427</td>
<td>.1537</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE2</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0398</td>
<td>.0003</td>
<td>.0586</td>
<td>.888</td>
<td>.3744</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0371</td>
<td>.0003</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>.4094</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRVEMP</td>
<td>-.0052</td>
<td>-.0115</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0587</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td>.5505</td>
<td>-.1202</td>
<td>-.2668</td>
<td>.0010</td>
<td>1.645</td>
<td>.1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRVEMP2</td>
<td>.0321</td>
<td>.2922</td>
<td>.0014</td>
<td>.0601</td>
<td>1.995</td>
<td>.0462</td>
<td>.0264</td>
<td>.2400</td>
<td>.0009</td>
<td>1.585</td>
<td>.1132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRVCETA</td>
<td>-.0062</td>
<td>-.0075</td>
<td>.0006</td>
<td>.0602</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>.7190</td>
<td>-.0079</td>
<td>-.0096</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.8826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISSTAT</td>
<td>.0543</td>
<td>.0133</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.0604</td>
<td>.710</td>
<td>.4777</td>
<td>-.3280</td>
<td>-.0806</td>
<td>.0008</td>
<td>1.421</td>
<td>.1556</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0604</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.9997</td>
<td>.1042</td>
<td>.0792</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>1.196</td>
<td>.2317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>.0449</td>
<td>.0413</td>
<td>.0011</td>
<td>.0619</td>
<td>1.776</td>
<td>.0758</td>
<td>-.0013</td>
<td>-.0012</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.9863</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>-.0368</td>
<td>-.0379</td>
<td>.0010</td>
<td>.0629</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>.0956</td>
<td>.1876</td>
<td>.1932</td>
<td>.0018</td>
<td>2.205</td>
<td>.0275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>-.0456</td>
<td>-.0440</td>
<td>.0009</td>
<td>.0639</td>
<td>1.632</td>
<td>.1027</td>
<td>.3161</td>
<td>.3049</td>
<td>.0047</td>
<td>3.542</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>-.0058</td>
<td>-.0044</td>
<td>.0006</td>
<td>.0639</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.9038</td>
<td>-.0167</td>
<td>-.0127</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>.7293</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(No variable entered, tolerance = 0.010 limits reached)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HINPR</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0418</td>
<td>.0017</td>
<td>.0655</td>
<td>2.173</td>
<td>.0298</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.1462</td>
<td>.0033</td>
<td>2.946</td>
<td>.0032</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINPR2</td>
<td>-.0000</td>
<td>-.0362</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>.0660</td>
<td>1.169</td>
<td>.2426</td>
<td>-.0000</td>
<td>-.0953</td>
<td>.0019</td>
<td>2.229</td>
<td>.0259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>.0567</td>
<td>.0689</td>
<td>.0018</td>
<td>.0678</td>
<td>2.292</td>
<td>.0220</td>
<td>-.0932</td>
<td>-.1132</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td>.4402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE V—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCOFFSTAT</td>
<td>0.0240</td>
<td>0.0474</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>0.0680</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>0.4696</td>
<td>0.0095</td>
<td>0.0181</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>0.8022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCEDESTAT</td>
<td>-0.0503</td>
<td>-1.1382</td>
<td>0.0009</td>
<td>0.0689</td>
<td>1.570</td>
<td>1.166</td>
<td>-0.0532</td>
<td>-1.461</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
<td>1.608</td>
<td>0.1079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCSTEP</td>
<td>0.0067</td>
<td>0.1611</td>
<td>0.0017</td>
<td>0.0705</td>
<td>2.178</td>
<td>0.0295</td>
<td>0.0071</td>
<td>0.1701</td>
<td>0.0019</td>
<td>2.245</td>
<td>0.0249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCECOSTAT</td>
<td>0.0327</td>
<td>0.0881</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>0.0709</td>
<td>1.052</td>
<td>0.2930</td>
<td>0.1713</td>
<td>0.4611</td>
<td>0.0041</td>
<td>3.310</td>
<td>0.0009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCRACE</td>
<td>-0.0152</td>
<td>-0.0182</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0710</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.7596</td>
<td>0.0029</td>
<td>0.0035</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.9556</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCENDER</td>
<td>-0.0169</td>
<td>-0.0307</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0710</td>
<td>0.501</td>
<td>0.6163</td>
<td>-0.0282</td>
<td>-0.0512</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td>0.4046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PCAGE

(No variable entered, tolerance = 0.010 limits reached)

PCPRVEMP

-0.0116, -0.0467, 0.0001, 0.0712, 0.617, 0.5373, 0.0042, 0.0168, 0.000, 0.202, 0.8397

PCPRVCETA

0.0136, 0.0224, 0.0000, 0.0712, 0.361, 0.7180, -0.0011, -0.0018, 0.000, 0.032, 0.9777

PCDISSTAT

0.2584, 0.0937, 0.0010, 0.0722, 1.650, 0.0992, 0.2674, 0.0970, 0.0011, 1.700, 0.0893

PCS8

-0.0552, -0.0593, 0.0003, 0.0725, 0.951, 0.3420, -0.1055, -0.1133, 0.0011, 1.681, 0.0928

PCS9

-0.0547, -0.0799, 0.0005, 0.0730, 1.202, 0.2296, -0.2204, -0.3221, 0.0054, 3.785, 0.0002

PCS10

-0.0132, -0.0168, 0.0000, 0.0730, 0.237, 0.8128, -0.0426, -0.0543, 0.0002, 0.764, 0.4447

PCS11

-0.0534, -0.0758, 0.0004, 0.0734, 1.105, 0.2692, -0.1981, -0.2810, 0.0045, 3.470, 0.0005

PCS12

-0.2884, -0.3717, 0.0077, 0.0812, 4.717, 0.0000, -0.2884, -0.3717, 0.0083, 4.717, 0.0000

PCS13

(No variable entered, tolerance = 0.010 limits reached)

PCS14

(No variable entered, tolerance = 0.010 limits reached)

MR2 = .0812

F = 6.33

p = .0000

DF = 37; 2650
Five significant relationships emerged from the analysis. Four independent variables contributed significantly to explain the variance in the outcome measure: previous offender status, education status, STEP reading test and gender. In addition, one interaction variable was also significant: participant/control group membership with the STEP test.

Previous offender status. When entered into the regression equation, previous offender status was significant (t= 10.052; p= .0000). Subjects' offender status explained only slightly more than three and a half per cent of the variance in the dependent measure. Youth who were prior offenders tended to have higher predicted rates of offending over the program summer when compared to youth who were nonoffenders.

Education status. There was a significant, positive, monotonic relationship between education status of youth and amount of trouble they got into with police over the program summer (t= 2.407; p= .0162). The variable explained only six tenths of one per cent of the variance in the dependent measure. Figure 5 graphs the relationship between education status and amount of trouble with police over the program summer. The greatest gain on the dependent measure came between the status categories high school student and post-high school attendee.
Fig. 5—Y = Trouble with Police, X = Preprogram Education Status.
**STEP Reading Test.** When the STEP Test was used as a predictor variable, there was a significant, negative relationship between subjects' reading ability level and the amount of trouble with police over the program summer (t = 3.758; p = .0002). The variable explained one half of one per cent of the variance in the dependent measure.

**Gender.** When entered into the regression equation, gender explained a significant proportion of the variance in the dependent measure (t = 4.953; p = .0000); however, the variable explained less than nine tenths of one per cent of this variance. Males had higher predicted rates of trouble with police over the program summer when compared to females.

**Interaction of participant/control group membership with STEP test.** This interaction variable was significant (t = 2.178; p = .0295), however, the variable explained less than two tenths of one per cent of the variance in the dependent measure. Participants with the highest STEP reading test scores had the lowest predicted postprogram rates of offending.

**Hypothesis 5: No significant difference exists between participants and controls on level of full-time employment at three months following the program.**

The difference between participants and controls on the
outcome measure of full-time employment at three months following the program was not significant. The incremental t statistic was 1.760 (see Table 6, column 5). The null hypothesis was confirmed.

Seven significant relationships emerged from the analysis. There were six independent variables which contributed significantly to explaining the variance in the outcome measure: previous employment status, age, education status, offender status, gender and race. In addition one interaction variable was significant: participant/control group status with race.

**Previous employment.** When entered into the regression equation, previous employment status of youth was significant (t = 5.263, p = .0000); however, the variable explained only one percent of the variance in the dependent measure. Youth who had never worked previous to the program summer were less likely to be working full-time at follow-up when compared to youth who had worked full- or part-time previous to the program summer.

**Age.** A nonmonotonic, nonlinear function for age was significant in explaining the variance in postprogram full-time employment status (t = 6.808, p = .0000). Somewhat less than three and a half percent of the variance in the criterion measure was explained by the independent measure. Figure 6 graphs the relationship between these two
### TABLE VI

**Y = EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT THREE MONTH FOLLOW-UP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRVEMP</td>
<td>.0525</td>
<td>.1010</td>
<td>.0102</td>
<td>.0102</td>
<td>5.263</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0441</td>
<td>.0849</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>.6015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRVEMP2</td>
<td>-.0364</td>
<td>-.2873</td>
<td>.0014</td>
<td>.0116</td>
<td>1.960</td>
<td>.0501</td>
<td>-.0049</td>
<td>-.0390</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.7976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRVCETA</td>
<td>.0011</td>
<td>.0011</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0116</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.9573</td>
<td>-.0624</td>
<td>-.0659</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>1.009</td>
<td>3.127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>-.0325</td>
<td>-.1358</td>
<td>.0179</td>
<td>.0296</td>
<td>7.041</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>-.0857</td>
<td>-.3586</td>
<td>.0206</td>
<td>7.473</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE2</td>
<td>.0010</td>
<td>.2936</td>
<td>.0165</td>
<td>.0460</td>
<td>6.808</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0009</td>
<td>.2686</td>
<td>.0132</td>
<td>5.959</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSTAT</td>
<td>.0362</td>
<td>.0417</td>
<td>.0017</td>
<td>.0477</td>
<td>2.191</td>
<td>.0285</td>
<td>.2554</td>
<td>.2942</td>
<td>.0020</td>
<td>2.317</td>
<td>.0206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSTAT2</td>
<td>-.0951</td>
<td>-.3949</td>
<td>.0053</td>
<td>.0530</td>
<td>3.858</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>-.0701</td>
<td>-.2912</td>
<td>.0028</td>
<td>2.712</td>
<td>.0067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP</td>
<td>-.0004</td>
<td>-.0057</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0530</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>.7618</td>
<td>-.0059</td>
<td>-.0694</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td>.4693</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP2</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0111</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0530</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.8892</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0154</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.8489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFSTAT</td>
<td>-.0521</td>
<td>-.0560</td>
<td>.0027</td>
<td>.0557</td>
<td>2.744</td>
<td>.0061</td>
<td>-.0248</td>
<td>-.0266</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>.6849</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOSTAT</td>
<td>-.1711</td>
<td>-.0196</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.0561</td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td>.3141</td>
<td>.0855</td>
<td>.0976</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>.3249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOSTAT2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISSTAT</td>
<td>.0497</td>
<td>.0106</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0562</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>.5736</td>
<td>-.0951</td>
<td>-.0203</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.7218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>.0744</td>
<td>.0855</td>
<td>.0065</td>
<td>.0626</td>
<td>4.288</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0454</td>
<td>.0522</td>
<td>.0003</td>
<td>.861</td>
<td>.3892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td>-.0717</td>
<td>-.0491</td>
<td>.0023</td>
<td>.0649</td>
<td>2.552</td>
<td>.0108</td>
<td>-.2726</td>
<td>-.1867</td>
<td>.0034</td>
<td>2.988</td>
<td>.0228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>.0125</td>
<td>.0082</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0650</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.6855</td>
<td>.0266</td>
<td>.0175</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.7922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>.0509</td>
<td>.0455</td>
<td>.0015</td>
<td>.0665</td>
<td>2.080</td>
<td>.0376</td>
<td>-.0539</td>
<td>-.0482</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>.5864</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>.0349</td>
<td>.0279</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>.0670</td>
<td>1.202</td>
<td>.2295</td>
<td>-.0720</td>
<td>-.0574</td>
<td>.0003</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>.4138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>-.0348</td>
<td>-.0310</td>
<td>.0007</td>
<td>.0676</td>
<td>1.369</td>
<td>.1712</td>
<td>.0113</td>
<td>.0101</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.9084</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>.0373</td>
<td>.0312</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>.0681</td>
<td>1.159</td>
<td>.2466</td>
<td>-.0534</td>
<td>-.0446</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>.6052</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>-.0236</td>
<td>-.0155</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0682</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>.6714</td>
<td>-.0189</td>
<td>-.0124</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.7358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINPR</td>
<td>-.0000</td>
<td>-.0137</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.0683</td>
<td>.710</td>
<td>.4777</td>
<td>-.0000</td>
<td>.0256</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>.6068</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINPR2</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0350</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>.0688</td>
<td>1.131</td>
<td>.2579</td>
<td>-.0000</td>
<td>-.0174</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.6852</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>.0502</td>
<td>.0528</td>
<td>.0011</td>
<td>.0699</td>
<td>1.760</td>
<td>.0785</td>
<td>.0646</td>
<td>.0679</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.6442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE VI—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regress. Coefficients and t Ratios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCPRVEMP</td>
<td>-.0027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCPRVCETA</td>
<td>.0395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCAGE</td>
<td>(No variable entered, tolerance = 0.010 limits reached)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCEDSTAT</td>
<td>.0147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCSTEP</td>
<td>.0028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCOFFSTAT</td>
<td>.0035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCECOSTAT</td>
<td>-.0669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCDISSTAT</td>
<td>.1151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCGEDRDER</td>
<td>.0255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCRACE</td>
<td>.1402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS8</td>
<td>-.0412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS9</td>
<td>.0717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS10</td>
<td>.0790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS11</td>
<td>-.0618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS12</td>
<td>.0646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS13</td>
<td>(No variable entered, tolerance = 0.010 limits reached)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS14</td>
<td>(No variable entered, tolerance = 0.010 limits reached)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MR2 = .0761  
F = 5.90  
p = .0000  
DF = 37; 2650
variables. Youth in the oldest and the youngest cohorts had the lowest predicted postprogram full-time employment status. The sharpest decline in full-time employment status came in the cohort of youth between seventeen and eighteen and a half years of age.

**Education status.** There was a significant, negative and nonlinear, monotonic relationship between education status of subjects and the criterion variable: full time employment status at three months following the program \((t=3.858, p=.0001)\). The variable explained seven tenths of one percent of the variance in the dependent measure. Figure 7 graphs the relationship between the independent and the dependent variables. Youth with post-high school status had the highest predicted rates of working full-time; conversely youth who were high school dropouts had the lowest predicted postprogram rates for working full time. The sharpest increase in the outcome measure came for those youth who were between the two highest educational categories.

**Offender status.** When entered into the regression equation, previous offender status was significant \(t=2.744, p=.0061\); however, the variable explained less than three tenths of one percent of the variance in the criterion variable. Youth who were offenders had higher predicted postprogram rates of working full-time than youth
Fig. 7—Y = Employment Status - Three Month Follow-up, X = Preprogram Education Status$^2$
who were nonoffenders.

**Gender.** When the variable gender was entered into the regression equation it was significant \((t= 4.288; p= .0000)\); however, it explained only .65 of one per cent of the variance in the dependent measure. Males were somewhat more likely to have higher predicted rates of working full-time than females.

**Race.** When entered into the regression equation, race explained a significant proportion of the variance in the dependent measure \((t= 2.552; p= .0108)\); however, the variable accounted for only two tenths of one per cent of the variance in the dependent variable. Minority youth had lower predicted rates of working full-time at three months following the program when compared to nonminority youth.

**Interaction of participant/control group membership and race.** This constructed interaction variable was significant \((t= 2.441; p= .0147)\); however, it explained only two tenths of one per cent of the variance in the dependent measure. Nonminority participants had the highest predicted rate of working full-time in the three month period following the program while minority participants had the second highest rate. The lowest predicted rate of postprogram full-time employment was for minority controls.
Hypothesis 6: No significant difference exists between participants and controls on level of full-time employment at eight months following the program.

When all previous independent variables were held constant, the effect of participant/control group membership was significant (t= 2.219; p= .0266). The null hypothesis was rejected. Table 7 arrays the data for this regression. The positive relationship between the variables indicates that participants had a higher level of full-time employment at this follow-up period.

A series of additional significant relationships emerged from this analysis. Five independent variables contributed significantly to explaining the variance in the outcome measure. These were: previous employment status, age, education status, economic status, gender and number of hours in the program.

Previous employment. When entered into the regression equation, previous employment status was significant and positively associated with postprogram employment status (t= 4.119; p= .0000); however, the variable explained only six tenths of one per cent of the variance in the dependent measure. Those youth who had worked full-time prior to the program had the highest predicted rates of working full-time in the eight month period following the program.
TABLE VII

Y = EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT EIGHT MONTH FOLLOW-UP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRVEMP</td>
<td>.0450</td>
<td>.0792</td>
<td>.0063</td>
<td>.0063</td>
<td>4.119</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>-.0102</td>
<td>-.0180</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRVEMP2</td>
<td>-.0348</td>
<td>-.2512</td>
<td>.0011</td>
<td>.0074</td>
<td>1.710</td>
<td>.0874</td>
<td>.0035</td>
<td>.0250</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRCETA</td>
<td>-.0168</td>
<td>-.0162</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.0076</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>.4469</td>
<td>-.0599</td>
<td>-.0578</td>
<td>.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>-.0370</td>
<td>-.1416</td>
<td>.0195</td>
<td>.0271</td>
<td>7.333</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>-.0990</td>
<td>-.3787</td>
<td>.0231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE2</td>
<td>.0012</td>
<td>.3104</td>
<td>.0184</td>
<td>.0455</td>
<td>7.194</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0011</td>
<td>.2820</td>
<td>.0146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSTAT</td>
<td>.0145</td>
<td>.0153</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.0457</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>.4238</td>
<td>.3242</td>
<td>.3412</td>
<td>.0027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSTAT2</td>
<td>-.0813</td>
<td>-.3083</td>
<td>.0032</td>
<td>.0489</td>
<td>3.005</td>
<td>.0027</td>
<td>-.0638</td>
<td>-.2419</td>
<td>.0019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP</td>
<td>-.0030</td>
<td>-.0324</td>
<td>.0010</td>
<td>.0500</td>
<td>1.711</td>
<td>.0872</td>
<td>-.0144</td>
<td>-.1543</td>
<td>.0010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP2</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0046</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0500</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.9541</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0298</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFSTAT</td>
<td>-.0189</td>
<td>-.0186</td>
<td>.0003</td>
<td>.0503</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>.3636</td>
<td>.0140</td>
<td>.0138</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOSTAT</td>
<td>-.0540</td>
<td>-.0564</td>
<td>.0030</td>
<td>.0532</td>
<td>2.897</td>
<td>.0038</td>
<td>-.0616</td>
<td>-.0642</td>
<td>.0002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

ECOSTAT2  ————(No variable entered, tolerance = 0.010 limits reached)———

DISSTAT    | .0604   | .0118    | .0001    | .0534  | .624    | .5329     | -.1186    | -.0231          | .0001            | .406             | .6842            |

GENDER     | .0932   | .0979    | .0085    | .0618  | 4.906   | .0000     | .1464     | .1539           | .0024            | 2.544            | .0110            |

RACE       | -.0164  | -.0293   | .0008    | .0626  | 1.521   | .1284     | -.1714    | -.1073          | .0011            | 1.722            | .0852            |

S8         | .0413   | .0248    | .0005    | .0632  | 1.224   | .2213     | .0612     | .0368           | .0000            | .557             | .5779            |

S9         | .0056   | .0046    | .0000    | .0632  | .661    | .8344     | -.0820    | -.0670          | .0002            | .759             | .4479            |

S10        | .0460   | .0335    | .0007    | .0639  | 1.443   | .1491     | .0199     | .0145           | .0000            | .207             | .8361            |

S11        | -.0017  | -.0014   | .0000    | .0639  | .060    | .9522     | .1038     | .0846           | .0004            | .966             | .3341            |

S12        | .1373   | .1049    | .0053    | .0692  | 3.902   | .0001     | -.0292    | -.0223          | .0000            | .259             | .7954            |

S13        | -.1174  | -.0704   | .0013    | .0705  | 1.930   | .0537     | -.1103    | -.0661          | .0012            | 1.808            | .0707            |

S14        ————(No variable entered, tolerance = 0.010 limits reached)———

HINPR      | -.0000  | -.0376   | .0013    | .0718  | 1.960   | .0501     | -.0000    | -.0246          | .0001            | .496             | .6201            |

HINPR2     | .0000   | .0678    | .0017    | .0735  | 2.197   | .0281     | .0000     | .0151           | .0000            | .352             | .7244            |

PC         | .0691   | .0664    | .0017    | .0752  | 2.219   | .0266     | .0606     | .0583           | .0001            | .397             | .6909            |
TABLE VII--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCPRVEMP</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.0752</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.9937</td>
<td>0.0024</td>
<td>0.0075</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.9281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCPRVCETA</td>
<td>0.0389</td>
<td>0.0507</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>0.0755</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>0.4098</td>
<td>0.0520</td>
<td>0.0678</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>1.065</td>
<td>0.2868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCAGE</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCEDSTAT</td>
<td>-0.0682</td>
<td>-0.1485</td>
<td>0.0011</td>
<td>0.0766</td>
<td>1.777</td>
<td>0.0756</td>
<td>-0.0744</td>
<td>-1.620</td>
<td>0.0012</td>
<td>1.782</td>
<td>0.0748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCSTEP</td>
<td>0.0066</td>
<td>0.1264</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
<td>0.0776</td>
<td>1.719</td>
<td>0.0857</td>
<td>0.0065</td>
<td>1.240</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
<td>1.637</td>
<td>0.1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCOFFSTAT</td>
<td>0.0067</td>
<td>0.0104</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0776</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.8799</td>
<td>-0.0167</td>
<td>-0.0261</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>0.7172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCECOSTAT</td>
<td>0.0293</td>
<td>0.0624</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>0.0778</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td>0.4552</td>
<td>0.0196</td>
<td>0.0417</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.7644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCDISSTAT</td>
<td>0.1242</td>
<td>0.0357</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0779</td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td>0.5284</td>
<td>0.0901</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>0.6502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCGENDER</td>
<td>-0.0339</td>
<td>-0.0487</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>0.0782</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td>0.4257</td>
<td>-0.0334</td>
<td>-0.0479</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td>0.4350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCRACE</td>
<td>0.0947</td>
<td>0.0897</td>
<td>0.0008</td>
<td>0.0789</td>
<td>1.511</td>
<td>0.1309</td>
<td>0.0803</td>
<td>0.0761</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>1.206</td>
<td>0.2279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS8</td>
<td>-0.0203</td>
<td>-0.0173</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0790</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.7813</td>
<td>-0.0088</td>
<td>-0.0075</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.9116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS9</td>
<td>0.0803</td>
<td>0.0929</td>
<td>0.0007</td>
<td>0.0797</td>
<td>1.402</td>
<td>1.610</td>
<td>0.0649</td>
<td>0.0751</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>0.3775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS10</td>
<td>0.0191</td>
<td>0.0193</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0797</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>0.7845</td>
<td>0.0200</td>
<td>0.0203</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.7756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS11</td>
<td>-1.2744</td>
<td>-1.1432</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>0.3120</td>
<td>2.097</td>
<td>0.0361</td>
<td>-0.0887</td>
<td>-0.0996</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
<td>1.231</td>
<td>0.2185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS12</td>
<td>0.0773</td>
<td>0.0789</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>0.0816</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>0.3167</td>
<td>0.0773</td>
<td>0.0789</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>0.3167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS13</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS14</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MR2 = .0816
F = 6.36
p = .0000
DF = 37; 2650
**Age.** A positive, nonlinear, monotonic function for age was significant ($t = 7.194; \ p = .0000$). The variable explained 3.79 percent of the variance in the dependent measure. Figure 8 graphs the relationship between these two variables. Older youth, seventeen and older, had the lowest predicted rates of full-time employment in this follow-up period. Sharpest decline on the outcome measure came for those youth in the highest age cohort: seventeen and older.

**Education status.** A negative, nonlinear, monotonic function for education status was significant ($t = 3.005; \ p = .0027$); however, this variable explained only three tenths of one percent of the variance in the dependent measure. Figure 9 graphs the relationship between these two variables. Youth with post-high school status had higher predicted rates of full-time employment than youth who were high school students or high school dropouts. Sharpest increases on postprogram employment status came for youth who were between the high school student to post-high school status categories.

**Economic status.** When entered into the regression equation, economic status was significant ($t = 2.897; \ p = .0038$); however, this variable explained only three tenths of one percent of the variance in the dependent measure. Those youth with the highest preprogram economic status had the highest predicted rates of full-time
Fig. 8 -- Y = Employment Status - Eight Month Follow-up, X = Age^2
Fig. 9 -- Y = Full-Time Employment Status - Eight Month Follow-up, X = Preprogram Education Status².
employment at the eight month follow-up period.

**Gender.** When entered into the regression equation, the variable gender was significant \( t = 4.906; p = .0000 \); however, the variable explained less than one per cent of the variance in the dependent measure. Males were somewhat more likely to have higher predicted rates of full-time employment at follow-up than females.

**Hours in program.** A positive, nonlinear, monotonic function for number of hours completed in the program was significant \( t = 2.197; p = .0281 \) in predicting full-time employment outcomes at eight month follow-up. Figure 10 graphs the relationship between these variables. Only three tenths of one per cent of the variance in the outcome measure was explained by this independent variable. While the effect was positive, there were diminishing returns with increased program hours; the greatest gain on the outcome measure came for those youth who had completed from six to 220 program hours.

**Hypothesis 7:** No significant difference exists between participants and controls on school participation at three months following the program.

When the effects of all previous independent variables were held constant, the effect of participant/control group
Fig. 10—Y = Full-Time Employment Status - Eight Month Follow-up, X = Hours in Program
membership on school participation at three month follow-up was significant \( (t = 4.190; \ p = .0000) \). The null hypothesis was rejected. Table 8 arrays the data for the regression analysis. The positive relationship between group status and the outcome variable indicates higher levels of full-time school participation for controls.

There were eight additional significant relationships which emerged from this analysis. Seven independent variables contributed significantly to explaining the variance in the criterion measure: education status, STEP reading test, offender status, economic status, age, previous employment, and hours of program participation. In addition, the interaction of participant/control group membership with economic status was also significant.

**Education status.** When entered into the regression equation, education status was significant \( (t = 18.861; \ p = .0000) \) and the variable explained nearly eighteen percent of the variance in the dependent measure. The monotonic, nonlinear relationship between the variables is graphed in Figure 11. Dropouts had the highest postprogram predicted school participation rates when compared to high school students and to youth with post-high school status. Predictably, greatest decline on the outcome measure came for those youth least likely to return to school full-time: those between high school and post-high school status.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Incr b</th>
<th>Incr B</th>
<th>Incr R2</th>
<th>Incr R2</th>
<th>Cum R</th>
<th>Incr t</th>
<th>Incr p</th>
<th>Simult b</th>
<th>Simult B</th>
<th>Simult R2</th>
<th>Simult t</th>
<th>Part Simult b</th>
<th>Part Simult B</th>
<th>Part Simult R2</th>
<th>Part Simult t</th>
<th>Simult p</th>
<th>Part Simult p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDSTAT</td>
<td>0.5139</td>
<td>0.2663</td>
<td>0.0709</td>
<td>0.0709</td>
<td>14.317</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>1.8082</td>
<td>0.9370</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>8.389</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSTAT2</td>
<td>-0.8384</td>
<td>-1.5658</td>
<td>0.1087</td>
<td>0.1796</td>
<td>18.861</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>-0.4390</td>
<td>-0.8200</td>
<td>0.0277</td>
<td>8.680</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP</td>
<td>0.0075</td>
<td>0.0397</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
<td>0.1812</td>
<td>2.263</td>
<td>0.0237</td>
<td>0.0554</td>
<td>0.0285</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>0.7354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP2</td>
<td>-0.0002</td>
<td>-0.0231</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.1812</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.7554</td>
<td>-0.0002</td>
<td>-0.0230</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>0.7468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFSTAT</td>
<td>-0.3681</td>
<td>-0.1877</td>
<td>0.0303</td>
<td>0.2115</td>
<td>10.151</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>-0.5374</td>
<td>-0.2599</td>
<td>0.0076</td>
<td>4.499</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOSTAT</td>
<td>-0.0981</td>
<td>-0.0504</td>
<td>0.0024</td>
<td>0.2139</td>
<td>2.080</td>
<td>0.0040</td>
<td>-0.1174</td>
<td>0.0603</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td>0.4893</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOSTAT2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(No variable entered, tolerance = 0.010 limits reached)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Incr b</th>
<th>Incr B</th>
<th>Incr R2</th>
<th>Incr R2</th>
<th>Cum R</th>
<th>Incr t</th>
<th>Incr p</th>
<th>Simult b</th>
<th>Simult B</th>
<th>Simult R2</th>
<th>Simult t</th>
<th>Part Simult b</th>
<th>Part Simult B</th>
<th>Part Simult R2</th>
<th>Part Simult t</th>
<th>Simult p</th>
<th>Part Simult p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>0.0204</td>
<td>0.0105</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.2149</td>
<td>1.771</td>
<td>0.0767</td>
<td>0.1798</td>
<td>0.0554</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td>0.3137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td>-0.1009</td>
<td>-0.0311</td>
<td>0.0009</td>
<td>0.2149</td>
<td>1.771</td>
<td>0.0767</td>
<td>0.1798</td>
<td>0.0554</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td>0.3137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>-0.0553</td>
<td>-0.1040</td>
<td>0.0090</td>
<td>0.2240</td>
<td>5.582</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>-0.2179</td>
<td>-0.4103</td>
<td>0.0344</td>
<td>9.718</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE2</td>
<td>0.0025</td>
<td>0.3180</td>
<td>0.0177</td>
<td>0.2417</td>
<td>7.961</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0025</td>
<td>0.3139</td>
<td>0.0231</td>
<td>7.917</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRVEMP2</td>
<td>0.0493</td>
<td>0.0427</td>
<td>0.0017</td>
<td>0.2434</td>
<td>2.473</td>
<td>0.0135</td>
<td>-0.0757</td>
<td>-0.6655</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>0.6471</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRVEMP2</td>
<td>0.0023</td>
<td>0.0081</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.2434</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.9510</td>
<td>0.0303</td>
<td>0.1075</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>0.4213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRVCETA</td>
<td>0.0489</td>
<td>0.0232</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>0.2438</td>
<td>1.238</td>
<td>0.2160</td>
<td>0.0709</td>
<td>0.0337</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td>0.5574</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISSTAT</td>
<td>-0.4767</td>
<td>-0.2846</td>
<td>0.5768</td>
<td>0.2440</td>
<td>2.196</td>
<td>0.0282</td>
<td>-0.2996</td>
<td>-0.0887</td>
<td>0.0009</td>
<td>1.520</td>
<td>0.1286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>-0.3060</td>
<td>-0.0766</td>
<td>0.0450</td>
<td>0.2499</td>
<td>4.010</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.4790</td>
<td>0.1926</td>
<td>0.0023</td>
<td>2.474</td>
<td>0.0134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>0.3282</td>
<td>0.1434</td>
<td>0.0134</td>
<td>0.2633</td>
<td>6.961</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0234</td>
<td>0.0008</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.8918</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>-0.0852</td>
<td>-0.0342</td>
<td>0.0008</td>
<td>0.2640</td>
<td>1.697</td>
<td>0.0898</td>
<td>0.3883</td>
<td>0.1559</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>2.017</td>
<td>0.0438</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>0.0556</td>
<td>0.0209</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.2643</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.3816</td>
<td>0.2805</td>
<td>0.1055</td>
<td>0.0007</td>
<td>1.389</td>
<td>0.1649</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>0.0360</td>
<td>0.0106</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.2643</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.7432</td>
<td>0.0042</td>
<td>0.0012</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.9694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(No variable entered, tolerance = 0.010 limits reached)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Incr b</th>
<th>Incr B</th>
<th>Incr R2</th>
<th>Incr R2</th>
<th>Cum R</th>
<th>Incr t</th>
<th>Incr p</th>
<th>Simult b</th>
<th>Simult B</th>
<th>Simult R2</th>
<th>Simult t</th>
<th>Part Simult b</th>
<th>Part Simult B</th>
<th>Part Simult R2</th>
<th>Part Simult t</th>
<th>Simult p</th>
<th>Part Simult p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HINPR</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>0.0556</td>
<td>0.0029</td>
<td>0.2672</td>
<td>3.260</td>
<td>0.0111</td>
<td>0.0012</td>
<td>0.2697</td>
<td>0.0141</td>
<td>6.160</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINPR2</td>
<td>-0.0000</td>
<td>-0.0689</td>
<td>0.0017</td>
<td>0.2689</td>
<td>2.513</td>
<td>0.0120</td>
<td>-0.0000</td>
<td>-0.1892</td>
<td>0.0094</td>
<td>5.016</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>0.2348</td>
<td>0.1112</td>
<td>0.0048</td>
<td>0.2737</td>
<td>4.190</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>-0.0623</td>
<td>-0.0295</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>0.8197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE VIII—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCS9</td>
<td>-0.287</td>
<td>-0.0164</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.2815</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>0.7802</td>
<td>-0.2101</td>
<td>-0.1197</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>1.595</td>
<td>1.109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS10</td>
<td>0.3043</td>
<td>0.1514</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
<td>0.2831</td>
<td>2.428</td>
<td>0.0153</td>
<td>0.2766</td>
<td>0.1376</td>
<td>0.0018</td>
<td>2.195</td>
<td>0.0282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS11</td>
<td>-0.2450</td>
<td>-0.1355</td>
<td>0.0014</td>
<td>0.2845</td>
<td>2.249</td>
<td>0.0246</td>
<td>-0.3296</td>
<td>-0.1823</td>
<td>0.0025</td>
<td>2.552</td>
<td>0.0108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS12</td>
<td>-1.688</td>
<td>-0.0848</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>0.2849</td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td>0.2226</td>
<td>-1.1688</td>
<td>-0.0848</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td>2.226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(No variable entered, tolerance = 0.010 limits reached)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(No variable entered, tolerance = 0.010 limits reached)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MR2 = .2849  
F = 28.53  
p = .0000  
DF = 37; 2650
Fig. 11—Y = School Status - Three Month Follow-up, X = Preprogram Education Status
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**STEP reading test.** When entered into the regression equation the STEP test was significant ($t = 2.263; p = .0237$) but explained less than two tenths of one per cent of the variance in the dependent measure. There was a positive association between reading achievement level of youth and their school status at three month follow-up.

**Offender status.** When offender status was entered into the regression equation, the variable was significant ($t = 10.151; p = .0000$) and explained three per cent of the variance in the criterion measure. Youth who were nonoffenders had higher predicted rates of school participation at three months following the program than those who were prior offenders.

**Economic status.** The independent variable economic status was significant in explaining the variance in the dependent measure of school participation at three month follow-up ($t = 2.880; p = .0040$). The variable explained only two tenths of one per cent of the variance in the dependent measure. The relationship between economic status and postprogram school participation was negative indicating that youth in the lowest economic status had higher predicted postprogram school participation scores and they were more likely to be in school full-time than middle or high status youth.

**Age.** A positive, monotonic, nonlinear function for age
was significant in predicting postprogram school status 
(t= 7.901; p= .0000). Age explained 2.7 per cent of the 
variance in the outcome measure. Figure 12 graphs the 
relationship between these two variables. Older subjects 
had the highest predicted postprogram rates of school 
participation and the sharpest increase in these rates came 
among youth who were between ages seventeen and eighteen and 
a half.

Previous employment. When entered into the regression 
equation, previous employment was significant (t= 2.473; 
p= .0135) but explained less than two tenths of one per cent 
of the variance in the dependent measure. Youth who had 
ever worked previous to the program had the highest 
postprogram school participation rates.

Hours in program. A positive, monotonic, nonlinear 
function for hours completed in the program was significant 
(t= 2.513; p= .0120) in predicting postprogram school 
activity, however, less than one half of one per cent of 
the variance in the dependent measure was explained by hours 
completed in the program. Figure 13 graphs the relationship 
between these two variables. The greatest gain in the 
outcome measure came for those participants who had 
completed between six to 220 program hours. While there 
continued to be a positive program effect after 220 hours, 
increased hours brought diminishing returns.
Interaction of participant/control group membership and previous economic status. This interaction variable was significant (t = 3.415; p = .0006); however, it explained only three tenths of one per cent of the variance in the dependent measure. The highest rates of predicted postprogram school attendance status was for controls in the lowest economic group, and the second highest was for participants in the highest economic group. Predicted rates of return to school were positively related to economic status for participants while they were inversely related to economic status for controls.

Hypothesis 8: No significant difference exists between participants and controls on school participation at eight months following the program.

When the effects of all previous independent variables were held constant, the effect of participant/control group membership on school participation at eight month follow-up was significant (t = 3.084; p = .0021). The null hypothesis was rejected. The positive relationship between the independent and dependent variables indicates a higher school participation status for controls. Table 9 arrays the data for the regression analysis.

A series of additional significant relationships
### TABLE IX

**Y = SCHOOL STATUS AT EIGHT MONTH FOLLOW-UP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDSTAT</td>
<td>.4996</td>
<td>.2534</td>
<td>.0642</td>
<td>.0642</td>
<td>13.577</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>2.4410</td>
<td>1.2380</td>
<td>.0462</td>
<td>11.332</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSTAT2</td>
<td>-.8919</td>
<td>-1.6307</td>
<td>.1179</td>
<td>.1821</td>
<td>19.673</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>-.6053</td>
<td>-1.1067</td>
<td>.0513</td>
<td>11.973</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.0008</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.1821</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.9638</td>
<td>.0138</td>
<td>.0716</td>
<td>.0003</td>
<td>.0087</td>
<td>.3863</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP2</td>
<td>-.0005</td>
<td>-.0554</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.1823</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.4547</td>
<td>-.0002</td>
<td>-.0214</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.7590</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFSTAT</td>
<td>-.3261</td>
<td>-.1544</td>
<td>.0205</td>
<td>.2028</td>
<td>8.303</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>-.2022</td>
<td>-.0957</td>
<td>.0011</td>
<td>1.694</td>
<td>.0904</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOSTAT</td>
<td>-.1841</td>
<td>-.0926</td>
<td>.0082</td>
<td>.2110</td>
<td>5.284</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0492</td>
<td>.0247</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>.7722</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOSTAT2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(No variable entered, tolerance = 0.010 limits reached)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENDER**

| .0780   | .0395   | .0014   | .2124   | 2.169   | .0302   | .0966   | .0489   | .0003   | .937     | .3488   |         |         |         |         |

**RACE**

| -.0361  | -.0109  | .0001   | .2125   | .618    | .5364   | -.0647  | -.0195  | .0001   | .363     | .7168   | .0000    |         |         |         |

**AGE**

| -.0291  | -.0535  | .0024   | .2149   | 2.857   | .0043   | -.1368  | -.2521  | .0139   | 6.104    | .0000   | .0000    |         |         |         |

**AGE2**

| .0018   | .2265   | .0090   | .2239   | 5.564   | .0000   | .0016   | .2011   | .0100   | 5.184    | .0000   | .0000    |         |         |         |

**PRVEMP**

| .0291   | .0247   | .0006   | .2244   | 1.410   | .1587   | .1494   | .1266   | .0003   | .904     | .3659   | .0000    |         |         |         |

**PRVEMP2**

| -.0154  | -.0536  | .0000   | .2245   | .403    | .6873   | -.0263  | -.0912  | .0002   | .698     | .4054   | .0000    |         |         |         |

**PRVCETA**

| .1393   | .0648   | .0034   | .2279   | 3.418   | .0006   | .2554   | .1188   | .0017   | 2.115    | .0345   | .0000    |         |         |         |

**DISSTAT**

| .2589   | .0243   | .0006   | .2284   | 1.427   | .1537   | -.5829  | -.0547  | .0005   | 1.116    | .2645   | .0000    |         |         |         |

**S8**

| -.1222  | -.0354  | .0011   | .2295   | 1.925   | .0543   | .0427   | .0124   | .0000   | .217     | .8283   | .0000    |         |         |         |

**S9**

| .2904   | .1143   | .0096   | .2391   | 5.790   | .0000   | .4035   | .1588   | .0016   | 2.085    | .0372   | .0000    |         |         |         |

**S10**

| .6609   | .2319   | .0350   | .2741   | 11.347  | .0000   | .5536   | .1943   | .0039   | 3.216    | .0013   | .0000    |         |         |         |

**S11**

| .1196   | .0470   | .0015   | .2756   | 2.351   | .0188   | .2949   | .1159   | .0009   | 1.533    | .1255   | .0000    |         |         |         |

**S12**

| -.3795  | -.1397  | .0094   | .2850   | 5.929   | .0000   | -.1201  | -.4421  | .0132   | 5.952    | .0000   | .0000    |         |         |         |

**S13**

| .2113   | .0610   | .0010   | .2860   | 1.910   | .0562   | .1939   | .0560   | .0012   | 1.774    | .0762   | .0000    |         |         |         |

**S14**

|         |          |         |          |         |         | (No variable entered, tolerance = 0.010 limits reached) |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |

**HINFR**

| .0001   | .0281   | .0008   | .2867   | 1.672   | .0947   | .0010   | .2286   | .0106   | 5.338    | .0000   |         |         |         |         |

**HINFR2**

| -.0000  | -.0968  | .0034   | .2901   | 3.585   | .0003   | -.0000  | -.1874  | .0096   | 5.078    | .0000   | .0000    |         |         |         |

**PC**

| .1742   | .0808   | .0025   | .2927   | 3.084   | .0021   | .1901   | .0881   | .0002   | .696     | .4865   | .0000    |         |         |         |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------|
| PCEDSTAT    | .1546       | .1621       | .0013        | .2940      | .2223      | .0263      | .0457       | .0479       | .0001             | .610          | .5418         |
| PCSTEP      | -.0051      | -.0470      | .0001        | .2941      | .732       | .4645      | -.0035      | -.0321      | .0001             | .491          | .6232         |
| PCOFFSTAT   | -.0170      | -.0080      | .0000        | .2941      | .134       | .8934      | -.0450      | -.0339      | .0001             | .545          | .5858         |
| PCECOSTAT   | .0275       | .0282       | .0000        | .2942      | .387       | .6990      | -.0363      | -.0373      | .0000             | .310          | .7566         |
| PCGENDER    | -.0623      | -.0431      | .0002        | .2943      | .808       | .4189      | -.0362      | -.0251      | .0001             | .472          | .6365         |
| PCRACE      | -.1584      | -.0723      | .0005        | .2949      | 1.395      | .1632      | -.0616      | -.0281      | .0001             | .516          | .6058         |
| PCAGE       |             |             |             |            |            |            |             |             |                   |               |               |

---(No variable entered, tolerance = 0.010 limits reached)---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCPRVEMP</td>
<td>.0598</td>
<td>.0919</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>.2954</td>
<td>1.394</td>
<td>.1635</td>
<td>.0123</td>
<td>.0189</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.7921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCPRVCETA</td>
<td>-.2815</td>
<td>-.1768</td>
<td>.0028</td>
<td>.2982</td>
<td>3.278</td>
<td>.0011</td>
<td>-.1550</td>
<td>-.0973</td>
<td>.0012</td>
<td>1.772</td>
<td>.0765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCDISSTAT</td>
<td>.7476</td>
<td>.1035</td>
<td>.0012</td>
<td>.2994</td>
<td>2.096</td>
<td>.0362</td>
<td>.5093</td>
<td>.0705</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>1.431</td>
<td>1.1524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS8</td>
<td>.0959</td>
<td>.0393</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.2995</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td>.4683</td>
<td>.0789</td>
<td>.0323</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>.5784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS9</td>
<td>-.2141</td>
<td>-.1194</td>
<td>.0011</td>
<td>.3006</td>
<td>2.066</td>
<td>.0389</td>
<td>-.0712</td>
<td>-.0397</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>.5886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS10</td>
<td>.0200</td>
<td>.0097</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.3006</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.8743</td>
<td>.0637</td>
<td>.0310</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td>.6128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS11</td>
<td>-.5596</td>
<td>-.3030</td>
<td>.0068</td>
<td>.3075</td>
<td>5.111</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>-.1748</td>
<td>-.0947</td>
<td>.0007</td>
<td>1.354</td>
<td>.1757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS12</td>
<td>.7672</td>
<td>.3774</td>
<td>.0080</td>
<td>.3154</td>
<td>5.549</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.7672</td>
<td>.3774</td>
<td>.0115</td>
<td>.5.549</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---(No variable entered, tolerance = 0.010 limits reached)---

MR2 = .3154
F = 32.998
p = .0000
DF = 37; 2650
emerged from this analysis. Six independent variables contributed significantly to explaining the variance in the criterion measure. These were: education status, offender status, economic status, age, previous CETA experience, and number of hours of program participation. In addition, the interaction of participant/control group membership with previous CETA experience was also significant.

**Education status.** A monotonic, nonlinear function for previous education status was significant ($t=19.673$; $p=.0000$) in explaining the variance in the outcome measure. The independent variable explained 18.2 per cent of the variance in the criterion variable. Figure 14 graphs the inverse relationship between these two variables. Youth who had previously been school dropouts had the highest rates of postprogram school attendance and, predictably, these rates dropped sharply for those youth who had post-high school status before the program.

**Offender status.** When entered into the regression equation, previous offender status was significant ($t=8.303$; $p=.0000$). The variable explained two per cent of the variance in the dependent measure. Nonoffenders had higher predicted postprogram school participation rates than did offenders.

**Economic status.** When economic status was used as the predictor variable, there was a significant, negative
Fig. 14—Y = School Status - Eight Month Follow-up, X = Preprogram Education Status²
relationship between the predictor and the criterion variable ($t = 5.284; p = .0000$). The economic status variable explained only eight tenths of one percent of the variance in the dependent variable. The lowest economic status subjects had the highest predicted postprogram school participation rates when compared to middle and higher economic status youth.

**Age.** A positive, monotonic, nonlinear function for age was significant ($t = 5.564; p = .0000$) in predicting postprogram school participation rates; however, only one percent of the variance on the criterion measure was explained by age of subjects. Figure 15 graphs the relationship between these two variables. Youth, seventeen and older, had the highest predicted postprogram school participation rates and the greatest increase in postprogram rates came for those youth in the age category over seventeen.

**Previous CETA experience.** When entered into the regression equation, previous CETA experience was significant ($t = 3.418; p = .0006$). The variable explained only three tenths of one percent of the variance in the criterion measure. Youth with previous CETA experience had somewhat higher predicted postprogram school participation rates than those without previous CETA experience.

**Number of hours in the program.** A nonlinear effect for
Fig. 15 -- \( Y = \text{School Status - Eight Month Follow-up}, \ X = \text{Age}^2 \)
number of hours completed in the program was significant 
(t= 3.585; p= .0003) in predicting postprogram participation 
rates; however, the variable explained only four tenths of 
one per cent of the variance in the dependent variable. 
Figure 16 graphs the monotonic relationship between these 
two variables and depicts the diminishing returns for 
increased hours in the program above the level of 220 
program hours.

Interaction of participant/control group membership and 
previous CETA experience. This interaction variable was 
significant (t= 3.278; p=.0011) but when entered into the 
regression equation it explained only three tenths of one 
per cent of the variance in the dependent measure. 
Participants with previous CETA experience had the highest 
postprogram rates of return to school.

Summary

Hierarchal regression analysis was used to measure the 
effects of participation in a youth employment and training 
program. Eight research hypotheses were tested.

No significant difference was found between 
participants and controls on postprogram measures of job 
knowledge, job seeking or job holding skills or on full-time 
employment status at three months following the program. A 
significant difference in favor of participants was found on
Fig. 16—Y = School Status - Eight Month Follow-up, X = Hours in Program²
the outcome of less trouble with police over the program summer and full-time employment status at eight months postprogram. When the "in school" variable used in the previous analysis of this data set was redefined to delete the activities of going into other CETA or apprenticeship programs, the significant difference on this outcome variable at three and eight months postprogram favored controls.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The present research was a reanalysis of an extant data set on a summer jobs training program for disadvantaged youth. This research intended to modify and extend the initial analysis in the following ways:

1) to enhance the research design by redefining the control group, deleting from the data set those controls who participated in other government training programs during the experimental period,

2) to more precisely define the outcomes measured by the Job Knowledge, Job Seeking Skills, and Job Holding Skills posttests by removing the common variance from these measures,

3) to examine the effects of four additional background variables: subjects' age, disadvantage status, previous employment history, and previous CETA experience on program outcomes,

4) to investigate the effects of number of hours of program participation and site location on achieving program outcomes, and

5) to investigate the effects of program participation on outcomes which were not included in the original
analysis. These included

a) amount of trouble with police over the program summer,

b) school status at three and eight month follow-up, where the outcome variable was redefined in order to eliminate other CETA training or apprenticeship programs from this "in school" variable.

Findings

The following section will review the outcomes from the present analysis in four areas: job knowledge and vocational skills, trouble with police, and employment and school outcomes at three and eight months following the program. These will be followed by findings on the effect of level of program participation and site location on outcomes.

Job Knowledge and Vocational Skills

The common variance between the outcome measures of Job Knowledge, Job Seeking Skills and Job Holding Skills posttests was removed creating a set of orthogonal dependent measures. Hierarchal regression analysis using a set of twenty-seven independent variables as covariates produced no significant difference between participants and controls on these new dependent measures.
A series of independent variables were significant when entered into the regression equation, however, because the squared multiple correlation for each model was low (between .087 and .193) the findings, while statistically significant, must be interpreted with caution.

The pretest explained a larger portion of the variance in the dependent measure than any other independent variable in each model. From forty-one to sixty-six per cent of the models' total variance was explained by the pretest.

When participant/control group membership was interacted with STEP reading test, gender, race, economic status and previous employment status, these interaction variables explained a significant portion of the variance in the posttest measure of Job Knowledge. Youth who had the highest predicted postprogram Job Knowledge scores included participants in the highest reading quartile and controls who were males, minorities, in the lowest family income category, with no previous full-time employment experience. While statistically significant, each of these interaction variables explained less than one per cent of the variance in the dependent measure.

**Trouble With Police Over the Program Summer**

In the original analysis of this data set, no investigation was made of any difference between participants and
controls on amount of trouble with police during the program summer. The present analysis found that there was a statistically significant difference between participant and controls on this outcome variable and that participants had less trouble with police.

A number of main effects and one interaction effect were also statistically significant, but again, the very low squared multiple correlation for the model (.0812) urges caution in interpreting results. Males, youth with a previous offender status, and post high school status and low STEP reading scores had higher predicted rates of offending. Previous offender status explained the greatest amount of variance in the dependent measure but this amounted to less than four percent. When participant/control status was interacted with STEP reading score it was significant and participants in the highest reading score centile had the lowest predicted rates of offending.

**Employment Status at Follow-up**

Youth were interviewed at three and eight months following the program on a variety of status variables including whether or not they were currently employed full-time or had worked some full-time since the end of the program summer. There was no significant difference between participants and controls at three months following the
program but at eight months postprogram there was a significant difference in favor of participants.

In addition to this finding, there were a series of independent variables which were significant but because of the models' very low squared multiple correlations (.076 and .082) the practical significance of these findings is called into question.

For both three and eight month follow-up data, being employed full-time was associated with the following characteristics: having been employed full-time previous to the program, being male, having a post-high school education status or being just under sixteen years of age. For the three months postprogram data, the interaction variable participant/control group membership and race was significant such that white, nonHispanic participants had the highest predicted postprogram employment rates.

One of the characteristics of this demonstration project was a well organized follow-up component. For eight months following the program summer, coordinators maintained contact with participants, offering counseling and referral services, review classes and information on employment activities (2). It is likely that the key element to the success of this program as measured by higher full-time employment rates at eight months postprogram, lies in the effectiveness of this follow-up component.
School Status at Follow-up

In the analysis of YEDPA demonstration programs, the outcome variable labeled "in school" at follow-up includes both school and training activities. The original analysis on this data set found that participants were more likely than controls to be in school or training at eight months but not at three months postprogram (2).

For the purpose of this analysis, the outcome variable "in school" was redefined so as to exclude participation in other CETA training or apprenticeship programs. Using this new "in school" outcome variable for three and eight month follow-up data, the regression analysis produced a significant difference between participants and controls. The data indicates that controls were more likely in school than participants. The squared multiple correlation for these two models was somewhat higher than the previous models (.2849 and .3154).

At eight months postprogram, participants with prior CETA experience had higher predicted postprogram school status when compared to controls or participants without CETA experience. However, while statistically significant, the explained variance for this interaction variable was exceptionally small, less than three tenths of one percent.

For both models, previous education status, offender
status, economic status and age were statistically significant. Youth who had been high school drop-outs prior to the program, those with family incomes in the lowest economic status category, youth between the ages of seventeen and eighteen and nonoffenders had the highest predicted postprogram school status.

The Effect of Program Hours on Program Outcomes

In four of the eight regressions, the nonlinear function for program hours was significant. Graphing various levels of program hours against predicted outcomes, a consistent pattern emerged. There was a positive relationship between number of hours completed in the program, however, beyond 220 hours the effects of program participation brought diminishing returns. This was the case for school and employment outcomes and for the measure of Job Knowledge. While there was a significant and positive effect for program hours on the posttest measure of Job Holding Skills, there was a negative effect for Job Seeking Skills. It is possible, that because controls were not involved in a CETA program, they were more actively looking for a job and that pursuit yielded greater understanding of the job seeking process.
The Effect of Site on Program Outcomes

This demonstration project ran at seven different sites around the country and data was aggregated across all sites. Anecdotal data subsequent to the original analysis suggested that significant differences may have existed among sites. It was possible that more positive findings for exemplary sites may have been lost by aggregating the data. One of the objectives of the present research was to explore the effect of site on program outcomes. Was there a consistent pattern of site effectiveness which ran counter to the analysis for all sites?

Looking at the postprogram status outcomes: trouble with police and school and employment status at follow-up, and controlling for the effects of all other variables, no clear picture of an exemplary site emerged. Of the six sites which entered the model, only Site 13 had a positive effect for each of these outcomes although none were significant. Sites 9 and 10 were positively associated with four of five of these outcomes and each was significantly associated with a postprogram school status outcome.

While no site was negatively associated with all five status outcomes, Site 8 was negatively associated with all but the school status outcome at eight months postprogram, however, none of these associations were significant. Site 8 was, however, significantly and positively associated with
the Job Knowledge outcome.

While curriculum guidelines and program goals were established by the national organization, it is likely that sites saw objectives that were uniquely local. The director at Site 11, saw the pencil and paper tests as "just another DOL requirement" and was not aware that these tests were to be measures of program effectiveness. On the other hand this site director stated that "getting kids back to school" was the top priority of their program (1). In fact, at three and eight months postprogram, this site was positively associated with this program outcome. At three months postprogram this effect was significant at the $p = < .05$ level.

In summary, the data suggest that sites were uneven in their efforts to achieve program goals. No exemplary site emerged from this analysis, however, three of six sites which entered the analysis were significantly and positively associated with program outcomes. Conversely, participation at one site was significantly and negatively associated with four of the five postprogram status outcomes.

Conclusions

The present research was a reanalysis of the effects of a YEDPA demonstration project for disadvantaged youth. This analysis yielded mixed results on the effect of the program
on intended outcomes. The program appears effective in two important areas: keeping youth out of trouble with police over the program summer and achieving higher rates of full-time employment at eight months following the program. When level of program participation was significant, there was likely a nonlinear effect, such that increased participation over the 220 hour level brought diminishing returns. The analysis also produced some preliminary evidence that differences existed among sites in achieving intended program outcomes.

Recommendations for Further Research

The strength of the relationships between the predictor models and the outcomes in this research, as in the initial analysis, was low ranging from .0761 to .3154. A significant portion of the explained variance in the outcome was attributed to the pretest alone (between 41 and 66 percent in the first three models). Cohen and Cohen (2) suggest that after the introduction of the pretest to the predictor model, additional covariates will not likely add to the predictive ability of the model. Still, using the first three models as an example, some 34 to 59 percent of the explained variance was attributable to covariates following the pretest. A search for factors which enhance the predictive ability of the model, might then be a
worthwhile effort for further research.

The predictor model for both analyses did not include personality characteristics of subjects' or family characteristics. Whether or not the youth lived within a family that provided financial support, whether they were married, or were parents themselves may have greatly impacted outcomes. While the model did not account for personality characteristics of the subjects, the data set did include measures of self-esteem and teacher and supervisor rating forms from which personality variables could have been derived. Inclusion of these may have significantly improved the predictive power of the model. While the analysis still leaves us with many questions vis-a-vis causality, the use of a more powerful model in a strictly descriptive mode is an important preliminary step "in thinking through...causal issues" (2, 397).

Over and above these issues, one must also be concerned with the possibility of measurement error in the original data set. While the research design was specified by the Department of Labor, interviewing and data collection procedures were in the hands of local sites. If measurement errors did occur, then efforts towards more precise model specification may still fail to yield a better predictive model.
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APPENDIX A

CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS AND CONTROLS
TABLE I
TOTAL NUMBER RECRUITED FOR APPLICANT POOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Program Capacity: 300</th>
<th>Program Capacity: 150</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(A)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of youth recruited from schools (75% of total participants)</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% over recruitment</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control 3:1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total recruited from schools</td>
<td>360*</td>
<td>180*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(B)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of youth recruited from courts (25% of total participants)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% over recruitment</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control 1:1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total recruited from courts</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(C)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number to be recruited from school and courts (A+B)</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ten percent of this total (36 and 18, respectively) were to be actual school dropouts and 90% were to be potential dropouts.

# TABLE NUMBER II

AGE OF PARTICIPANTS AND CONTROLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Controls</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.1%</td>
<td>.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>.4%</td>
<td>.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.1%</td>
<td>.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.1%</td>
<td>.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>2688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE III
GENDER OF PARTICIPANTS AND CONTROLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Controls</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>1472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>1211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>2688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Status</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>Row Pct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. Student</td>
<td>1432</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. Dropout</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. Graduate</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post High School Attendee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE V
ECONOMIC STATUS
OF PARTICIPANTS AND CONTROLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Col Pct</th>
<th>Total Pct</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Controls</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-70% LLSIL</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>724</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-85% LLSIL</td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+% LLSIL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>2688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE NUMBER VI  
DISADVANTAGED STATUS OF PARTICIPANTS AND CONTROLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disadvantaged Status</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Controls</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>2656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>2688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE NUMBER VII
**RACE/ETHNICITY OF PARTICIPANTS AND CONTROLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Controls</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>Col Pct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tot Pct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (Non Hispanic)</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (Not Hispanic)</td>
<td>1473</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>1091</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>2688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE NUMBER VIII
OFFENDER STATUS
OF PARTICIPANTS AND CONTROLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offender Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Col Pct</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offender</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>401</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Offender</td>
<td>1454</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>386</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Controls</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offender</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Offender</td>
<td>1454</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>2688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE NUMBER IX

PREVIOUS CETA EXPERIENCE OF PARTICIPANTS AND CONTROLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous CETA Experience</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Controls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1293</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>1091</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>2688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE X
PREVIOUS EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF PARTICIPANTS AND CONTROLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Employment Status</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Controls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never Worked</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>1181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked Part-Time on Previous Job</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked Full-Time on Previous Job</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>2688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Individual Participant Profile**

2. **NAME**
   
   - First Name: [ ]
   - MI: [ ]
   - Last Name: [ ]

3. **ADDRESS**
   
   - No. and Street: [ ]
   - City: [ ]
   - State: [ ]
   - ZIP: [ ]

4. **TELEPHONE:**

5. **SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER:**

6. **DATE OF BIRTH:**
   
   - Month: [ ]
   - Day: [ ]
   - Year: [ ]

---

### PARTICIPANT'S CHARACTERISTICS

7. **SEX:**
   
   - 1 - Male
   - 2 - Female

8. **EDUCATION STATUS:**
   
   1 - H.S. Student, enter grade: [ ]
   2 - H.S. Dropout, enter grade: [ ]
   3 - GED
   4 - H.S. Graduate
   5 - Post-High School Attendee

9. **ECONOMIC STATUS:**
   
   1 - 0-10% LLJ/LRL
   2 - 10-30% LLJ/LRL
   3 - 30-100% LLJ/LRL
   4 - Above 100% LLJ/LRL

10. **AFFILIATION STATUS:**
    
    1 - AFDC
    2 - Public Assistance-SI
    3 - Other Cash (Public)

11. **ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED:**
    
    - 1 - Yes
    - 2 - No

12. **RACE/ETHNIC GROUP:**
    
    1 - White (not Hispanic)
    2 - Black (not Hispanic)
    3 - Hispanic
    4 - American Indian/Alaskan Native
    5 - Asian/Pacific Islander

13. **LIMITED ENGLISH SPEAKING ABILITY:**
    
    - 1 - Yes
    - 2 - No

14. **FAMILY STATUS:**
    
    1 - Single
    2 - Married
    3 - Widowed
    4 - Divorced

15. **MARRITAL STATUS:**
    
    TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS

16. **CHILDREN:**
    
    1 - Yes (if yes, how many? [ ])
    - 2 - No

17. **VETERAN GROUP:**
    
    1 - Veteran
    2 - Vietnam Era
    3 - Special
    4 - Special Disabled
    5 - Not a Veteran

18. **MIGRANT/SEASONAL FARM FAMILY MEMBER:**
    
    1 - Yes
    - 2 - No

19. **HANDICAPPED:**
    
    - 1 - Yes
    - 2 - No

---

### PROGRAM STATUS

30. **ENTRY DATE:**
    
    - Month: [ ]
    - Day: [ ]
    - Year: [ ]

31. **PROGRAM SERVICE GROUP:**
    
    1 - Participant Group 1
    2 - Participant Group 2
    3 - Participant Group 3
    4 - Control Group 1
    5 - Control Group 2

32. **RECEIVED ACADEMIC CREDIT:**
    
    - 1 - Yes
    - 2 - No

33. **RECEIVED HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA:**
    
    - 1 - Yes
    - 2 - No

34. **RECEIVED GED CERTIFICATE:**
    
    - 1 - Yes
    - 2 - No

35. **RECEIVED OCCUPATIONAL CERTIFICATE:**
    
    - 1 - Yes
    - 2 - No

36. **OTHER PROGRAM PROGRESS:**
    
    - [ ]

37. **TERMINATION:**
    
    39. **Termination Date:**
        
        - Month: [ ]
        - Day: [ ]
        - Year: [ ]

40. **TOTAL PROGRAM HOURS:**
    
    - [ ]

41. **TOTAL PROGRAM WAGES:**
    
    - DOLLARS [ ]
    - CENTS [ ]

42. **LABOR FORCE STATUS:**
    
    1 - Employed
    2 - Underemployed
    3 - Unemployed
    4 - In school
    5 - Other
    6 - Status unknown

43. **ENTERED UNSUBSIDIZED EMPLOYMENT:**
    
    1 - Yes
    - 2 - No

44. **ENTRY DATE:**
    
    - Month: [ ]
    - Day: [ ]
    - Year: [ ]

45. **JOB TITLE:**
    
    - [ ]

46. **HOURLY WAGE:**
    
    - DOLLARS [ ]
    - CENTS [ ]

47. **HOURS WORKED PER WEEK:**
    
    - [ ]

48. **OTHER POSITIVE TERMINATION:**
    
    1 - Entered full-time academic or vocational school
    2 - Entered a non-CETA funded Manpower Program
    3 - Intermittent transfer
    4 - Completed program objective not involving unsubsidized employment
    5 - Entered Armed Forces

49. **NON-POSITIVE TERMINATION:**
    
    Reason for termination:
    
    1 - Last off
    2 - Health
    3 - Pregnancy
    4 - Family care
    5 - Criminal activity
    6 - Moved from area
    7 - Refused to continue
    8 - Administrative separation
    9 - Other
    10 - Other non-positive
Directions
Each question in this test is followed by four suggested answers.
Read each question and decide which one of the four suggested answers is best.
Then circle the letter next to the answer you have chosen.

SAMPLE
Read the paragraph and answer the two sample questions below by circling the letter next to the answer you have chosen.

The Herring Gull is especially good at seizing food from other birds. It is about twenty-four inches long, and it is the gull that you most often see at the beach. It will often chase a bird that is carrying a fish or a stolen egg home to eat. The Herring Gull keeps attacking the other bird until it drops the egg or the fish. Of course the egg will break if it hits the ground. But Herring Gulls are so fast and agile they can sometimes catch an egg in mid-air.

SAMPLE 1
Which of the following is the best title for this passage?

A) How Herring Gulls Get Food
B) Catching Eggs
C) How Herring Gulls Fly Faster Than Other Birds
D) Eating Habits of Birds

SAMPLE 2
How long is a Herring Gull?

A) 12 inches
B) 18 inches
C) 24 inches
D) 32 inches
Questions 1-5

From loaves lying ready on the table, each person cut a thick slice of bread. This he placed in front of him to serve as a plate, or "trencher." Everyone reached into the serving dishes with both hands and carried the food, sauce and all, as best he could to his trencher.

"Do not dip your fingers into the sauce deeper than the second joint," Lady Alice told Robert when he first came to the castle. "That would not be good manners."

Dogs prowled about the tables, waiting hungrily for bits of food and bones to be thrown to them. They often fought over the scraps.

The floor of the great hall was covered with rushes — reeds cut from the river bank in spring and spread out to lessen the chill of the cold stone. At first this carpeting was soft and fragrant. But it soon became foul with bits of bone and food.

1. What did the people in this passage use as plates?
   A) Silver
   B) China
   C) Bread
   D) Napkins

2. The floor of the great hall was made of
   A) stone
   B) wood
   C) dirt
   D) mud

3. Rushes were put on the floor in order to
   A) cover up the used trenchers
   B) make the carpet look pretty
   C) make the floor feel warmer
   D) keep the dogs away

4. The story takes place in a
   A) restaurant
   B) castle
   C) school
   D) church

5. The story says that the dogs were
   A) big
   B) fast
   C) hungry
   D) ugly
Chocolate comes from a white bean produced by the cacao tree. The Aztec Indians first made chocolate by whipping ground, roasted cacao beans in hot water and then adding vanilla, green pepper, and spices. Later the Spanish found that by adding sugar to the ground cacao beans they could make a delicious new drink. This new drink was to become very popular among the kings of Europe. Chocolate was sometimes drunk by sick people as a tonic. Special chocolate houses in Spain, France, Italy, Holland, and England served this new treat to fashionable customers. Now chocolate is a flavor we enjoy in candy, cake, ice cream, and milk shakes.

6. What is the best title for this story?
A) How the Spanish Discovered Chocolate
B) The History of Chocolate
C) Flavors of Candy and Ice Cream
D) How to Grow Cacao Trees

7. What did the Aztec Indians put in chocolate?
A) Milk
B) Sugar
C) Whipped cream
D) Green pepper

8. The kings of Europe drank chocolate with
A) sugar
B) spices
C) green pepper
D) vanilla

9. Tonic in line 10 means
A) medicine
B) soda
C) treat
D) candy

10. The first people in the passage to use chocolate were the
A) Spanish
B) French
C) English
D) Aztecs

11. Fashionable in line 12 means
A) sick
B) intelligent
C) stylish
D) young

Early people had little reason for measuring the area of land. They did not have permanent homes and were nomadic. In later years, people began to stay in one place on land that they owned. Therefore, they needed some kind of description or measure of land.

Seeds were the earliest measures of this kind and the amount of land which a given amount of seed would plant became a unit of measure. A common unit of land measurement today is an acre. At first an acre represented the amount of land a farmer could plow with his oxen in one day. However, this was never a very precise way of measuring the land. An acre still means a certain amount of land in one country and a different amount in other countries.

12. The passage is mostly about
A) how land is measured
B) how people lived long ago
C) why seeds were used to measure land
D) why farmers used oxen to plow

13. Nomadic in line 3 means
A) farming without modern tools
B) moving from place to place
C) living in caves
D) fighting with other groups of people

14. Why was the use of oxen not a very good way to measure land?
A) Different people could plow different amounts of land in a day.
B) Some people planted more seeds than other people.
C) People did not know how to farm efficiently.
D) People did not care how much land they owned.
Questions 15-20

As a young society woman Mary Cassatt might have done the conventional things, but she was different. She had a passion for drawing and painting; she was determined to be an artist, and a good one, regardless of what family and friends thought.

After several years of studying in Italy, Spain, and Belgium she ended her art pilgrimage by settling in Paris. There she was soon attracted to the work of the artist Degas. His work is known here in America chiefly through copies of his drawings of ballet girls. In a way she became his disciple. She was willing to accept his suggestions and criticisms as she would not accept anyone else’s.

More than any other artist of modern times, Mary Cassatt made herself famous by painting the single theme of mother and child.

15. The main purpose of this story is to discuss Mary Cassatt’s
   A) career
   B) family
   C) friends
   D) travels

16. Mary Cassatt is most famous for paintings she did of
   A) ballet dancers
   B) scenery in Paris
   C) scenery in America
   D) women and their children

17. The word conventional in line 2 means
   A) humble
   B) artistic
   C) miraculous
   D) usual

18. The word pilgrimage in line 8 means
   A) journey
   B) friendship
   C) purchase
   D) masterpiece

19. A disciple (line 12) is a person who
   A) nurses another back to health
   B) follows the teachings of another
   C) inspires someone to do great works
   D) receives money from someone who has died

20. It can be concluded that Mary Cassatt believed that Degas
   A) was a difficult person to understand
   B) painted like artists she knew in America
   C) wanted to go to America
   D) had good ideas about painting

STOP! If you finish before time is called, you may check your work.
In these exercises you'll see pictures of different jobs and the name of each job. Next to each picture are questions about the job, like how much that job pays or what kind of work you do on that job.

Please answer the questions about each job. For each question, mark the space next to the answer that you think is the right one.

1. Where would you work on this job most of the time?
   - In a factory on the assembly line
   - In the kitchen of a restaurant
   - In a store
   - In your own home

2. What kind of work do you think you would do on this job?
   - Design and repair cash registers
   - Check out goods for customers and collect money
   - Operate a copying machine and keep financial records
   - Help people borrow money when they need it

3. When are you supposed to do the work on this job?
   - Mostly at night from midnight to 8 o'clock in the morning
   - Might be any hours—day or night, weekdays or weekends
   - Only weekends—all day Friday, Saturday and Sunday
   - Only during the day from Monday to Friday
4.
When are you supposed to do the work on this job?
- Monday to Friday, from about 8 o'clock in the morning to 4 o'clock in the afternoon
- Mostly at night from about midnight to 8 o'clock in the morning for 5 days a week
- Any kind of hours day or night from Monday to Friday
- Only at nights and on weekends

5.
About how much would you get paid when you start on this job full-time?
- $6.75 to $7.50 an hour
- $1.25 to $1.65 an hour
- $2.00 to 2.65 an hour
- $3.75 to $4.25 an hour

6.
How much schooling do you think you'd need to get this job?
- Grade school only
- A high school diploma only
- A college degree
- No special schooling
7. Where would you work on this job most of the time?

- In your own home
- In a garage or service station
- In a factory on an assembly line
- Outdoors, where new houses are being built

8. Which one of these tools would you use in this kind of work?

9. When are you supposed to do the work on this job?

- Any hours of the day or night
- Mostly during the day from about 8 o' clock in the morning to 4 o' clock in the afternoon
- Mostly at night from about midnight to 8 o' clock in the morning
- Only on weekends—Friday, Saturday and Sunday
10. When are you supposed to do the work on this job?

- Only during the day—from about 8 o'clock in the morning to 5 o'clock in the afternoon
- Only at night—from about midnight to 8 o'clock in the morning
- Might be any days or almost any hours during the day or night
- Every Friday, Saturday and Sunday only—either during the day or at night

11. What kind of work do you think you would do on this job?

- Decide what medicine a sick person should take
- Help a sick person by feeding him
- Do blood tests to tell what is wrong with a sick person
- Give examinations to tell if someone is sick

12. About how much would you get paid when you start on this job full-time?

- $4.25 to $4.75 an hour
- More than $5.00 an hour
- $2.90 to $3.50 an hour
- $1.85 to $2.25 an hour
13. What kind of work do you think you would do on this job?
- Give medicine to sick people
- Teach people how to read and write
- Talk with people about their problems
- Arrest people who commit crimes

14. About how much would you get paid when you start on this job full-time?
- $6.00 to $7.00 an hour
- $2.25 to $2.75 an hour
- Over $8.00 an hour
- $4.00 to $4.75 an hour

15. How much schooling do you think you'd need to get this job?
- No special schooling
- A college degree
- A trade school certificate
- Grade school only
16. When are you supposed to do the work on this job?

- Only during the day from about 8 o'clock in the morning to about 5 o'clock in the afternoon
- Could be any days or any hours during the day or night
- Whatever hours you feel like working
- Only at nights from about midnight to 8 o'clock in the morning

17. How much schooling do you think you'd need to get this job?

- High school diploma
- Grade school only
- Trade school certificate
- No special schooling

18. Where would you work on this job most of the time?

- In a factory on an assembly line
- In your own home
- Outdoors on a farm
- Outdoors in a city
19. About how much would you get paid when you start on this job full-time?

- $3.75 to $4.25 an hour
- $1.30 to $1.65 an hour
- $2.20 to $2.50 an hour
- $8.50 to $9.25 an hour

20. What kind of work do you think you would do on this job?

- Keep records of all letters received in a post office
- Sell stamps in a post office
- Sort letters and deliver them to people
- Fix mail-sorting machines when they break down

21. When are you supposed to do the work on this job?

- Only at night—from about midnight to 8 o’clock in the morning
- Might be any day or any hours during the day or night
- Mostly during the week from about 8 o’clock in the morning to 5 o’clock in the afternoon
- Every Friday, Saturday, and Sunday only
22. Which one of these tools would you use in this kind of work?

[Diagram with options]

23. How much schooling do you think you’d need to get this job?

☐ No special schooling
☐ At least a college degree and special schooling
☐ Only a grade school diploma
☐ A trade school certificate and training on the job

24. About how much would you get paid when you start on this job full-time?

☐ $6.00 to $6.75 an hour
☐ $2.60 to $3.50 an hour
☐ $7.90 to $11.50 an hour
☐ $4.00 to $5.25 an hour
25. Where would you work on this job most of the time?
- In a factory, on an assembly line
- In a shop, like a hardware store
- In your own home
- In a building, like an office building

26. About how much would you get paid when you start on this job full-time?
- $4.85 to $5.25 an hour
- $1.75 to $2.25 an hour
- $3.25 to $4.00 an hour
- $5.90 to $6.75 an hour

27. What kind of work do you think you would do on this job?
- Fix broken telephones
- Help people make telephone calls
- Send telephone bills to people
- Help design new telephones
28.
Which one of these tools would you use in this kind of work?

☐ [Tool 1]

☐ [Tool 2]

☐ [Tool 3]

☐ [Tool 4]

29.
How much schooling do you think you'd need to get this job?

☐ A high school diploma only

☐ A college degree and special training

☐ Trade school certificate and special training

☐ Grade school only

30.
When are you supposed to do the work on this job?

☐ Only from about 8 o'clock in the morning to 5 o'clock in the afternoon

☐ Almost any hours during the night or day

☐ Nights only from midnight to 8 o'clock in the morning

☐ Only on weekends—Friday, Saturday and Sunday
31. When are you supposed to do the work on this job?

- Nights only from about midnight to 8 o’clock in the morning
- Weekends only—Friday, Saturday and Sunday
- Whatever hours you feel like working
- Mostly during the day from about 8 o’clock in the morning to 5 o’clock in the afternoon

32. About how much would you get paid when you start on this job full-time?

- More than $5.00 an hour
- $1.75 to $2.25 an hour
- $1.00 to $1.40 an hour
- $2.75 to $3.25 an hour

33. How much schooling do you think you’d need to get this job?

- High school diploma
- Trade school certificate
- College degree
- No special schooling

PLEASE STOP HERE.
WAIT TO BE TOLD HOW TO DO THE NEXT GROUP OF QUESTIONS.
The questions that follow are to find out how much you know about how people should act on a job—and what you might do on a job when certain things happen.

1. If you feel too sick to go to work one day, would you call and let the boss know?
   - I wouldn’t bother—it wouldn’t make any difference to the boss.
   - I might call if I happened to think of it.
   - I would always call—otherwise the boss would get sore.

2. If you’re short of money before payday each week, would you borrow what you need from somebody at work?
   - I would do that anytime I felt like it.
   - I might do that sometimes.
   - I would never try to do that at work.

3. What would you say to a boss who said this to you?
   - Sorry, I’ll try to get here on time from now on.
   - It’s tough for me to make it here on time but I’ll try.
   - I do my work—what’s the difference if I’m late.
4.
How do you feel about this person who’s dressed in a sloppy way at work?

- It doesn’t matter how you dress as long as you do your job.
- You should dress sharper than the rest so you stand out and are noticed.
- You should dress about the same way as the other people and look neat.

5.
How do you feel about placing a few bets each day at work?

- I wouldn’t do that—most bosses wouldn’t like it.
- There’s nothing wrong with it—a boss wouldn’t mind.
- I might do that sometimes—but I wouldn’t overdo it.

6.
When someone who’s the boss gives you a lot of orders about what to do, how do you feel?

- It rubs me the wrong way to take orders and I usually let the boss know it.
- I don’t like taking orders, but I’ll do it if the boss doesn’t push it too far.
- I usually don’t mind. The boss’s job is to give orders.
7.
How do you feel about someone taking a drink this way on the job?
- It's okay, if you try not to get caught too often.
- You should never do it—a boss wouldn't like it.
- It's your own business when you take a drink—most bosses wouldn't mind.

8.
What would you think if someone working next to you said this?
- That person better lay off or I'll hit 'em right now.
- I'm going to quit this job if the people here bug me.
- I won't look for trouble, I'll just ignore it.

9.
If you get a paycheck and you think the amount is wrong what would you do?
- Let it go. It doesn't pay to make a fuss.
- Go tell the boss he or she's a thief.
- Tell the person who gives out the pay that you think there's a mistake.
10. What would you say if the boss asked you this?

☐ Not me, I only work if I'm paid to do it.

☐ I would do it if I could get some extra time off.

☐ It's too much trouble for me to work after regular hours.

11. If you finish the work that's given to you in the morning and the boss doesn't tell you what to do the rest of the day—what would you do?

☐ Just knock off and relax. It's best to work only when you're told what to do.

☐ Look for something else that needs doing on the job or maybe help somebody else with their work.

☐ Try to look like I'm working at something so the boss won't think I'm goofing off.
The questions that follow are to find out how much you know about looking for jobs. For each question, mark the space next to the answer that you think is the right one.

1.
If you go to the State Employment Service to help you find a job—what would they charge if they found a job for you?

☐ They would charge one week's pay.

☐ They would charge whatever you can afford.

☐ It doesn’t cost you anything.

☐ They would charge half of a week’s pay.

2.
On which day are there more "help wanted" ads for jobs in the newspaper?

☐ On Sunday

☐ On Saturday

☐ It’s the same any day

☐ On Tuesday
KEYPUNCH
NITES
MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY
Minimum 1-2 Yrs Exp
GOOD STARTING SALARY
EXCELLENT COMPANY BENEFITS
IMMEDIATE 20% DISCOUNT
ON ALL FASHIONABLE MUSE
FOR MORE DETAILS CALL
OR 5-1000, EXT 477
Worthman Smith
560 Washington St, N.Y.C.
(212) 222 App Locat Houston St, N.Y.C.

3.
How much experience would you need for this job?
☐ You don’t need any experience.
☐ At least one or two years.
☐ Less than a year.
☐ At least five years’ experience.

4.
What kind of benefits do you get on this job?
☐ You can make free telephone calls.
☐ You get your lunch free.
☐ You can buy things cheaper than the regular price.
☐ They pay your carfare to get to work.

5.
When would you work on this job?
☐ Weekends—Friday, Saturday and Sunday.
☐ During the day from 8 o’clock in the morning to five o’clock in the afternoon.
☐ Five nights a week.
☐ Sometimes during the day, sometimes at night.
SALES HELP WANTED
SALESPERSON
CAMERAS
APPLIANCES
RADIO & TV
ROBERTSON'S
VALLEY STREAM

Top notch experienced sales person needed for our newest store in the Green Acres Shopping Center.
1 PM—10 PM, 5 days or 6 PM—10 PM
High Salary + PMs
Opportunity to Advance
Excellent Benefit Program
Apply at
Employment Office
460 Sunrise Hwy, Valley Stream
An Equal Opportunity Employer

6.
What would you do on this job?

☐ Fix cameras and radios.

☐ Sell things in a store.

☐ Teach people how to drive a car.

☐ Sell houses to people.

7.
What would you do to get this job?

☐ Write a letter to the manager of the place.

☐ Call the telephone number given in this ad.

☐ Call the State Employment Service and tell them you want to apply.

☐ Go to the address given in the ad and ask about the job.

8.
When would you work on this job?

☐ In the mornings for five days a week.

☐ At night, on the weekends only.

☐ Any hours or any days you want to pick.

☐ In the afternoon or at night for five days a week.
MAIL CLERK

ADV. AGENCY

Handle distribution of mail & outside deliveries. Neat appearance. HS grad or mature person. Good advancement apply for alert person.

RADIO CITY AREA

Ms. Morse  Circle 5-1000

9.

Where would you work on this job?

☐ In a department store.

☐ In an office.

☐ In a factory.

☐ In your own home.

10.

What would you do to get this job?

☐ Call the State Employment Service and ask them about the job.

☐ Write a letter to the place that has the job.

☐ Go to the place yourself and ask about the job.

☐ Call the place on the phone.

11.

What would you do in this job?

☐ Sell things in a store.

☐ Write letters and mail them.

☐ Sort mail and make deliveries.

☐ Fix adding machines and typewriters.
### APPLICATION FOR EMPLOYMENT

**PERSONAL INFORMATION**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Security Number</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **NAME**
   - Last
   - First
   - Middle

2. **PRESENT ADDRESS**
   - Street
   - City
   - State

3. **PERMANENT ADDRESS**
   - Street
   - City
   - State

4. **PHONE NO.**

5. **CITIZEN OF U.S.A.**
   - YES
   - NO

6. **KIND OF WORK YOU PREFER**

7. **EDUCATION**
   - CIRCLE THE NUMBER OF THE HIGHEST GRADE COMPLETED
   - 7
   - 8
   - 9
   - 10
   - 11
   - 12
   - 13
   - 14

8. **OFFICE MACHINES YOU OPERATE**

9. **IF RELATED TO ANYONE IN OUR EMPLOY, STATE NAME AND DEPARTMENT REFERRED BY**

---

**12.**

If you finished high school and got your diploma, which number would you circle on line 6?

- [ ] 8
- [ ] 11
- [ ] 12
- [ ] 14

**13.**

What would you put on line number 2 where it says "present address?"

- [ ] The address of the place where you live now.
- [ ] The address where a friend lives.
- [ ] The address of the place where you're applying for the job.
- [ ] The address of the place where you worked last.

**14.**

If you have an uncle who works for this place and he told you about coming here to apply for a job, where would you write your uncle's name?

- [ ] Line 1
- [ ] Line 4
- [ ] Line 7
- [ ] Line 8
### FORMER EMPLOYERS

(LIST BELOW LAST FOUR EMPLOYERS, STARTING WITH LAST ONE FIRST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>NAME AND ADDRESS OF EMPLOYER</th>
<th>SALARY</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>REASON FOR LEAVING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 1977</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Joy Manufacturing Co.  55 Eaton Place  Chicago, Illinois</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>Parts Assembler</td>
<td>Still employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1976</td>
<td>Nov 1976</td>
<td>West Side Housing Project  12 W. South Street  Moline, Illinois</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>Maintenance Helper</td>
<td>Wanted more money</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EMPLOYMENT DESIRED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION A</th>
<th>DATE YOU CAN START</th>
<th>SALARY DESIRED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anytime</strong></td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ARE YOU EMPLOYED NOW?** Yes

**EVER APPLIED TO THIS COMPANY BEFORE?** No

**IF SO MAY WE INQUIRE OF YOUR PRESENT EMPLOYER?** Yes

15. What job did this person hold right before the job he or she holds now?

- ☐ Packer
- ☐ Maintenance helper
- ☐ Messenger
- ☐ Parts Assembler

16. In the blank where the A is, which of these things would make sense if you wrote it?

- ☐ 247 Jay Street
- ☐ $4.40 an hour
- ☐ Sales person
- ☐ No night work

17. What should be put in the place marked B?

- ☐ Don’t put anything.
- ☐ Other places the person applied for jobs.
- ☐ Where the person worked last.
- ☐ Where the person lives.

PLEASE STOP HERE.
WAIT TO BE TOLD HOW TO DO THE NEXT GROUP OF QUESTIONS.
Program Completion Survey

- We're trying to find out how people who have been in your training program for a while have been doing since they left the program—like how things have been working out for you in general; what you think you've gotten out of being in the program; what you are doing now and what things you would like to do from now on; how you feel about jobs; and so on. We would like to know your feelings about these things. We plan to use what we find out to make programs like this better for trainees.

- The answers you give to any questions will all be confidential and private. Anything we find out from these interviews will be reported for a whole group at a time (like a few hundred) so that no one can know your answers. However, all the information requested is important and your response to each question will be appreciated.

- Let me go over the questions with you. It should take no more than about 25 minutes. Remember, if you don't understand a question, please stop me to make sure it's clear.
Counselor’s Rating Form

Counselor’s Name ___________________________________________ Date __________________________

Name of Enrollee Being Rated ___________________________________________

ETS I.D. NUMBER

On this sheet are 11 statements about enrollee behavior that counselors consider important in determining how well an enrollee is coming along. We would appreciate your evaluation of how these apply to this enrollee.

Please read each statement carefully. Then circle one of the numbers 1 to 5 that best indicates how the statement applies to the enrollee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 = This describes the enrollee perfectly.</th>
<th>2 = This is true most of the time.</th>
<th>3 = Sometimes true of the enrollee.</th>
<th>4 = This is not usually so.</th>
<th>5 = The enrollee is not like this at all.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Pays attention to good grooming and dresses appropriately.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Is not very open about discussing personal and job problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Shows a lot of resentment and hostility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Is cooperative and willing to listen to advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Makes realistic plans about future jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Shows little poise or self-assurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Is coherent in expressing himself (herself)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Is motivated to want to work and expend effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Does not show good day-to-day planning so that he (she) can handle the job (let’s home life interfere, for example)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Indicates a willingness to enroll in school or some sort of training on a part-time basis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Shows qualities that indicate he (she) will do well after leaving the program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Completion Survey

1. ETS I.D. NO. .................................................

2. DATE OF INTERVIEW ....................................

3. NAME OF RESPONDENT
   LAST NAME ...........................................
   FIRST NAME ........................................

4. HOME ADDRESS
   NUMBER AND STREET ..................................
   CITY AND STATE ....................................
   ZIP CODE ...........................................

5. TELEPHONE NUMBER WHERE RESPONDENT CAN BE REACHED
   AREA CODE ...........................................
   TELEPHONE NUMBER ...............................

6. RESPONDENT'S SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER .................

7. SEX: □ Male □ Female

8. DATE OF BIRTH ........................................

9. Since you've been in the program have you been working on a general equivalency high school diploma (GED)?
   Yes □ No □

9a. If yes, have you gotten the GED yet?
   Yes □ No □

9b. Did you get (or will you be getting) your high school diploma in June?
   □ Yes □ No: Will get it later (end of summer or next school year) □ No: Leaving school without it.

10. What types of things did you take part in during the program? (Check all those which are applicable.)
    1 □ Personal counseling
    2 □ Job counseling
    3 □ Classroom training: vocational skills
    4 □ Classroom training: remedial education
    5 □ Classroom training: GED
    6 □ Working on a job
    7 □ Referral to a full-time permanent job
    8 □ Other (specify): ................................

11. Of the things you took part in during the program, which two do you think were most helpful to you?
    (Check only two.)
    1 □ Personal counseling
    2 □ Job counseling
    3 □ Classroom training: vocational skills
    4 □ Classroom training: remedial education
    5 □ Classroom training: GED
    6 □ Working on a job
    7 □ Referral to a full-time permanent job
    8 □ Other (specify): ................................

12. How do you feel about your experiences in the program?
    □ Very satisfied □ Satisfied □ Very dissatisfied

13. Are you still enrolled in the program?
    □ Yes (Skip to question 22) □ No (Go on to question 14)

14. How many weeks has it been since you left the program? ........................................

WEEKS
15. Are you presently working?

☐ Yes (Go on to question 16.) ☐ No (Skip to question 20.)

16. Are you presently working 30 or more hours per week?

☐ Yes (Go on to question 17.) ☐ No (Skip to question 21.)

17. Where do you work?

NAME OF COMPANY ________________________________________

NUMBER AND STREET OR ROUTE ________________________________________

CITY AND STATE ________________________________________

TELEPHONE NUMBER ________________________________________

18. What is your job title?

__________________________________________________________

19. How helpful was the program in preparing you for this job?

☐ It was no help at all ☐ It helped a little, now and then ☐ It was very helpful in a lot of ways.

(Skip to question 22.)

20. Have you worked since leaving the program? ☐ Yes ☐ No

21. What are you doing now? (Check all those which are applicable.)

1 ☐ Looking for a job 3 ☐ In another CETA training program

2 ☐ In school 4 ☐ Nothing special (Probe: How do you spend your day? Briefly describe.)

22. Do you think you’re able to get the kind of job you want?

☐ I would have a very good chance. ☐ I might have some chance. ☐ I won’t have much chance.

23. Do you think you’re able to do the work on the job well enough to satisfy any boss?

☐ I won’t be able to, on most jobs. ☐ I might be able to, on most jobs. ☐ I definitely will be able to, on any job.

24. Do you think you’re able to get by on a job without a lot of help from the boss, or the people you work with?

☐ Yes, I’ll get by on my own without help ☐ I may need a little help sometimes ☐ I’m going to need a lot of help from other people.

25. Do you think, if you have to learn something new on a job, you could learn enough to do the job right?

☐ Yes, I could, anytime for any job. ☐ Maybe I could learn, for some jobs. ☐ I would have a tough time if I have to learn something new.

26. Do you think you’ve got what it takes to get promoted and move up to better jobs?

☐ It would be rough for me to get promotions. ☐ Maybe I could, on some jobs. ☐ I could get promoted for sure, on any job.

27. Do you think being in the program has made you feel more like you’re going to be able to make it in a job later on?

☐ It was no help to me at all. ☐ It was some help to me ☐ It helped me a lot.
People look for different things in their choice of jobs.

28. How important is it that you get to do interesting work?
   - That's really important to me.
   - It may be important to me.
   - I don't really care about that.

29. How important is it that you can get paid what you're worth?
   - That's really important to me.
   - It may be important to me.
   - I don't really care about that.

30. How important is it that you wouldn't have to worry about being fired?
   - That's really important to me.
   - It may be important to me.
   - I don't really care about that.

31. How important is it that you feel like you're doing work that's worth doing?
   - That's really important to me.
   - It may be important to me.
   - I don't really care about that.

32. How important is it that you can get raises and make more money fast?
   - That's really important to me.
   - It may be important to me.
   - I don't really care about that.

33. How important is it that you have a chance for steady work?
   - That's really important to me.
   - It may be important to me.
   - I don't really care about that.

34. What kind of full-time job would (did) you look for right after leaving the program?
   Write in kind of job: ________________________________

35. What kind of full-time job would you like best right now?
   Write in job choice: ________________________________

36. What is the lowest hourly pay you would take for the job you would like best right now?
   Write in hourly pay: $ __________________________

37. How much do you know about what it takes to do the job you would like best right now?
   - I know a lot about that kind of job.
   - I know a few things about what the job takes.
   - I don't really know much about it.

38. How willing would you be to go into a training program for the job you would like best right now?
   (Check only one.)
   1. I wouldn't bother.
   2. I would do it only if I were paid.
   3. I would do it for no pay.
   4. I am already trained for that job.

39. Since being in the program, has there been a change in the way you get along with your family?
   - I have no family. (Skip to question 42.)
   - I get along better with them than I used to.
   - I get along worse with them than I used to.
   - I get along with them the same way I always did.

40. How does your family feel about how you're doing (did) in the program?
   - They think I'm doing great.
   - They think I'm getting by okay.
   - They think I'm doing poorly
41 Out of what you earn a week, about how much do you give to your family? $ 

☐ I don't earn any money

42 Since being in the program have there been any changes in the way you use your money? 

(Check one box in each row.)

☐ [More]

☐ [Less]

☐ [Same]

1) Savings

2) Home and family (rent, food, clothing)

3) Leisure (recreation)

4) Education

43. How often do you save money from your pay? (Check only one.) 

☐ I don't earn any money.

☐ I save something

☐ Sometimes I save.

☐ I never save.

44 Which of these people or agencies have been giving you a hard time lately? (Check as many as apply.) 

1. Supervisor at work

2. People you work with

3. Social worker (Welfare)

4. Employment agencies

5. Program people

6. The police or the courts

7. Neighbors

8. Lawyers

9. Credit collection outfits

10. Storekeepers

11. Somebody in your family

12. A hospital, or people who work in a hospital 

(like the doctors, the clerks)

13. Friends

14. Others (specify): ________________________________

45 Since you've been in this program have you gotten in any trouble with the police; been arrested, charged or booked? (Do not include status offenses, such as parking tickets or runaway.)

☐ No

☐ Just once

☐ A couple of times

☐ More than a couple of times

46. How important is it to you to keep out of trouble with the police and the law?

☐ Real important; I go out of my way to avoid trouble.

☐ I usually try to steer clear unless I'm pushed real hard.

☐ Not too important; if I get in trouble I don't care too much.

47. We appreciate the help that you've given us. We would like to keep up with how you're doing. We will want to talk with you again in the next few months. At that time we'll pay you $5.00 for your help. Please give us the names and addresses of two people who will know where to reach you during the next few months.

Name ___________________________ Name ___________________________

Address ___________________________ Address ___________________________

Phone ___________________________ Phone ___________________________

Relationship ___________________________ Relationship ___________________________

48. Additional Comments by Youth:

ATTACH ADDITIONAL SHEET, IF MORE SPACE NEEDED.

Additional information [To be obtained by interviewer from the program records]

1) Number of different work sites to which the enrollee has been assigned since joining the program ________

2) Number of days absent from the program ________
Below are 10 statements about things that work supervisors consider important when it comes to how the enrollee is doing. We would appreciate your telling us how each one applies to this enrollee. The information is strictly private and will not have any effect on the enrollee in any way.

Please read each statement carefully. Then put a check in one of the five boxes to show how that statement fits the enrollee that you’re rating.

1. KNOWS HOW TO FOLLOW INSTRUCTIONS PROPERLY
   This describes just how the enrollee is.
   □ This is true most of the time.
   □ Sometimes this is true of the enrollee.
   □ This is not usually so.
   □ The enrollee is not like this at all.

2. RESENTS TAKING ORDERS FROM THOSE WHO SUPERVISE HIM/HER.
   This describes just how the enrollee is.
   □ This is true most of the time.
   □ Sometimes this is true of the enrollee.
   □ This is not usually so.
   □ The enrollee is not like this at all.

3. KNOWS HOW TO DRESS RIGHT FOR THE JOB.
   This describes just how the enrollee is.
   □ This is true most of the time.
   □ Sometimes this is true of the enrollee.
   □ This is not usually so.
   □ The enrollee is not like this at all.

4. TAKES SOME PRIDE IN THE WORK AND DOESN’T JUST RUSH THROUGH TO GET IT FINISHED.
   This describes just how the enrollee is.
   □ This is true most of the time.
   □ Sometimes this is true of the enrollee.
   □ This is not usually so.
   □ The enrollee is not like this at all.

PLEASE CONTINUE ON REVERSE...
5. HAS TO BE TOLD WHAT TO DO EVERY MINUTE OR CAN'T KEEP BUSY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This describes just how the enrollee is.</th>
<th>This is true most of the time.</th>
<th>Sometimes this is true of the enrollee.</th>
<th>This is not usually so.</th>
<th>The enrollee is not like this at all.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. GETS ALONG WITH OTHERS ON THE JOB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This describes just how the enrollee is.</th>
<th>This is true most of the time.</th>
<th>Sometimes this is true of the enrollee.</th>
<th>This is not usually so.</th>
<th>The enrollee is not like this at all.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. CAN'T GET TO WORK ON TIME.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This describes just how the enrollee is.</th>
<th>This is true most of the time.</th>
<th>Sometimes this is true of the enrollee.</th>
<th>This is not usually so.</th>
<th>The enrollee is not like this at all.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. SHOWS SOME INITIATIVE IN TAKING ON A PIECE OF WORK.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This describes just how the enrollee is.</th>
<th>This is true most of the time.</th>
<th>Sometimes this is true of the enrollee.</th>
<th>This is not usually so.</th>
<th>The enrollee is not like this at all.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. DOESN'T MAKE TROUBLE ON THE JOB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This describes just how the enrollee is.</th>
<th>This is true most of the time.</th>
<th>Sometimes this is true of the enrollee.</th>
<th>This is not usually so.</th>
<th>The enrollee is not like this at all.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. ASKS QUESTIONS IF PROBLEMS COME UP—DOESN'T JUST GO AHEAD AND DO THE JOB WRONG.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This describes just how the enrollee is.</th>
<th>This is true most of the time.</th>
<th>Sometimes this is true of the enrollee.</th>
<th>This is not usually so.</th>
<th>The enrollee is not like this at all.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Control Group Status Survey

- This instrument is to be filled in by the interviewer, NOT the respondent.

- We're trying to find out how people have been doing since our last contact—like how things have been working out for you in general; what you are doing now and what things you would like to do from now on; how you feel about jobs; and so on. We would like to know your feelings about these things.

- The answers you give to any questions will all be confidential and private. Anything we find out from these interviews would be reported for a whole group at a time (like a few hundred) so that no one will know your answers. However, all the information requested is important and your response to each question will be appreciated.

- Let me go over the questions with you. It should take no more than about 25 minutes. Remember, if you don't understand a question, please stop me to make sure it's clear.
Control Group Status Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ETS I.D. NO.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. DATE OF INTERVIEW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. NAME OF RESPONDENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. HOME ADDRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. TELEPHONE NUMBER WHERE RESPONDANT CAN BE REACHED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. RESPONDENT'S SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. SEX</td>
<td>Male □ Female □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. DATE OF BIRTH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Have you been working on a general equivalency high school diploma (GED) over the last 6 months?</td>
<td>Yes □ No □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a. If yes, have you gotten the GED yet?</td>
<td>Yes □ No □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b. Did you get (or will you be getting) your high school diploma in June?</td>
<td>Yes □ No; Will get it later (end of summer or next school year).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Over the last 6 months, have you been enrolled in any government-sponsored employment and training program? (If yes, on this list, enter the number of weeks that you were in each program.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. CETA Job or Training</td>
<td>Weeks □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Summer Youth Program</td>
<td>Weeks □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Job Corps</td>
<td>Weeks □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Young Adult Conservation Corps</td>
<td>Weeks □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Neighborhood Youth Corps</td>
<td>Weeks □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other Government Sponsored Programs</td>
<td>Weeks □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. What types of things have you taken part in over the last 6 months?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Check ALL those which are applicable.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal counseling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Job counseling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Classroom training: vocational skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Classroom training: remedial education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Classroom training: GED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Working on a job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Referral to a full-time permanent job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Of the things you took part in over the last 6 months, which TWO do you think were most helpful to you? 
(Check only TWO.)

1 • Personal counseling
2 • Job counseling
3 • Classroom training: vocational skills
4 • Classroom training: remedial education
5 • Classroom training: GED
6 • Working on a job
7 • Referral to a full-time permanent job
8 • None

13. How do you feel about what you have been doing over the last 6 months? 
☐ Very satisfied ☐ Satisfied ☐ Very dissatisfied

14. Have you worked at any time during the last month? .................................................. ☐ Yes ☐ No

15. Are you presently working? 
☐ Yes (Go on to question 16) ☐ No (Skip to question 20)

16. Are you presently working 30 or more hours per week? 
☐ Yes ☐ No

17. Where do you work? 

NAME OF COMPANY ________________________________
NUMBER AND STREET OR ROUTE ____________________________
CITY AND STATE ________________________________
TELEPHONE NUMBER ____________________________

18. What is your job title? ________________________________

19. Which one of the following sources was most helpful in getting you your job? (Check only one.)

1 • School Counselor
2 • Friends or people in neighborhood
3 • Newspaper
4 • Government (public) employment agency
5 • Non-government (private) employment agency
6 • Family
7 • Help wanted sign
8 • Church or community leaders (e.g., teachers, ministers, and so on)
9 • Other (specify): ________________________________
0 • None of the above: I got it on my own.

20. What are you doing now? (Check all those which are applicable.)

1 • Working and not looking for a job
2 • Looking for a job
3 • In school
4 • In a CETA training program
5 • Nothing special (Probe: How do you spend your day? Briefly describe.)
I would like to know what you think about certain things relating to jobs.

21. Do you think you're able to get the kind of job you want?
   - [ ] I would have a very good chance.
   - [ ] I might have some chance.
   - [ ] I won't have much chance.

22. Do you think you're able to do the work on the job well enough to satisfy any boss?
   - [ ] I won't be able to, on most jobs.
   - [ ] I might be able to, on most jobs.
   - [ ] I definitely will be able to, on any job.

23. Do you think you're able to get by on a job without a lot of help from the boss, or the people you work with?
   - [ ] Yes, I'll get by on my own without help.
   - [ ] I may need a little help sometimes.
   - [ ] I'm going to need a lot of help from other people.

24. Do you think, if you have to learn something new on a job, you could learn enough to do the job right?
   - [ ] Yes, I could, anytime for any job.
   - [ ] Maybe I could learn, for some jobs.
   - [ ] I would have a tough time if I have to learn something new.

25. Do you think you've got what it takes to get promoted and move up to better jobs?
   - [ ] It would be rough for me to get promotions.
   - [ ] Maybe I could, on some jobs.
   - [ ] I could get promoted for sure, on any job.

26. How important is it that you get to do interesting work?
   - [ ] That's real important to me.
   - [ ] It may be important; I'm not too sure.
   - [ ] I don't really care about that.

27. How important is it that you can get paid what you're worth?
   - [ ] That's real important to me.
   - [ ] It may be important; I'm not too sure.
   - [ ] I don't really care about that.

28. How important is it that you wouldn't have to worry about being fired?
   - [ ] That's real important to me.
   - [ ] It may be important; I'm not too sure.
   - [ ] I don't really care about that.

29. How important is it that you feel like you're doing work that's worth doing?
   - [ ] That's real important to me.
   - [ ] It may be important; I'm not too sure.
   - [ ] I don't really care about that.

30. How important is it that you can get raises and make more money fast?
   - [ ] That's real important to me.
   - [ ] It may be important; I'm not too sure.
   - [ ] I don't really care about that.

31. How important is it that you have a chance for steady work?
   - [ ] That's real important to me.
   - [ ] It may be important; I'm not too sure.
   - [ ] I don't really care about that.
32. What kind of full-time job would (did) you look for right now?
Write in kind of job: ____________________________________________

33. What kind of full-time job would you like best right now?
Write in job choice: ____________________________________________

34. What is the lowest hourly pay you would take for the job you would like best right now?
$ __________ PER HR

35. How much do you know about what it takes to do the job you would like best right now?
☐ I know a lot about that kind of job
☐ I know a few things about what the job takes
☐ I don't really know much about it

36. How willing would you be to go into a training program for the job you would like best right now?
(Check only one.)
1 ☐ I wouldn't bother
2 ☐ I would do it only if I were paid
3 ☐ I would do it for no pay
4 ☐ I am already trained for that job.

37. Over the last 6 months, has there been a change in the way you get along with your family?
1 ☐ I have no family. [Skip to question 40]
2 ☐ I get along better with them than I used to
3 ☐ I get along worse with them than I used to
4 ☐ I get along with them the same way I always did

38. How does your family feel about how you've been doing over the last 6 months?
☐ They think I'm doing great.
☐ They think I'm doing poorly.
☐ They think I'm doing okay.

39. Out of what you earn a week, about how much do you give to your family? $ __________ PER W
☐ I don't earn any money

40. Over the last 6 months, have there been any changes in the way you use your money?
1) Savings __________________________ 2) Home and family (Rent, food, clothing) ___________
3) Leisure (recreation) __________ 4) Education __________
(Make a choice in each row.)

41. How often do you save money from your pay? (Check only one.)
1 ☐ I don't save anything
2 ☐ I save something
3 ☐ Sometimes I save
4 ☐ I never save, any of my pay

42. Which of these people or agencies have been giving you a hard time lately?
[Check as many as apply.]
1 ☐ Supervisor at work
2 ☐ People you work with
3 ☐ Social worker (Welfare)
4 ☐ Employment agencies
5 ☐ School Counselor
6 ☐ The police or the courts
7 ☐ Neighbors
8 ☐ Lawyers
9 ☐ Credit collection outfits
10 ☐ Storekeepers
11 ☐ Somebody in your family
12 ☐ A hospital, or people who work in a hospital
13 ☐ Friends
14 ☐ Others (specify)
43. Over the last 6 months, have you gotten into any trouble with the police; been arrested, charged or booked? (Do not include status offenses, such as parking tickets or runaways.)

1  [ ] No
2  [ ] Just once.  3  [ ] A couple of times  4  [ ] More than a couple of times

44. How important is it to you to keep out of trouble with the police and the law?

[ ] Real important; I go out of my way to avoid trouble.
[ ] I usually try to steer clear unless I'm pushed real hard.
[ ] Not too important; if I get into trouble I don't care too much.

45. We appreciate the help that you've given us. We would like to keep up with how you're doing. We will want to talk with you again in the next few months. At that time we'll pay you $5.00 for your help. Please give us the names and addresses of two people who will know where to reach you during the next few months.

Name ____________________________  Name ____________________________
Address __________________________  Address __________________________
Phone ____________________________  Phone ____________________________
Relationship ________________________  Relationship ________________________

46. Additional Comments by Youth:
Program Follow-up Survey

- We’re trying to find out how people who have been in your training program for a while have been doing since they left the program—like how things have been working out for you in general; what you think you’ve gotten out of being in the program; what you are doing now and what things you would like to do from now on; how you feel about jobs; and so on. We would like to know your feelings about these things. We plan to use what we find out to make programs like this better for trainees.

- The answers you give to any questions will all be confidential and private. Anything we find out from these interviews would be reported for a whole group at a time (like a few hundred) so that no one will know your answers. However, all the information requested is important and your response to each question will be appreciated.

- Let me go over the questions with you. It should take no more than about 25 minutes. Remember, if you don’t understand a question, please stop me to make sure it’s clear.
Follow-up Survey

1. ETS L.D. NO. ____________________________

2. DATE OF INTERVIEW: __________________
   MONTH __________  DAY __________  YEAR __________

3. NAME OF RESPONDENT: ______________________

4. HOME ADDRESS:
   NUMBER AND STREET ____________________________
   CITY AND STATE ____________________________

5. TELEPHONE NUMBER WHERE RESPONDENT CAN BE REACHED:
   AREA CODE __________  TELEPHONE NUMBER __________

6. RESPONDENT'S SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER: ____________

7. SEX: □ Male    □ Female

8. DATE OF BIRTH: __________________
   MONTH __________  DAY __________  YEAR __________

9. How many weeks has it been since you left the program (number of weeks)? ____________ WEEKS

10. Are you presently working full-time (30 or more hours per week)?
    □ Yes. (Go on to question 11.)
    □ No, but I have worked full-time since leaving the program.
       (Go on to question 11, but ask about most recent job.)
    □ No, I have never worked full-time since leaving the program.
       (Skip to question 36.)

11. Where do (did) you (most recently) work?
    NAME OF COMPANY: ____________________________
    NUMBER AND STREET OR ROUTE ____________________________
    CITY AND STATE: ____________________________
    TELEPHONE NUMBER: __________

12. What kind of business is (was) that? ____________________________

13. What is (was) your job title? ____________________________

14. How helpful was the program in preparing you for this job?
    □ It was no help at all.
    □ It helped a little, now and then.
    □ It was very helpful in a lot of ways.

15. How many hours a week do (did) you usually work? ____________ HOURS

16. How many weeks have you been (were you) on that job? ____________ WEEKS
17. How much per hour do (did) you earn at that job? ........................................... $ \text{DOLARS} \text{ CENTS} \text{ PER HR}

18. Is [Was] this a temporary CETA job? ................................................................. □ Yes □ No

19. Is [Was] this your first job since you left the program? ........................................ □ Yes □ No
   [If yes, skip to question 23.]

20. How many jobs (full-time and part-time) have you had since leaving the program? ........... JOBS

21. Why did you leave your last job?
   □ I quit. □ I was laid off. □ I was fired.
   21a. What was the main reason for that? (Probe.) ..................................................

22. What was your starting hourly salary on your first full-time job after leaving the program? $ \text{DOLARS} \text{ CENTS} \text{ PER HR}

23. How long were you out of the program before you got your first full-time job? .................. WEEKS

24. Which one of the following sources was most helpful in getting you your first full-time job?
   (Check only one.)
   1 □ Program staff
   2 □ Friends or people in neighborhood
   3 □ Newspaper
   4 □ Government (public) employment agency
   5 □ Non-government (private) employment agency
   6 □ Family
   7 □ Help wanted sign
   8 □ Church or community leaders (e.g., teachers, ministers, and so on)
   9 □ Other (specify): ..........................................................
   0 □ None of the above: I got it on my own.

25. In how many places did you actually fill out an application before you got your first full-time job? ...... PLACES

26. In how many places did you actually get to have an interview before you got your first job? ......... PLACES

27. Did the program staff refer you to any of those places where you either filled out an application or were interviewed? □ Yes □ No

28. Since leaving the program how well have your jobs gone?
   □ Much better than I thought I would do
   □ Worse than I expected to do
   □ About what I expected I would do

29. Have you gotten a raise on your present (or last) full-time job? ..................................... □ Yes □ No
   29a. If yes: Number of raises ...........................................................

30. Did you get a promotion on that full-time job? ..................................................... □ Yes □ No
I would like to find out how you feel about your most recent full-time job.
(Refer to job indicated in answer to question 11).

31. What are your feelings about the kind of work you do (did)?
   - It's great; I like it a lot.
   - It's okay.
   - Don't like the work at all.

32. How's your pay for the kind of work you do (did)?
   - Good pay for the kind of job I have (had).
   - Just about what it should be for the job.
   - A lot less than the job is (was) worth.

33. If you have your way, would you want to work for this place five years from now?
   - Definitely not.
   - I'm not sure.
   - Yes, I'm sure I would.

34. If you knew then what you know now about this job—would you have taken the job?
   - No—not if I knew what I know now.
   - I'm not too sure.
   - Yes, I would take the job there again.

35. When you finish a day's work, do (did) you feel like you did something worthwhile?
   - I almost never feel (felt) that way.
   - Sometimes I feel (felt) that way.
   - I almost always feel (felt) that way.

36. Since you left the program, have you received any unemployment compensation payments?
   - Yes
   - No

36a. If yes, how much per week have you received? $_________

37. Since you left the program have you done any part-time work for less than 30 hours per week?
   - Yes
   - No

37a. If yes, what kind of work did you do on your last job?
   (Describe type of job.)

37b. How much per hour did you earn at that job? $_________
Here are some questions about educational or training activities you might presently be involved with.

38. Are you now going to school or involved in any other training activity? □ Yes □ No
   (If no, skip to question 41.)

39. Is your education or training program full- or part-time?
   □ Full-time □ Part-time

40. Which describes your education or training program? (Check all those that apply.)
   1 □ Other CETA training program
   2 □ Regular high school
   3 □ Business/vocational, technical, trade high school
   4 □ High school equivalency program (GED)
   5 □ College
   6 □ Business/vocational technical postsecondary (not high school)
   7 □ Union apprenticeship program
   8 □ Other (specify): ____________________________

I would like to ask you a few questions about your plans for the future.

[Interviewer note: For those respondents who are employed, continue with question 41. For those respondents who are unemployed, skip to question 44.]

FOR THOSE PRESENTLY EMPLOYED:

41. What's the highest pay you expect to get on the job you have now? $ ______

42. What plans do you have for the next six months? (Check all those appropriate.)
   1 □ Keep working at job/no particular plans
   2 □ Look for a better job
   3 □ Go into another training program
   4 □ Go to school full-time
   5 □ Join the armed forces
   6 □ Other (specify): ____________________________
   (Skip to question 45.)

43. What kind of a full-time job would you look for if you were to leave this one?
   Write in job choice: ____________________________

PLEASE CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE...
FOR THOSE PRESENTLY UNEMPLOYED:

44. What plans do you have for the next six months? (Check all those appropriate.)
   1. [ ] Look for a job
   2. [ ] Go into another training program
   3. [ ] Go to school full-time
   4. [ ] Join the armed forces
   5. [ ] Other __________________________
   6. [ ] Nothing special (Probe: How do you spend your day?)

45. What kind of a full-time job would you look for if you were now looking for a job?
   Write in job choice: __________________________

46. What is the least hourly pay you would take for that job? __________________________ $ __________ PER HO

47. How much do you know about what it takes to do that job?
   [ ] I know a lot about that kind of job.
   [ ] I know a few things about what the job takes.
   [ ] I don’t really know much about it.

48. What do you think is the highest hourly pay you could earn for the job? __________________________ $ __________ PER HO

49. Since being in the program, has there been a change in the way you get along with your family?
   [ ] I have no family. (Skip to question 52.)
   [ ] I get along better with them than I used to.
   [ ] I get along worse with them than I used to.
   [ ] I get along with them the same way I always did.

50. How does your family feel about how you did in the program?
   [ ] They think I’m doing great.
   [ ] They think I’m getting along okay.
   [ ] They think I’m doing poorly.

51. Out of what you earn a week, about how much do you give to your family? __________________________ $ __________ PER WK

52. How often do you save money from your pay? (Check only one)
   [ ] I don’t earn any money.
   [ ] I save something each week.
   [ ] Sometimes I save, sometimes I don’t.
   [ ] I never save any of my pay.

53. Do you buy things on credit?
   [ ] No, I don’t use credit.
   [ ] I buy some things on credit.
   [ ] I buy most everything on credit.

54. Since you left the program have you gone to a public Employment Service Office (e.g., State or government employment service?) __________________________ [ ] Yes  [ ] No

54a. If yes, how many times [number of visits] __________________________
55. Which of these people or agencies have been giving you a hard time lately?

[Check as many as apply.]

1. Supervisor at work
2. People you work with
3. Social worker (Welfare)
4. Employment agencies
5. Program people (like the counselor)
6. The police or the courts
7. Neighbors
8. Lawyers
9. Credit collection outfits
10. Storekeepers
11. Somebody in your family
12. A hospital, or people who work in a hospital (like the doctors; the clerks)
13. Friends
14. Others (specify): __________________________________________________________

56. Since you've been in this program have you gotten in any trouble with the police; been arrested, charged or booked? (Do not include status offenses, such as parking tickets or runaway.)

☐ No
☐ Just once
☐ A couple of times
☐ More than a couple of times

57. How important is it to you to keep out of trouble with the police and the law?

☐ Real important; I go out of my way to avoid trouble.
☐ I usually try to steer clear unless I'm pushed real hard.
☐ Not too important; if I get in trouble I don't care too much.

58. We appreciate the help that you've given us. We would like to keep up with how you're doing. We will want to talk with you again in the next few months. At that time we'll pay you $10.00 for your help. Please give us the names and addresses of two people who will know where to reach you during the next few months.

Name________________________________________________________
Address______________________________________________________
Phone________________________________________________________
Relationship____________________________________________________

Name________________________________________________________
Address______________________________________________________
Phone________________________________________________________
Relationship____________________________________________________
Interviewer Note: Ask this question only of respondents who answered question 11.

59. We hope to make future programs better by talking to employers who have hired youth from the program you were in. We want to ask your present (or former) employer how you are (were) doing on your full-time job. Can we ask these questions? (Show questions for Employer's Rating Form and STRESS CONFIDENTIALITY).

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, obtain job supervisor's name: ________________________________

60. Additional Comments by Youth:
Control Group Follow-up Survey

- This instrument is to be filled in by the interviewer, NOT the respondent.

- We're trying to find out how people have been doing since our last contact—like how things have been working out for you in general; what you are doing now and what things you would like to do from now on; how you feel about jobs; and so on. We would like to know your feelings about these things.

- The answers you give to any questions will all be confidential and private. Anything we find out from these interviews would be reported for a whole group at a time (like a few hundred) so that no one will know your answers. However, all the information requested is important and your response to each question will be appreciated.

- Let me go over the questions with you. It should take no more than about 25 minutes. Remember, if you don't understand a question, please stop me to make sure it's clear.
Follow-up Survey

1. ETS I.D. NO. ___________________________  2. DATE OF INTERVIEW ___________________________
   MONTH _______ DAY _______ YEAR _______

3. NAME OF RESPONDENT __________________________

4. HOME ADDRESS _____________________________
   NUMBER AND STREET ___________________________
   CITY AND STATE _____________________________
   ZIP CODE __________________

5. TELEPHONE NUMBER WHERE RESPONDENT CAN BE REACHED _____________________________
   AREA CODE __________________ TELEPHONE NUMBER ___________________

6. RESPONDENT'S SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER _____________________________

7. SEX       ☐ Male ☐ Female  8. DATE OF BIRTH ___________________________
   MONTH _______ DAY _______ YEAR _______

9. Are you presently working full-time (30 or more hours per week)?
   ☐ Yes, (Go on to question 10.)
   ☐ No, but I have worked full-time within the last three months. (Go on to question 10., but ask about most recent job.)
   ☐ No, and I have not worked full-time within the last three months. (Skip to question 33)

10. Where do (did) you (most recently) work?
    NAME OF COMPANY ___________________________
    NUMBER AND STREET OR ROUTE ___________________________
    CITY AND STATE _____________________________
    TELEPHONE NUMBER ___________________________

11. What kind of business is (was) that? _____________________________

12. What is (was) your job title? _____________________________

13. How many hours a week do (did) you usually work? _____________________________
   HOURS __________________

14. How many weeks have you been (were you) on that job? _____________________________
   WEEKS __________________
15. How much per hour do (did) you earn at that job? ........................................... $
   [ ] 0.00 to $4.99
   [ ] 5.00 to $9.99
   [ ] 10.00 to $14.99
   [ ] 15.00 to $19.99
   [ ] 20.00 to $24.99
   [ ] 25.00 to $29.99
   [ ] 30.00 to $34.99
   [ ] 35.00 to $39.99
   [ ] 40.00 to $44.99
   [ ] 45.00 to $49.99
   [ ] 50.00 to $59.99
   [ ] 60.00 to $69.99
   [ ] 70.00 to $79.99
   [ ] 80.00 to $89.99
   [ ] 90.00 to $99.99
   [ ] $100.00 or more

16. Is (Was) this a temporary CETA job? ................................................................. [ ] Yes  [ ] No

17. Is (Was) that the only job you've had in the last three months? .............................. [ ] Yes  [ ] No

(if yes skip to question 21)

18. How many jobs (full-time and part-time) have you had in the last three months? .......

19. Why did you leave your last job?
   [ ] I quit  [ ] I was laid off  [ ] I was fired

19a. What was the main reason for that? (Probe.)

20. What was your starting hourly salary on your first full-time job in the last three months? $

21. When did you get that full-time job? ................................................................. MONTH  DAY  YEAR

22. Which one of the following sources was most helpful in getting you that full-time job? (Check only one.)

   1  [ ] School Counselor
   2  [ ] Friends or people in neighborhood
   3  [ ] Newspaper
   4  [ ] Government (public) employment agency
   5  [ ] Non-government (private) employment agency
   6  [ ] Family
   7  [ ] Help wanted sign
   8  [ ] Church or community leaders (e.g., teachers, ministers, and so on)
   9  [ ] Other (specify): ________________________________
   10 [ ] None of the above: I got it on my own.

23. In how many places did you actually fill out an application before you got that full-time job? ............ PLACES

24. In how many places did you actually get to have an interview before you got that full-time job? ........ PLACES

25. Have you gotten a raise on your present (or last) full-time job? ..................................... [ ] Yes  [ ] No

25a. If yes: Number of raises .................................................................

26. Did you get a promotion on that full-time job? ........................................................ [ ] Yes  [ ] No

27. How well have you done on the job during the last three months?
   [ ] Much better than I thought I would do  [ ] Worse than I expected to do  [ ] About what I expected I would do
I would like to find out how you feel about your most recent full-time job.

28. What are your feelings about the kind of work you do (did)?
   - It's great; I like it a lot.
   - It's okay.
   - Don't like the work at all.

29. How's your pay for the kind of work you do (did)?
   - Good pay for the kind of job I have (had).
   - Just about what it should be for the job.
   - A lot less than the job is (was) worth.

30. If you have your way, would you want to work for this place five years from now?
   - Definitely not.
   - I'm not sure.
   - Yes, I'm sure I would.

31. If you knew then what you know now about this job---would you have taken the job?
   - No—not if I knew what I know now.
   - I'm not too sure.
   - Yes, I would take the job there again.

32. When you finish a day's work, do (did) you feel like you did something worthwhile?
   - I almost never feel (felt) that way.
   - Sometimes I feel (felt) that way.
   - I almost always feel (felt) that way.

33. Have you received any unemployment compensation payments during the last three months? □ Yes □ No
33a. If yes, how much per week have you received? $_______ per wk.

34. Have you done any part-time work for less than 30 hours per week during the last three months? □ Yes □ No
34a. If yes, what kind of work did you do on your last job? (Describe type of job.) ____________________________
34b. How much per hour did you earn at that job? $_______ per hr.
Here are some questions about educational or training activities you might presently be involved with.

35. Are you now going to school or involved in any other training activity? □ Yes □ No  
[If no, skip to question 38.]

36. Is your education or training program full- or part-time?  
□ Full-time □ Part-time

37. Which describes your education or training program? (Check all those that apply.)  
1. □ A CETA training program  
2. □ Regular high school  
3. □ Business/vocational, technical/trade high school  
4. □ High school equivalency program (GED)  
5. □ College  
6. □ Business/vocational technical postsecondary (not high school)  
7. □ Union apprenticeship program  
8. □ Other (specify): ________________________________

I would like to ask you about your plans for the future.

[Interviewer note: For those respondents who are employed, continue with question 38.  
For those respondents who are unemployed, skip to question 41.]

FOR THOSE PRESENTLY EMPLOYED:

38. What's the highest pay you expect to get on the job you have now? $ ____________ PER HR

39. What plans do you have for the next six months? (Check all those appropriate.)  
1. □ Keep working at job/no particular plans  
2. □ Look for a better job  
3. □ Go into a training program  
4. □ Go to school full-time  
5. □ Join the armed forces  
6. □ Other (specify): ________________________________

40. What kind of a full-time job would you look for if you were to leave this one?  
Write in job choice: ________________________________  
(Skip to question 43.)

PLEASE CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE . . .
FOR THOSE PRESENTLY UNEMPLOYED:

41. What plans do you have for the next six months? (Check all those appropriate.)
   1. [ ] Look for a job
   2. [ ] Go into another training program
   3. [ ] Go to school full-time
   4. [ ] Join the armed forces
   5. [ ] Other ________________________________________________________________
   6. [ ] Nothing special (Probe: How do you spend your day?) ______________________

42. What kind of a full-time job would you look for if you were now looking for a job?
   Write in job choice: ____________________________________________________________

43. What is the least hourly pay you would take for that job? ________________________ $_________ PER HR.

44. How much do you know about what it takes to do that job?
   [ ] I know a lot about that kind of job.
   [ ] I know a few things about the job.
   [ ] I don’t really know much about it.

45. What do you think is the highest hourly pay you could earn for the job? ____________ $_________ PER HR.

46. Within the last three months, has there been a change in the way you get along with your family?
   1. [ ] I have no family. (Skip to question 49.)
   2. [ ] I get along better with them than I used to.
   3. [ ] I get along worse with them than I used to.
   4. [ ] I get along with them the same way I always did.

47. How does your family feel about how you've been doing over the last three months?
   [ ] They think I’m great.
   [ ] They think I’m getting by okay.
   [ ] They think I’m doing poorly.

48. Out of what you earn a week, about how much do you give to your family? _________ $_________ PER WK.

49. How often do you save money from your pay? (Check only one.)
   1. [ ] I don’t earn any money.
   2. [ ] I save something each week.
   3. [ ] Sometimes I save, sometimes I don’t.
   4. [ ] I never save any of my pay.

50. Do you buy things on credit?
   [ ] No, I don’t use credit.
   [ ] I buy some things on credit.
   [ ] I buy most everything on credit.

51. During the last three months, have you gone to a public Employment Service Office (e.g., State or government employment service?) ____________________________ [ ] Yes [ ] No

51a. If yes, how many times (number of visits)? ________________________________
52. Which of these people or agencies have been giving you a hard time lately?

[Check as many as apply.)

1 □ Supervisor at work
2 □ People you work with
3 □ Social worker (Welfare)
4 □ Employment agencies
5 □ School Counselor
6 □ The police or the courts
7 □ Neighbors
8 □ Lawyers
9 □ Credit collection outfits
10 □ Storekeepers
11 □ Somebody in your family
12 □ A hospital, or people who work in a hospital (like the doctors, the clerks)
13 □ Friends
14 □ Others (specify): ____________________________

53. Within the last three months, have you gotten in any trouble with the police; been arrested, charged or booked? (Do not include status offenses, such as parking tickets or runaway.)

1 □ No
2 □ Just once
3 □ A couple of times
4 □ More than a couple of times

54. How important is it to you to keep out of trouble with the police and the law?

□ Real important; I go out of my way to avoid trouble.
□ I usually try to steer clear unless I'm pushed real hard.
□ Not too important; if I get in trouble I don't care too much

55. We appreciate the help that you've given us. We would like to keep up with how you're doing. We will want to talk with you again in the next few months. At that time we'll pay you $10.00 for your help. Please give us the names and addresses of two people who will know where to reach you during the next few months.

Name ____________________________
Address ____________________________
Phone ____________________________
Relationship ____________________________

Name ____________________________
Address ____________________________
Phone ____________________________
Relationship ____________________________
Interviewer Note: Ask this question only of respondents who answered question 10.

56. We want to ask your present (or former) employer how you are (were) doing on your full-time job. Can we ask these questions? (Show questions for Employer’s Rating Form and STRESS CONFIDENTIALITY).

☐ Yes  ☐ No

If yes, obtain job supervisor’s name: __________________________________________

57. Additional Comments by Youth:
Sequence of Instrument Administration for Out-of-School (Except Summer-Only Programs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>During First Week of Program</th>
<th>At Exit From (or end of) Program</th>
<th>Three Months After Exit From Program</th>
<th>Eight Months After Exit From Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Those who remain in program for less than 10 program days</td>
<td>Participant’s Characteristics (IPP)</td>
<td>Program Status-(IPP)</td>
<td>Program Follow-Up Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those who remain in program for 10 or more program days, but less than 3 calendar months</td>
<td>Participant’s Characteristics (IPP)</td>
<td>Program Status-(IPP)</td>
<td>Program Follow-Up Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretests</td>
<td>Posttests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those who remain in program for 3 or more calendar months</td>
<td>Participant’s Characteristics (IPP)</td>
<td>Program Status-(IPP)</td>
<td>Program Follow-Up Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretests</td>
<td>Posttests</td>
<td>Program Completion Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>Participant’s Characteristics (IPP)</td>
<td>Posttests</td>
<td>Control Group Follow-Up Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretests</td>
<td>Control Group Status Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. If you can determine when a participant will leave the program, test in last 2 weeks prior to leaving. If the youth leaves before testing has taken place, locate youth for testing and, if necessary, pay youth $5.00 to complete testing (this includes both the Posttests and the Program Completion Survey, if required).

2. Date set in consultation with

3. Pay $5.00 to each youth who completes the 3 month Follow-Up Survey.

4. Pay $10.00 to each youth who completes the 8 month follow-Up Survey.

5. If necessary, you may pay control group youth for participating in testing. $5.00 for Pretests, and $5.00 for Posttests and Control Group Status Survey.

APPENDIX C

A REVIEW OF THE INFLUENCES OF CONTROL VARIABLES ON
EMPLOYMENT AND RELATED OUTCOMES

The influences of control variables on employment
and related outcomes that were of interest in this research
can be highlighted as follows:

(1) **Age.**—Youths generally fare better in the labor
market as they become older (Mangum and Walsh, 1978; Barton
and Fraser, 1980; Stevenson, 1980; Taggart, 1980). Older
participants tend to gain more from participation in
manpower training programs (Nedwick and Staff, 1980), while
younger participants are more likely to be program dropouts
(Mallar and Staff, 1980).

(2) **Education.**—Youths with a high school diploma generally
do better than those who are high school dropouts on
virtually every measure of labor market performance
(Friedlander, 1972; Saunders, 1974; Mangum and Walsh, 1978;
Barton and Fraser, 1980; Youthwork, 1980; Vice President’s

(3) **Race.**—Nonwhites generally do worse than whites in the
labor market (Mallar and Staff, 1980; Taggart, 1980; Saks and
Smith 1981; Rist, 1982) and race combined with low
educational attainment is associated with the most severe
labor market maladjustment (Youthwork, 1980; Mangum and
(4) **Gender.**—Males have an advantage over females in terms of employment and pay (Youthwork, 1980) and these differentials are not much affected by the overall state of the economy (Saks and Smith, 1981; Taggart, 1980). The most disadvantaged group in the labor market is young, black women (Taggart, 1980; Barton and Fraser, 1980).

(5) **Previous Employment.**—Youths who had better preprogram work histories generally do better than other youths in the labor market during subsequent time periods (Mallar and Staff, 1987; Stevenson, 1980; Vice President's Task Force, 1980; Taggart, 1980; Adams, 1978).

(6) **Reading Ability.**—Youths with higher reading ability tend to be the biggest "gainers" on measures of employment skills (job knowledge, job seeking skills, job holding skills) when pencil and paper tests are used to measure program effectiveness (Freeberg and Rock, 1980; Nedwick and Staff, 1980).

(7) **Background of Delinquent Behavior.**—High rates of social pathology including drug use and delinquent behavior are associated with youth unemployment (Taggart, 1980; Mangum and Walsh, 1978).

(8) **Socioeconomic Status.**—Youth from families in the lowest socioeconomic categories are less likely to successfully use formal job search processes (Saunders, 1974) and are less likely to be successful in making the
school to work transition (Vice President’s Task Force, 1980; Barton and Fraser, 1980; Taggart, 1980).

(9) **Number of Hours in Program.**—Manpower training program enrollees who complete the program have a postprogram earnings advantage over both nonenrollees and noncompleters (Somers and Warlick, 1975; Westat, 1981; Mallar and Staff, 1980; Nedwick and Staff, 1980).

(10) **Site.**—Variations among site locations were found among multisite programs and were attributed to turnover in staff and program leadership (Treadway, 1979). Delivery systems within the same programs vary, and overall program effectiveness may not be evident across all sites for the same program (Treadway, 1979; Freeberg and Rock, 1980; Youthwork, 1980; Fuller, 1981).

Statistical controls for a number of variables were recommended in the ETS/OYP analysis plan. These included gender, race/ethnicity, economic status, and pretest score where appropriate (ETS, 1980). In the previous analysis of this data set by the Center for Studies in Social Policy, education status and offender status were shown to contribute significantly to the predictability of the regression models (CSSP, 1981). Among the suggestions included by the authors of that study was to further explore the impact of two other control variables: prior CETA involvement of subjects and differences between sites.
These control variables (gender, race/ethnicity, economic status, pretest score, education status, offender status, prior CETA involvement and site location) were included in the model for the present research.
APPENDIX D

INTERACTION EFFECTS TABLES

Regression 1: \( Y = \) Posttest measure of Job Knowledge

(1) Interaction of P/C and STEP reading test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quartile</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Y= 14.59</td>
<td>14.74</td>
<td>14.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>Y= 14.81</td>
<td>14.43</td>
<td>14.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Interaction of P/C and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Y= 14.04</td>
<td>14.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>Y= 15.18</td>
<td>14.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) Interaction of P/C and Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Nonminority</th>
<th>Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Y= 15.14</td>
<td>13.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>Y= 14.3</td>
<td>15.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) Interaction of P/C and Economic Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Status</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Y= 13.7</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>Y= 15.78</td>
<td>14.94</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(5) Interaction of P/C and Previous Employment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X=</th>
<th>Worked</th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
<th>Never Worked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants Y=</td>
<td>13.83</td>
<td>14.79</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls Y=</td>
<td>17.66</td>
<td>18.08</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regression 4: Y = Amount of trouble with police over program summer.

(1) Interaction of P/C and STEP reading test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centile</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X=</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants Y=</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls Y=</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regression 5: Y = Full-time employment status at three months following the program.

(1) Interaction of P/C and Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X=</th>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>Nonminority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants Y=</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls Y=</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regression 7: Y = School status at three months following the program.

(1) Interaction of P/C and Economic Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X=</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants Y=</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls Y=</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regression B: \( Y = \) School status at eight months following the program.

(1) Interaction of P/C and Previous CETA Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Previous CETA</th>
<th>Previous CETA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants Y=</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls    Y=</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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