DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 139 915 CE 010 814

AUTHOR	Richardson, Ann
TITLE	Vouchered Skill Training in WIN: Program Guidelines and Selected Empirical Findings.
INSTITUTION	Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Employment and Training Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	BSSR-0085-6
PUB DATE	Feb 77
CONTRACT	DL-51-11-73-02
NOTE	125p.; Not available in hard copy due to small print of original
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Agencies; Agency Role; *Education Vouchers; Employers; *Federal Programs; *Job Training; On the Job Training; *Program Administration; Program Descriptions; *Program Effectiveness; Vocational Education; Vocational Schools; Welfare Agencies; Welfare Recipients
IDENTIFIERS	United States; *Work Incentive Program

ABSTRACT

The voucher training program for Work Incentive Program (WIN) clients described within this interim report is a system for providing occupational training to clients through entitlements rather than direct service (client and trainer are in a direct relationship facilitated by the agency). The basic program objective, discussed in the introduction, is to maximize the extent to which clients make occupational decisions, selecting the type of training which they feel is most suitable (in a vocational school or on the job) and negotiating for training without intercession by WIN but within the context of existing statutes and program guidelines. Part I describes the procedures in administering the voucher program and the role of the WIN staff and includes (1) the program design, (2) the voucher process, (3) special counseling and information system, and (4) staff qualification and training. Part II deals with administrative considerations bearing on the feasibility of the vouchering system and contains selected empirical findings from program field tests conducted between 1974 and 1976 in Portland, Oregon and Baltimore, Maryland. Comparisons are made between vouchered (institutional and OJT) and regular clients with respect to demographic characteristics, training occupations, school and/or employer characteristics, length and cost of training, and training completion rates. Complete findings and a summary of findings are included along with sample copies of a voucher and other program materials. (EM)

VOUCHERED SKILL TRAINING IN WIN: PROGRAM GUIDELINES AND SELECTED EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

February, 1977

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET	1. Report No. BSSR 0085-6	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.
4. Title and Subtitle VOUCHERED SKILL TRAINING IN WIN: PROGRAM GUIDELINES AND SELECTED EMPIRICAL FINDINGS			5. Report Date February 28, 1977 6.
7. Author(s) Ann Richardson			8. Performing Organization Rept. No. BSSR 0085-6
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc. 1990 M Street, N. W. Washington, D. C. 20036			10. Project/Task/Work Unit No. BSSR 538 11. Contract/Grant No. 51-11-73-02
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address Employment and Training Administration U.S. Department of Labor Washington, D. C.			13. Type of Report & Period Covered Interim 14.

15. Supplementary Notes
Supplements NTIS 51-11-73-02, 51-11-73-024

16. Abstracts This document consists of two parts. Part I contains operating procedures for administration of a voucher program for skill training for WIN clients, and the counseling and labor market information requirements of the system. Part II contains selected empirical findings from actual field tests of voucher training systems in Portland, Oregon, and Baltimore, Maryland, between 1974 and 1976.

Comparisons are made between vouchered and regular clients with respect to demographic characteristics, training occupations, length and cost of training, drop-out rates, and for OJT clients, employer characteristics, and training wages. Vouchers were most attractive to better-educated WIN clients; institutional vouchers more often appealed to younger participants and volunteer women, OJT vouchers to men and older participants. Generally, the data suggest that vouchered clients selected from a wider range of occupations than nonvouchered OJT clients, and that drop-out rates were slightly lower for the group of vouchered trainees.

17. Key Words and Document Analysis. 17a. Descriptors

Education
Technical Schools

17b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms

Welfare
Work Incentive Program (WIN)
Vocational Training
Vocational Schools
Vouchers
Vouchering

17c. COSATI Field Group

18. Availability Statement	19. Security Class (This Report)	21. No. of Pages
Release Unlimited	UNCLASSIFIED	125
	20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED	22. Price

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The WIN program uses a variety of ways to achieve its ultimate goal of permanent and productive employment for former welfare recipients. Among the most important methods of preparing WIN clients for the labor force is skill training, either in institutional vocational training programs or through on-the-job training (OJT). There is evidence from previous research, however, that there is room for improvement in the WIN training function, to allow clients more frequently to acquire skills which will move them out of a secondary labor force which is characterized by short-term job tenure and frequent periods of extended unemployment.

Several factors might be combined to improve training opportunities for WIN clients, to make them competitive in the more stable segments of the labor force. Among these factors are greater client commitment to training ("motivation," involvement, etc.); and a heightend sense among training suppliers of the needs of the community and of students. The voucher program for skill training is designed to utilize both of these resources.

The argument has been made that a characteristic of many welfare recipients is that they lack confidence in their ability to succeed, and that low self-esteem and expectations of failure can frustrate attempts to overcome one's disadvantaged position. One means of countering clients' unfavorable self-images might be to increase their sense of control over their own lives. A training program in which the client has real and major decision-making power would be likely to engage his involvement and commitment, which in turn would result in a greater likelihood of successful completion of training. Such an outcome would combine two advantages: the experience of success; and more adequate preparation for entry into the labor market.

The argument that increasing competition among suppliers of training would result in greater sensitivity to students' nee s rests on the assumption that, if a student can withhold training funds from unresponsive trainers, they will change in desirable directions rather than risk losing business. A program in which the client himself chooses

from a variety of trainers the one which best serves his needs might, therefore, have the effect of increasing the overall quality of training available to WIN clients.

There is still another aspect to the question of broadening the range of available training opportunities. Current practices in which training arrangements exist for a limited range of occupations by a limited number of schools or employers may have the effect of moving clients into training for which they have neither abilities nor interest, merely because the particular training slots for which WIN has contracted are available. Under a voucher system in which training arrangements are made by the clients themselves and funds are committed on an individual basis, this problem might be lessened.

In the abstract, vouchering is a system of delivering services in which those who are to be the ultimate consumers are provided not with direct service, but instead with an entitlement, to be spent where and how the consumers themselves choose.[1]

In the WIN voucher training program, the participant is provided with a letter of introduction (the "voucher") to prospective trainers establishing the client's bona fides, and explaining the program and the terms under which the skill training is to be provided.

Structurally, vouchering amounts to changing the relationships among agency, program participant, and the provider of services. More traditional service delivery systems have the agency in an intermediary position between suppliers and participants. Vouchering reorganizes this arrangement, putting the client and the supplier in a direct, nonmediated relationship, and recasting the agency's responsibility into facilitation of that relationship.

From the clients' point of view, the essence of the WIN voucher training program is to maximize the extent to which they take over the process of making occupational decisions, selecting the type of training which they feel is most suitable, and negotiating for training without intercession by WIN. This basic objective has set the terms of the design

[1]Vouchering is not an entirely new idea. Among other examples, the GI Bill is a voucher system; some types of college scholarships are another case; and so is the food stamp program.

of the program. It is also the case, however, that the vouchering will be carried out in the context of an existing set of statutes and WIN program guidelines. The procedures for administering the voucher program and the WIN staff role in the program which are described in Part I of this document represent an attempt to balance these two considerations.

The procedures also reflect experience gathered during a limited number of actual field tests of the system, funded by the Department of Labor and conducted by the Bureau of Social Science Research, in Portland, Oregon, and Baltimore, Maryland, between 1974 and 1976. While these tests have not been definitive of the feasibility of vouchered training in WIN, they have provided valuable operating experience which has resulted in several modifications of some of the administrative details of the system.[2] A description of the tests and a summary presentation of empirical findings are presented in Part II of this document.

There are variety of benefits which might reasonably be expected to result from vouchering skill training in WIN. Among them are these:

putting decision-making, negotiating and purchasing power into the hands of the consumers of training may increase the likelihood that individual client needs will be met adequately;

allowing a client to choose a trainer in terms of his or her own needs, without limiting the options to those made available by WIN, may broaden his or her occupational and training opportunities;

the client's meaningful participation in decisions about his or her own life may increase skills in dealing with a variety of institutions, and enhance his or her self-esteem, sense of efficacy, and commitment to the accomplishment of his or her goals;

the client's power to give or withhold payment from a supplier of skill training may have the result that trainers will become more responsive to client needs and wishes in order to attract voucher training money; and

shifting to clients some of the responsibility for arranging for training might reduce the workloads of WIN staff, so that they would be able to divert their energies to other productive activities within the program.

---

[2]This experience is reported at several points in the following pages.

PART I: DESIGN AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES FOR A VOUCHER SYSTEM FOR SKILL TRAINING IN THE WORK INCENTIVE PROGRAM

A. THE DESIGN OF THE VOUCHER PROGRAM

All WIN registrants who are AFDC recipients are eligible to participate in the voucher program if they wish to do so. Voucher clients are entitled to all the services normally provided to clients of the WIN program. Each client will be informed of his or her eligibility at the earliest practicable time after the program is established. For new WIN clients, this will ordinarily be at intake or during appraisal. For others, this will be upon recall from the pool of unassigned recipients, or upon completion of another WIN component to which they have already been assigned.

Length of Training

In general, voucher clients are entitled to the optimum length of training needed to prepare them for full participation in their training occupations. In the Portland and Baltimore field tests, participants were allowed up to one year for institutional training, and as many as eight weeks in excess of the maximum permissable time for OJT as defined by the DOT code for the occupation in question.[3] Ordinarily, the length of institutional training will be governed by the institution's normal course length and course sequence. The length of OJT will be determined the same way it regularly is in the local WIN jurisdiction.

Types of Training Allowed

Voucher program participants may elect training either in a vocational school or on the job.

---

[3] Contrary to some expectations, the length of training did not in fact reach these maxima. The average length of institutional training in Portland was eight months; that in Baltimore was considerably shorter. The average OJT in Portland was for seven months, or nine weeks longer than the average for "regular" WIN OJT there. At the same time, however, the overall one-year limit had the effect of eliminating from eligibility a number of occupations which were otherwise reasonable training possibilities. Practical limits on the research effort precluded a test of the effects of longer permissible training periods.

It is consistent with the goal of maximizing the client's freedom of choice not to impose any restrictions on training mode, and that was the procedure followed in the field tests. There are some specific considerations which local offices may wish to attend in this connection, however.

Part-time study.--Voucher clients might elect to undertake training on a part-time schedule, so long as the training can be completed within the time allowed, and the school or OJT employer agrees to the arrangement. There was rather substantial demand for part-time institutional training in the field tests, especially in Baltimore. It is likely that this kind of arrangement would be particularly attractive to volunteer clients.

Remedial education.--Remedial education may be a necessary first step in acquiring occupational skills for many clients. In view of the overall objective of WIN training as skill training, it was thought in the field tests that it would be inconsistent to provide vouchers to be used exclusively for remedial classroom instruction. However, in cases in which a training institution's course sequence included a remedial educational component, the voucher could be used for that education, as well as for specific occupational training. Further, if a school or an OJT employer required the GED as a condition of eligibility for training, the client was allowed up to 13 weeks(*)[4] to complete work for the GED.

Work Experience.--In some circumstances, it may be useful for a client to participate in a Work Experience component before reaching a final decision on his training occupation or before undertaking training. Clients in the field tests who wished to do so were entitled to up to 13 weeks' Work Experience(*).

Correspondence courses.--Making the vouchers available for correspondence courses follows from the objective of broadening the client's training options as much as possible. Vouchers could be used for correspondence courses in the Portland field test. While there was fairly little demand for at-home training there, it seems a potentially

[4] Voucher procedures which are explicitly in conformity with existing Federal WIN regulations are designated with (*).

valuable additional training resource, especially for volunteers, for clients in rural or semi-rural programs, or for those in jurisdictions with relatively restricted training opportunities. It would require special arrangements for payment of fees and periodic assessment of client performance, but they are not necessarily complex arrangements. In cases in which a course involves a brief period (fewer than four weeks, for instance) of study outside the state, the local office may wish to consider also using the voucher for the costs of transportation to and from the training site and for maintenance during the on-site training.

Combined institutional training and OJT.--Institutional training and OJT may be combined in several ways, so long as the training is completed within the overall time limit:

- the participant might undertake OJT and institutional training simultaneously, so long as s/he is able to arrange it with the vendors involved;
- if the participant and employer agree that the OJT should be supplemented by job-related institutional training, the participant might attend training classes during the work day or in free time, so long as no more than 25 percent of the classroom training takes place before the OJT starts (*);
- the two kinds of training might be undertaken in sequence.

Occupations for Which Training Is Allowed

In the field tests, vouchers could be used for training in any occupation which the client chose, so long as it could be completed in one year, and there was a reasonable expectation that s/he would be employable at the completion of training. With respect to OJT, then-current restrictions on occupations[5] were in force. In addition, OJT vouchers could not be used for jobs for which the starting hourly wage rate was less than the Federal minimum wage or, where higher, the rate prevailing for that occupation in the local area.

[5]Vouchers could not be used for OJT in any of the following occupations:

- occupations dependent on a commission as the primary source of income;
- sewing machine operators in the garment and apparel industry (SIC 2300);
- bartenders;
- intermittent seasonal occupations;
- professional occupations requiring licenses; or
- occupations which do not require specific training as a prerequisite to employment, or for which fewer than four weeks' training is required.

An important issue here is whether provisions for essentially unrestricted occupational choices are likely to generate an unusually high proportion of "unrealistic" or "unsuitable" training plans. Experience with the field tests suggests that this is not likely to be a problem, and may indeed result in a better fit of occupation and client. The availability to voucher clients of systematic self-assessment counseling (see Section C below) is an additional structural safeguard against this possibility.

Eligibility of Vendors

In the field tests, there were no restrictions on the types of vendors (public/private, profit/nonprofit) to which the voucher could be taken.

There are two reasonable, though quite opposed, positions which might be taken on the eligibility of particular individual training vendors. One position is that any vendor willing to accept a voucher should be eligible to do so. This follows from the goals of maximizing freedom of client choice and minimizing agency involvement in training arrangements. The primary objection to this approach is that it offers no means of control over the quality of training being received by clients, and could put the government into the business of supporting some fradulent trainers.

At the other extreme is the position that the voucher program should compile its own list of "acceptable" training vendors who are able to satisfy some set of criteria on quality of training. However, a strong objection to this possibility is a practical one: to establish a special accreditation system would require a good deal of time; this is likely to be an especially serious problem when it comes to compiling an exhaustive list of employers to be accredited, and most particularly in large cities.

On balance, the first seems the better alternative, and even offers some additional desirable possibilities. For one thing, increasing competition among training vendors, by not limiting an "approved" list to the best schools or to employers who have made OJT positions available to WIN in the past, may encourage efforts by all (and perhaps especially vocational schools) to offer more satisfactory programs. For another, it will allow the utilization for OJT of employers who for one reason or another have not previously participated in WIN OJT.

In general, then, vouchers may be committed to any vocational school or employer in the metropolitan area licensed to do business in the jurisdiction. However, with particular respect to OJT, a voucher may not be committed to any employer who is listed in the Department of Labor's "Joint Consolidated List of Debarred, Ineligible, and Suspended Contractors;" nor to an employer who is currently struck or who has locked out his employees (*).

Payments, Allowances, Social Services, and Reimbursements

WIN allowances for training-related expenses and (in the case of institutional training) incentive payments are the same for voucher clients as they are for any regular WIN client in institutional training or OJT (*). Similarly, voucher trainees are eligible for all social services which are available to regular trainees (*).

Trainers will be reimbursed for the costs of vouchered training at the same rate as they are for regular WIN training. Vocational schools will be reimbursed for 100 percent of the cost of tuition, books, and supplies (*). OJT employers will be reimbursed for the cost of training (*);[6] in addition, an OJT employer will be reimbursed for 100 percent of the paid time which a client spends away from work in agreed-upon job-related training classes, together with any tuition costs th employer may incur (*).

Trainers and WIN staff will follow normal WIN procedures for invoicing, verification of attendance, and routine regular follow-up once training has begun.

[6]Until recently, up to one-half the product of the hourly rate of pay the hours worked per week, and the total weeks of training.

B. THE VOUCHER PROCESS

The following section is a description of the process and sequence by which clients enter the voucher system, develop training plans, and arrange for the training.

Preliminary Orientation

All clients are given an initial general description of the voucher program, as a new option available to them in WIN. This description forms part of a more general orientation to the regular WIN program. It may be useful also to provide each registrant with a brief written description of the voucher program for later reference. One possibility is shown in Appendix 1.

Those who are interested in exploring further the possibilities of participating in the voucher program are given a more detailed description of the program, their rights and responsibilities as participants, and the special counseling and information services which will be available to them.

Following the more detailed orientation, and once the registrant becomes an AFDC recipient, each client decides whether s/he wishes to proceed as a voucher program participant or instead to enter another WIN component (or to leave WIN, in the case of volunteer clients). A voucher program slot will be set aside for each person who elects to undertake vouchered training.

The Decision-Making and Training Search Period

Each voucher client is allowed a reasonable period in which to accomplish several tasks: complete (or revise) a WIN Employability Plan, decide on a training occupation, choose the type of training (OJT or institutional training, or a combination of types), seek a training position, and secure an agreement to train.

In the field tests, program participants were allowed up to six weeks for these activities. In a few cases, the period was extended when the training search was unavoidably delayed by circumstances beyond

the client's control, such as illness; when a client was within a few days of completing a training arrangement; and when there were delays on the part of WIN staff in completing formal contracting procedures. In order to avoid penalizing clients for agency delays in contracting operations, the limit on the decision-making and search period might best apply just to the completion of all stages through the securing of the Preliminary Agreement to train.

While six weeks was ample time for clients to make these arrangements for institutional training it was, by WIN staff and client accounts, too short for OJT, especially in the low-demand labor market in which each vouchered OJT test was made. Local offices may prefer to specify a longer search time for OJT.

Decision-making.--Because for many clients the voucher program will involve unfamiliar activities, and in order to aid them in reaching decisions on training, several special services were made available which clients were strongly encouraged (but not required) to use. In keeping with the goal of maximizing the client's independence of the agency in reaching his decisions, the structuring of this system is highly client-centered and client-determined. This entails corresponding changes in the work of the WIN staff member, who assumes the role of facilitator of clients' exploration of themselves and their training and work prospects, not that of guide or decision-maker.

The special counseling and information system has four major components. Each of these components is described in more detail in Section C below. To summarize them:

- self-assessment counseling, in which the client alone or together with a WIN staff member explores his or her interests, aversions, aspirations, and preparation, as each bears on his or her potential role in the labor force;
- a locally-sensitive labor market information system designed to be utilized by the client, which includes information on job structure and content, local employment outlooks, modal entry routes, and other such job-related matters;
- a list of local training resources, including all vocational schools and all employers licensed to do business in the jurisdiction;
- an effective exposure to techniques of successful training search, including information on seeking specific resources; the presentation of one's self, job history, and qualifications; and ways in which to secure an agreement to provide training.

The client may use this system to the extent s/he wishes and for as long as s/he feels is necessary (including not at all), so long as all arrangements for training are completed within the time allotted.

Training search.--When the client feels that s/he is ready to proceed with the active search for a training arrangement, the voucher itself is issued, together with copies of the appropriate Preliminary Agreement form to be completed by the potential trainer (see Appendix II for examples).

It is the responsibility of the client, using whatever methods s/he chooses, to locate a vocational school or OJT employer (or both) able and willing to provide training in the client's choice of occupation, and to negotiate the terms of the training.

Voucher clients will be encouraged to make as wide an exploration of training possibilities as they feel is necessary. In order to aid in the regular and diligent search for a training situation, and so that it does not become an undue financial burden, each client will receive a payment to help offset lunch and transportation expenses associated with the search.[7] In addition, SAU child care during the search period has been reported in the field tests to be of valuable additional help during the search.

Job search payments and child care begin when the active training search begins, and end when a training situation has been arranged, when the client leaves the voucher program for some reason, or when the s/he exhausts the decision-making and search period.

Reserved vouchers.--Voucher slots may be reserved for clients who have secured Preliminary Agreements, under certain circumstances:

- the requirement by any vendor that the trainee have the GED in order to enroll in the training course in question, so long as the required GED work can be completed within 13 weeks (reserved for up to 13 weeks, and not counted against the overall total entitlement for training);

[7] In Portland, voucher clients were allowed up to $2.50 per day for these expenses. Providing bus tickets (or tokens) or gas vouchers might be a reasonable, though only partial, alternative.

- the client wishes to be in Work Experience prior to making a final decision on the training occupation or before beginning training (reserved for up to 13 weeks, and not counted against the general entitlement for training);
- the start of training will be delayed for other reasons, such as the beginning of a semester;
- the start of training will be delayed due to other circumstances beyond the client's control, such as illness or the need for medical or dental care.

Uncommitted vouchers.--If the client has been unable to secure a Preliminary Agreement to train within the allotted time (with permissable extensions), or whenever s/he becomes discouraged and wishes to leave the voucher project, s/he will be reassigned to regular WIN status and will be allowed to develop and pursue a new Employability Plan just as is any new WIN registrant, without penalty for participation in the voucher project.

Training Agreements and Contracts

Preliminary agreements.--An employer or training institution who wishes to provide training for a voucher client will complete and sign the appropriate Preliminary Agreement indicating the intention to enter into a contract with WIN. Depending on the kind of training, the items to be negotiated between the trainer and the client (and to be included in the Preliminary Agreement) will differ slightly.

In the case of institutional training, the Preliminary Agreement should specify the training occupation, the proposed starting date, the total weeks of training, the total classroom hours of training, and the estimated cost of books and supplies. (See Appendix II.)

In the case of OJT, the Preliminary Agreement should specify the training occupation, the proposed starting date, the total weeks of training, the starting rate of pay, the employers' agreement to hire the client prior to training, and the intention to retain him or her as a regular employee following successful completion of the training (so long as the employee continues to perform satisfactorily on the job). (See Appendix II.)

Should a client wish to arrange for some combination of institutional training and OJT, s/he will secure a Preliminary Agreement from each of the trainers involved in the proposal.

When the Preliminary Agreement has been completed, the client will return a signed copy of it to WIN for review, in preparation for conclusion of a final contract between WIN and the trainer.

Review process and criteria.--Each Preliminary Agreement will be reviewed by the Voucher Unit staff (see Section D below) for conformity to voucher program guidelines and state WIN regulations. In the field tests, only those Preliminary Agreements which appeared to WIN staff to exceed voucher program guidelines were referred for review by the local office manager. Training plans which would cost in excess of $2,500 for institutional training or $3,800 for OJT were referred for review to the State and Regional offices of WIN, as well. These cost figures were not absolute ceilings--many training plans which were reviewed had sufficient merit to justify their higher cost. The review did, however, allow for a greater degree of administrative control over the costs of vouchered training.

The question of the circumstances under which an individual training plan should be subject to review in terms of its general "suitability" for the particular client in question is a complex one. It is consistent with the logic of the voucher system, however, that clients not only be allowed to make their own decisions and choices, but truly be able to act upon them. This principle is violated when administrators reserve final judgement on the suitability of individual proposals. When this kind of final judgement is the province of the WIN administrator, the "voucher" program becomes in actuality only a leg-work program from the client's perspective. Nonetheless, WIN has responsibilities for the expenditure of public monies which must also be taken into account. Clearly, each administrator will arrive at his or her own criteria for final judgement on training plans. It would defeat the purposes of the voucher program, however, if these criteria were to be based on unwarranted assumptions about individual clients or groups of clients.

Final training contract.--If the proposed training is in conformity with voucher program guidelines, the appropriate member of the WIN staff (see Section D) will prepare a formal training contract and secure the trainer's signature on it. The WIN representative will discuss with the trainer any issues not covered in the Preliminary Agreement, if

necessary (e.g., the clearance of an OJT plan with appropriate collective bargaining agents). So long as the matters which were the subject of negotiations between the trainer and the client are in conformity with voucher program guidelines, they are not subject to renegotiation between the WIN representative and the trainer.

Second-Chance Provision

A voucher client may find after starting training that s/he made an error in the choice of occupation, training type or mode, or training vendor, or is unable to complete training because of illness or a breakdown in child care arrangements.

Under these circumstances, each voucher client in the field tests was entitled to a chance to undertake a new training program, so long as the revised training plan could be concluded within six weeks from the time of the change, and the training could be completed within the time remaining in the overall one-year entitlement for training. The second-chance option was exercised by fewer than ten percent of the voucher clients in the field tests.[8]

Each participant who is contemplating a change in a vouchered training plan, or who is considering whether to continue as a voucher client, will have the opportunity to receive counseling by the WIN staff if s/he judges that it would be helpful in reaching a decision; while such counseling will be encouraged by the WIN staff, it is not required.

If a voucher client drops out of training, or is laid off by the trainer, s/he will be subject to normal WIN adjudication procedures.

Summary of Client Progress

What follows is a summary outline of the process through which the typical voucher client goes.

[8]Most of them occurred among clients wishing to change employers, a few among institutional training students who were disappointed in the school they chose.

1. Client is called up, appraised, and told briefly of the availability of the vouchered training option.

2. Initially interested clients are given a more detailed description of their rights and responsibilities in the voucher program.

3. Client indicates whether s/he desires to participate in the voucher program or to enter some other WIN component.

4. Development (or revision) of Employability Plan, self-assessment counseling, training and labor market analyses, and search for training program continue for a designated period. If the client has been unable to locate a training arrangement by that time (a Preliminary Agreement signed), and arrangments are not in the immediate offing, s/he is reassigned to the regular WIN caseload, and the voucher slot is made available for another client.

5. Client and trainer negotiate a Preliminary Agreement for training.

6. When the client returns the signed Preliminary Agreement, WIN reviews it for conformity to program procedures and executes a training contract.

7. Client begins training and is eligible to receive all regular incentive payments and training-related expenses.

C. THE SPECIAL COUNSELING AND INFORMATION SYSTEM

If, as described earlier, the central structural change involved in vouchering is the transfer of decision-making and arrangements for training from staff to client, it follows that the voucher client should have as much information as possible with which to make the decisions which are his or hers to make. "Information" encompasses a wide range of material, and includes information on one's self, on occupational content and labor market characteristics, on the full range of local training opportunities, and on techniques of securing a training situation. While many voucher clients will already have many of these kinds of information, others will not. Some will require new skills, and should be provided with some means of access to them. Thus, the voucher program provides a special counseling and information system. The system is described in four parts: self-assessment counseling, occupational and labor force characteristics, accessible training opportunities, and training negotiation techniques. (Of course, these are artificially sha distinctions, since each affects the other in a variety of ways.)

Self-Assessment Counseling

Self-assessment is based on the observation that every client possesses job-relevant skills and aptitudes which s/he has accrued in work, in the home, as a volunteer, or through hobbies. The task of self-assessment is to examine the specific functions that a client performs in his or her day-to-day life, and to relate those skills and aptitudes to the skills and aptitudes of which specific occupations are composed.

One self-assessment model that has been used successfully in a manpower training program similar to the WIN voucher program is that of Andersen.[9] The central steps in the model are these: (1) gathering "data" on the client; (2) working the data for career patterns and occupational options; (3) arriving at some tentative directions and reality checks against objective information; and (4) formulating a plan of action.

---

[9] John Niels Andersen, Special Counseling Project (Seattle Community College, 1975), a report on the counseling component of the Seattle Income Maintenance Experiment.

In the data-gathering phase of the self-assessment process, the client is involved in developing materials of several sorts; things at which s/he has been successful (paid, unpaid, study, play); things s/he has done for which s/he has been commended; jobs that s/he has held, along with a description of duties, job functions, responsibilities and problems solved; the different kinds of equipment (very broadly defined, and ranging from tractor through needle and thread to logic) that s/he can use; the kinds of things s/he would like to do; and, finally, the kinds of things s/he would like not to do (including, for example, the work s/he has done in the past).

(The following examples used to illustrate the self-assessment process are taken from the self-assessment of "Jane Jones," a 26-year-old woman who finished high school seven years ago and has been out of the labor force since. The first three steps of the self-assessment which involved the counselor were completed in three sessions, over a total of approximately four hours.)

The primary data were developed by Jones herself. Jones reported that she had been successful in the past at paid work in this way: "For any paid job that I have held I have always felt that I worked efficiently and to the best of my abilities to get the work done." She later elaborated this by saying that, in comparison with others doing the same work, she was usually faster, more accurate, and had a firm sense of the ways in which her work fit into larger work objectives. Jones was also successful at math courses in high school, and, in her leisure time, had successfully "taken a woodworking course and made a nice chopping block; played softball and felt I was an adequate pitcher and player; made a small stain-glass window; matted and framed a print; developed and printed my own pictures." A more thorough self-assessment would also have probed what things she had done successfully in the home management and child raising phases of her life.

Jones has been commended by others for her accuracy and speed at work, and for "a sweater I knitted; pictures I've taken; a needle-point I've done." She has held jobs as a general clerk in a trade association ("set up new filing system; made sure billing was done by the first of each month; checked on underpayments on insurance"), a waitress ("waited on tables adequately, but found the work very hectic and very few returns either monetarily or personally"), a key puncher ("I was slower than others at first, but usually got as much work done, because I'd stick with it"), and a maid in a motel ("did general clean-up work, which was better than being a waitress because I didn't have to deal with people directly"). In each job, Jones was laid off for lack of work, usually after five or six months' employment.

As for equipment, Jones can operate a keypunch machine, a cash register, a table saw, a jigsaw, an electric sander, a soldering iron, a camera, and an adding machine.

The kinds of things Jones would like to do include "learn about computers, travel, live on the West Coast, work more on my own." She is especially interested in entering somewhat higher-level, more stable work than she has had in the past. And, finally, she listed several things she does not like to do "keypunching; sales work; service jobs, such as waitressing and having to cater to others; waiting on lines or waiting for someone else; being late."

These data are the basis for a search for <u>themes</u> or <u>patterns</u> which recur in the client's everyday life. Various combinations of these patterns or themes are likely to suggest career directions to explore, and occupations or work activities which utilize the skills, strengths, interests, and other characteristics that the client possesses.

Several themes emerged from analysis of Jones' responses in the interview following her work alone on the original data-gathering. Among them were these: a desire for autonomy; a low tolerance for risk-taking; a dislike of direct contact with recipients of services, such as motel guests, program clients, etc.; a preference for fairly highly-structured task settings (clearly stated goals, rules by which to reach goals, etc.); a high tolerance for frustration; comfort with a supervisory role that also allows for a good deal of "hands on" involvement in the tasks at hand; preference for self-control of the pace of work; an interest in organization and coordination of work; initiative. When asked to describe the qualities of the ideal job, Jones mentioned having time to think about the work to be done; having some middle-management responsibilities; organizing work and tasks; being in a middle-sized organization rather than a very large or a very small one; doing work which is "involving," but does not require a great deal of overtime involvement; a variety of work, which gives a sense of development, progress, change, which has some discernable effect, and which is not repetitious.

Following these steps, the client then continues by exploring occupational options in detail, using whatever resources s/he has at his or her command. These may include his or her own work history, the occupational information available from the voucher program's Labor Market Information System (see below), from the WIN staff, from current or former workers in the occupations in question, from employers who use workers in those occupations, and so forth. The purpose of this exploration is to eliminate some occupational options

and confirm the attractiveness of others. The discovery that an occupation is strongly seasonal, that it requires working at night or on split shift, that it requires standing for hours at a time, or that it requires being away from home for long periods, for example, may lead some clients to decide against pursuing training for that occupation--although for others these occupational characteristics may not be important, or indeed offer attractive conditions of work. "Reality checking" of this sort is especially important in reducing the incidence of disappointments which result in dropping out of training. It may also increase the client's commitment to completion of training by assuring him of eventual rewards which do not necessarily come at the entry level of the occupation in question, but which may sustain his interest (and commitment) through his period of preparation for the job.

Jones continued with this part of the self-assessment on her own, and with the help primarily of the Occupational Outlook Handbook. She returned with four of what looked to her as likely eventual occupational possibilities: computer programmer, bank officer (general manager), city manager, and urban planner. In discussions with the counselor, she developed lists of attractive and undesireable aspects of each occupation.

Computer Programmer

for:	skill is transferable between different types of organizations; jobs available all over the US; job requires analysis, patience, persistence, problem-solving, accuracy; minimum customer contact; continual learning experience; growing field; salary; advancement opportunities; work independently; choice of organization size.
against:	minimum of travel; generally a service occupation, doing others' work; graduate degrees required for some jobs; work may be narrow in scope.

Bank Officer

for:	management; may enter a trainee program; there is a variety of work; independence; good employment outlook; salary; advancement possibilities; job requires decision-making.
against:	good business background required; lack of travel; requires customer contact.

City Manager

for:	management; job requires problem-solving, coordination of operations of various city agencies; versatility; team work; salary.
against:	business degree required; job is very political; a male-dominated occupation; stress situations may be frequent; long hours; must attend citizens' meetings.

Urban Planner
for: job requires problem-solving; work has variety; use independent judgement; good employment prospects; salary; wide scope of work.
against: male-dominated occupation; graduate background required; must attend civic meetings; civil service position; long hours; very political work.

Finally, once the client has narrowed the range of occupational options down to one--or a few--s/he is ready to begin the search for a training arrangement.

Following this analysis, Jones began to investigate the possibilities for training which might lead to computer programming, and was particularly in search of a training program which would allow credit for her keypunch experience , so that she might complete training in a year or less which would qualify her for employment as a Junior Programmer, a Programmer Aide, or a Programmer Trainee. She also planned to investigate the possibilities of an OJT position.

Although self-assessment can, in principle, be done by the client alone, most people find it helpful to do it with someone else. A WIN staff person (designated here as a "Voucher Specialist") can facilitate the self-assessment process by providing the means by which the client can accomplish as thorough an exploration of self and of the world of work as s/he feels s/he needs and wants.

The role of the Voucher Specialist in the self-assessment process is an important one, and may require some reorganization of the traditional staff role. The Voucher Specialist provides focus and a structure in which the participant is able to act autonomously. In order to conform to the basic principles of the program, the Voucher Specialist necessarily most focus primarily on the process involved (as opposed to content) as the participant moves through self-assessment. The Voucher Specialist actively facilitates the self-assessment process by providing appropriate support, encouragement, and challenge, without at the same time usurping the client's right to self-determination and final decision-making. Thus, the interaction between the Voucher Specialist and participant is nondirective and very definitely client-centered.

It is important to note here that the examples of self-assessment presented above are meant only to indicate the outlines of one method by which clients move toward occupational choices with which they are comfortable. The details of the process itself are less important than its outcomes: a client-determined plan of preparation for the

labor force, based on a broad range of detailed information on him- or herself and on the world of work.

Labor Market Information

The self-assessment process will not be of much use in itself unless it is coupled with an exploration of the world of work. Voucher program clients must have access to information on occupations, on education and training requirements, modal entry routes (OJT, institutional training, promotion, family relationships, etc.), types of skills and experience needed, salaries, advancement potential, hiring trends and projections, work environments, and job mobility.

Information of this sort which is both locally sensitive and fully client-useable is not routinely available in local WIN projects. Probably the most useful resource which is readily available is the Occupational Outlook Handbook, which contains detailed and useful occupational descriptions which may be read by clients (though the focus is national and often cannot take into account local variations in conditions of work). Some areas have access to specially-developed local labor market information systems, such as the University of Oregon's "Career Information System"[10] which, if available, would be a very useful supplement to the Occupational Outlook Handbook.

Local Training Opportunities

Existing lists of vocational schools, together with their training offerings, which are published by State or local boards of education are a readily available resource. Statewide listings would, of course, best be abstracted to limit the list to vocational schools in the metropolitan area(s) in which vouchers can be commited. The abstracted list can be supplemented by information in the Yellow Pages and other local sources. Voucher clients find two kinds of listings helpful: one listing training occupations within each school, and one listing all schools which offer training in specified occupations. (Examples of each type of list for the Portland metropolitan area are to be found in Appendix III.)

[10] For information on CIS: Office of the Director, Career Information System, 247 Hendricks Hall, University of Oregon, Eugene 97403.

Lists of local employers are considerably more difficult to locate, and almost never include the single piece of information which the client would find most useful: an indication (perhaps by DOT Code) of what employers utilize what occupations. Lacking a special listing of that sort, there are several alternatives which can partially fill the client's need for information on local employment opportunities. It may be possible to arrange with the Employment Service or the Unemployment Insurance agency for a listing from their files of certain information on local firms (at a minimum, name of firm, address, phone, SIC code of firm) which can be made available for client use. In addition, in many cities listings such as Dun and Bradstreet, Contacts Influential, Directories of Directors, local Chamber of Commerce directories, State Department of Commerce or Economic Development directories, and similar publications, may provide useful (though probably only partial) information. Finally, the want ads and local Yellow Pages often provide useful supplementary information of this sort.

The particular case of the Job Bank.--For purposes of the voucher program, the Job Bank offers some utility as a locator of local OJT opportunities. However, it usually covers a highly restricted range of local employers and current job openings. Further, the Job Bank system is not altogether client-useable, since listings are blind with respect to employer, and following up on an opening requires the intercession of WIN staff. The staff discretion and screening activities which are associated with the referral process are not in this respect consistent with the basic features of the voucher system. In any event, the Job Bank would not be an adequate substitute for a comprehensive listing of local employers.

Training Search Coaching

For some clients, and particularly those who seek OJT, the means by which best to secure a training position without intercession by WIN may pose problems. Experience with field tests of the voucher program suggests that these problems lie primarily in the area of employers' reluctance to hire persons without direct "sponsorship"

(individual recommendations of clients selected for specified job openings) by WIN. For this reason, the voucher program information system includes a segment in which clients can learn about effective methods of securing training.

Training search coaching involves a wide variety of activities, including the preparation of resumés and applications, practice in application interviews, practice in explaining the voucher program to prospective trainers and in negotiating the terms of training, and discussion of ways to operate successfully in training (including such matters as punctuality, study habits, reliability in reporting to work or class, ways to work well with others, the willingness to receive orders or criticism from others, personal appearance, etc.).

In addition to information on these matters, it is important that clients have access to at least a minimum of consumer education. This will be particularly useful for those who seek institutional training and wish to have some basis for evaluation of local training opportunities. A pamphlet published by the Federal Trade Commission, "Our Vocational Training Can Guarantee You the Job of a Lifetime,"[11] has been used in the field tests of the voucher program, and may be a useful supplement to existing consumer education resources.[12]

The Voucher Specialist has an important function in the training search coaching for those clients who elect to utilize the service, and will assume an active--though not directive--role in the process. Successful performance in this role as resource person for clients will require that the Voucher Specialist develop and refine his own skills and his information on the elements involved in locating, securing, and maintaining a training position.

---

[11] FTC Consumer Bulletin No. 13 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, Stock Number 1800-00153).

[12] Data from the Portland vouchered institutional training program show, however, that clients who read the pamphlet and recalled its contents accurately in interviews were somewhat more likely than others to choose private over public vocational schools. While this is inherently neither good nor bad, of course, it is an unexpected finding, since the purpose of the pamphlet is to caution against unscrupulous practices of some private schools.

WIN projects which have implemented an Intensive Manpower Services component (IMS) may find that certain of its features can profitably be integrated with the voucher program for purposes of the training search coaching, and particularly so for those clients who seek OJT. The purposes of IMS and the voucner program are similar in many respects, and the process of acquiring and maintaining unsubsidized work and OJT positions are largely the same, so far as requirements for job-seeking skills are concerned.

Depending on the specifics of the design of individual IMS components, some elements of IMS may be inconsistent with the voucher program. In particular, job development and referrals to openings defeat the client-determined nature of the voucher system. On the other hand, the IMS component can lend itself to a voucher format by providing a comprehensive job search coaching opportunity, in which the expertise of WIN staff in techniques of successful job search and development can be utilized.

D. STAFFING THE VOUCHER OPERATION

Two major types of alternatives for staffing the voucher program have been examined in the field tests: general WIN staff involvement vs. a specialized Voucher Unit; and experienced WIN staff vs. newly-recruited personnel. The experience with each of these variations is described below.

Structure.--The decentralized model for administration of the voucher program, in which clients are part of every case load, offers certain advantages. One of them is that it maximizes the involvement of the WIN staff, which may increase the degree to which the local project is able to obtain a broad range of experience with the voucher system. However, this also offers the disadvantage that differences among staff in interpretation of the procedures and underlying principles of the program may in reality create nearly as many "voucher programs" as there are staff members involved. This makes any assessment of the effects of the voucher program itself highly complex at best, and undetectable at worst. The decentralized model may, in addition, mean that staff persons are required to treat different (voucher vs. non-voucher) clients in different ways, which has been found to pose difficult problems of consistency for staff members. Further, this administrative structure can present a threat to Job Developers' relationships with employers who rely on the agency's willingness to refer only selected applicants for OJT.

The establishment of a specialized Voucher Unit will offset the problems of inconsistency of staff work content and of program administration, by centralizing all vouchering activities in one administrative unit. It requires explicit attention to coordination with regular WIN operations (arrangements for referral of interested clients to the Voucher Unit, transfer of case files, etc.), but that coordination is not complex. (For an example of a coordinative structure, see Appendix IV.)

On balance, the centralized Voucher Unit structure appears to offer the greater advantages, in ease of supervision, in consistency of client treatment, and in the ability of the Voucher Specialists to

devote the necessary time and effort to development and refinement of the skills as resource persons which are required by the special counseling and information system described above.

It is estimated that a Voucher Unit requires the following staff to manage a caseload of approximately 25-35 new voucher clients per month:

two professional ES staff (or three, if training contracts are to be written by the Voucher Specialists rather than by regular WIN staff);

one SAU worker (and perhaps an aide, depending on the mix within the voucher program clientele of men and women and of mandatory and volunteer clients);

one clerk (and probably a second, if training contracts are to be prepared within the Voucher Unit).

Recruitment.--Staffing the voucher operation with persons who are new to WIN seems on the face of it to offer certain advantages. New recruits may, for example, have less to "unlearn" about traditional ways of delivering training opportunities to clients, and may find it more comfortable to work with the client self-determination which is at the heart of the voucher system. On the other hand, however, experienced WIN staff often can offer considerable expertise on the local labor market and on WIN program procedures, strengths which should not be lost to the voucher operation.

On balance, the use of experienced staff seems to be the better option. This will particularly be the case where regular staff are experienced with a WIN program which allows clients considerable autonomy under regular conditions, or where resources are especially strong for any necessary staff training in client-centered counseling.

Qualifications of Voucher Specialists

Mindful that recruitment to the voucher operation will be constrained by State civil service provisions, it is relevant nonetheless to describe certain desirable qualifications for those who will be assigned to the Voucher Specialist position. A baccalaureate degree in one of the social sciences would be desirable. Further, the Specialist should have (the equivalent of) at least one year's experience which demonstrates an ability to function effectively in a helping relationship. A Voucher Specialist's immediate and long-term career goals are relevant to the position in a broad sense, as an indication that s/he has given

some thought to those goals and as a measure of interest and commitment. Another desirable characteristic is the candidate's evidence of autonomy and self-direction in his or her own life; s/he should be able to demonstrate the kinds of thought patterns and concrete behavior s/he wants clients to assume.

Special Training for the Voucher Specialist Position

For at least some Voucher Specialists, their responsibilities in the voucher program will entail (perhaps marked) changes in practice, and it may be necessary to provide specialized training. In general, the skills taught and information conveyed in the staff training are predetermined by the goals and rationale of the voucher program itself. In order effectively to facilitate the client's activity in the program, the Voucher Specialist should possess the following skills, and be able to transfer these skills to clients:

- self-assessment counseling techniques;
- career development theory, to provide a conceptual framework within which to understand and view the issues confronting the client in making occupational and training decisions;
- analysis of occupations and of the local labor force;
- decision-making theory, to aid the Specialist in the responsibility to facilitate the client's work in reaching responsible and effective choices;
- reaching and negotiating with training institutions and employers;
- sustaining employment and furthering vocational development.

The following outline of a training program assumes that the Voucher Specialist has had fairly little relevant experience or prior training in the skills required for this position. (With more experienced staff, the content would vary not so much in the topics covered as in the emphasis and approach that would be required.)

A. Counseling Fundamentals
   1. Basic counseling skills
   2. Self-assessment counseling procedures
   3. Analysis of skills, interests, abilities, work attitudes, values, needs, and life style.

B. Analysis of Occupations and Labor Force
   1. Sources of occupational information
   2. Occupational and local job market research
   3. Identification of local training opportunities.
C. Decision-Making
D. Implementation of Choice
   1. Contacting employers and vocational schools
   2. Resume writing
   3. Interviewing
   4. Negotiating a training agreement
   5. Sustaining employment

The mode and duration of this special training will be determined by the extent of previous experience of the Voucher Specialists and their formal training. It is probable that the training would require the equivalent of six full days of training, in most cases. A plan for six consecutive days of training is not recommended. Some preferable possibilities would include two full days of training per week for three weeks, or twelve half days of training over the same period of time. These kinds of more flexible arrangements allow the Voucher Specialists time and opportunity to assimilate the new material and relate it to their work.

For an effective program, the office manager and non-Voucher Unit staff need to be involved in training in order to understand the Voucher Specialists' role and responsibilities and how their own work relates to that of the voucher operation. Their involvement will enhance the support which will be essential to the overall program.

Arrangements for special training.--There are several reasons that the needs of the voucher program would best be served by arranging that staff training be conducted by outside professional consultants rather than WIN staff personnel.

All of the content of the training program described in the previous section is important, and none of it can be eliminated without detracting from the comprehensiveness of the training. An untrained person assuming the position of trainer may eliminate or alter sections of the content on grounds that they are unimportant

or irrelevant. S/he may also eliminate sections due to unfamiliarity with the material or to feelings of uncertainty in presentation.

A professional consultant will recognize that the approach in presenting the content is another important factor. Voucher Specialists need different training depending on their qualifications, experience, education, and attitudes. A professional consultant can be sensitive to these variations and flexible in presentation in order to adopt the appropriate approach without negating or neglecting content.

A professional consultant is likely to be relatively more qualified to train by virtue of experience, education, professional development, and familiarity with the content as outlined in the previous section. S/he is aware of the development processes that are relevant to becoming a Voucher Specialist and is concerned with enhancing the cognitive, affective, and skill development of the Voucher Unit staff.

Departments of counseling and career counseling centers on college and university campuses are useful sources for professional consultants who would be suitable trainers of Voucher Specialists. In addition to these, organizations such as community action agencies[12] may provide additional suitable resources.

Several qualifications are important for professional consultants to train Voucher Specialists. At least three or four years' work experience in the capacity as instructor and counselor is to be preferred. The experience as an instructor will have enabled the trainer better to identify the level of the students' cognitive development and an understanding of the process necessary to further their development. The experience as a counselor will have enabled the trainer the opportunity to develop skills in facilitating human growth and his or her own expertise in the helping relationship.

---

[12] Expert consultant help was recruited from the Special Counseling Project of the Seattle Income Maintenance Experiment for the Portland field tests, for example, and from the Career Development Center of the University of Maryland for the Baltimore test.

It is preferable that the consultant be currently involved in career development activities, whether they be in an educational, business, industrial, governmental, or a community setting. It would be most desirable that the consultant have experience with a variety of populations, and in particular with a population similar to the one the voucher program will serve.

The use of a training team (e.g., two or three persons) is a preferable approach. While overall roles and functions are shared, richness and diversity are enhanced when trainers can share their respective skills in theoretical perspective, observation, and practical application of ideas within the training program. A team can place greater emphasis on assessing the needs of the trainees and can design means by which to meet those needs in deliberate and systematic ways.

Many kinds of training materials are available to prospective trainers, who are limited only by their skill and resourcefulness. A loan copy of a Resource Guide for professional trainers is available free from BSSR upon request. The Resource Guide is a compilation of materials from a variety of original sources which are potentially useful in a training program such as the one outlined here. Many of these materials were used in the Baltimore field test of the voucher system.

PART II: SELECTED FINDINGS ON THE ADMINISTRATIVE FEASIBILITY OF VOUCHERING SKILL TRAINING IN WIN

A. PREFATORY SUMMARY

Part II of this document deals with a limited set of administrative considerations bearing on the feasibility of vouchering skill training in the WIN program. It concerns these questions:

- who among WIN participants took vouchers for training, and who did not?
- what were the determinants of whether voucher clients were able to make arrangements for training?
- what occupations did voucher clients choose for training, and how did they compare with regular WIN training?
- with whom were the training arrangements made?
- how long did vouchered training last, by comparison with training in the regular WIN program?
- what were the comparative costs of the vouchered training?
- what effect, if any, did vouchering have on the rate at which trainees completed their training?

The empirical data which are analyzed below were developed during field tests of vouchers for institutional training and for OJT conducted by BSSR between 1974 and 1976 in Portland, Oregon, and Baltimore, Maryland, under a grant from the Employment and Training Administration of the Department of Labor.

Section A: Who Took Vouchers?--One-third of new WIN participants chose to join the vouchered institutional training program in Portland when they were offered during four months in 1974. This is only an approximate estimate of the demand for vouchered training there, because funds for institutional training in the regular WIN program had been exhausted for some months before the voucher program began operations.

Institutional training vouchers were relatively more attractive to more-educated clients, to younger participants, and to volunteer women.

When vouchers for OJT were made available for five months during 1976, about the same proportion of new WIN registrants (38 percent) accepted them as did vouchers for institutional training. OJT vouchers were more attractive to men than to women, to the more-educated clients, and to older participants.

Examination of factors involved in the choice of vouchered OJT as against institutional training was not possible in Portland, but could be studied in the Baltimore program, where the type of training was another of the choices available to participants in the voucher program. When clients had that choice, they were as likely to choose OJT as institutional training. This was contrary to the expectation in many quarters that the demand for institutional training would greatly exceed that for OJT.

Within the Baltimore voucher group, there were few background social characteristics with any influence on the choice of one or the other type of training. The more-educated clients preferred institutional training over OJT, and so did the handful of white clients. On the other hand, older clients more often chose OJT than institutional training.

Generally, then, the option of a vouchered training system was attractive to a noticeable minority of WIN clients in each city, and apparently about equally so whether the vouchers were to be used for institutional training or OJT.

Section B: Who Committed Vouchers for Training?--Over 80 percent of those who set out for vouchered institutional training were able to arrange for training with a vocational school.

The OJT voucher commitment rate was substantially lower in both Portland and Baltimore. Fewer than ten percent of the vouchers for OJT were converted to training contracts in either city. This figure is most difficult to evaluate, however, because of a series of program administrative problems, because the OJT program was tested in Portland during the 1975 recession, and because of fundamental differences between the vouchered and regular WIN OJT programs in the way employees find their way to jobs. The datum cannot be taken as a definitive indicator of the relative efficacy of a vouchered OJT system, standing alone as it is.

Nonetheless, there are certain interesting observations to be made on the OJT voucher commitment rate. Among them is the decided influence of the client's most recent occupation: those whose last job was a white

collar job were considerably more likely to locate OJT positions than previous blue collar workers (and both more than those few clients with no previous work history).

Section C: Vouchered Training Occupations.--Vouchering had few effects on the overall distribution of occupations for which clients were trained. Those in vouchered institutional training were somewhat less likely to be preparing for white collar work than was the case for those in regular institutional training in Portland, but not markedly so.

Among the women in the voucher program, there was a clear (though minority) tendency to choose "nontraditional" occupations; among them were auto mechanic, welder/auto body, truck driver, and diesel mechanic.

In the institutional training groups, both vouchered and regular, whether the client was allowed to make his or her own decision on training (had "autonomy") had an important effect on the training occupation. Those in either program who were given decision-making autonomy were very clearly less likely to be in training for clerical work. Training for (and placement in) clerical occupations may sometimes more clearly serve WIN's than clients' purposes.

By contrast with their regular WIN institutional training counterparts (e.g., those of the same sex, or at the same educational level), vouchering had an especially large impact on the distribution of training occupations for men and for the nonwhite trainees in Portland, who were relatively more likely to be preparing for white collar work (as against voucher trainees as a whole, who were less likely to be in training for that type of occupation).

Vouchering had a somewhat greater effect on the distribution of occupations for which clients were receiving OJT. Voucher clients were less often employed as craftspersons or operatives than was the case for regular OJT, and were more often to be found in jobs in the lower reaches of the managerial/administrative category.

Relative to their regular OJT counterparts, vouchering had a particularly large impact for the volunteer women (fewer in white collar jobs) and for those with the most education (more in white collar work).

Section D: Vocational Schools and OJT Employers.--Except for a slight tendency among the voucher trainees to choose public over private vocational schools, the range of training institutions used by both

vouchered and regular trainees was nearly exactly the same. This is attributed partly to the structure of vocational training opportunities in Portland, and to a probable tendency for voucher clients and WIN staff (acting on behalf of regular WIN trainees) alike to choose schools at least partly on the basis of their proximity to home or to major transportation routes. In addition, among those who were predisposed to attend private schools and who read and accurately recalled the message of a consumer education publication of the Federal Trade Commission, the proportion attending private schools was very high.

Although vouchering did not materially alter the mix of training institutions in Portland, it made rather clear differences among some subgroups of clients. Private school training was relatively higher among volunteer women (as compared with that for volunteer women in regular WIN training), the least educated, nonwhite clients, and older trainees. It was markedly lower among mandatory women and the most educated.

Among clients in OJT, there was a general shift to smaller firms among those in the voucher program, and particularly away from the very largest employers in Portland. This is no doubt a function both of voucher clients' greater access to personnel decision-makers in smaller firms, and of WIN's organization of its regular job development responsibilities.

Section E: The Length of Training.--Clients in vouchered institutional training could arrange for up to 52 weeks of instruction, and were not subject to the regular WIN six-month average for institutional training. As a result of that, together with the slight shift to public schools (where training is normally longer) and small changes in the demographic composition of the voucher group, vouchered institutional training lasted about 10 weeks longer than it did for regular trainees.

Clients in vouchered OJT could arrange for training for as many as eight weeks longer than the maximum prescribed by the DOT skill level of the job, and vouchered OJT ran for about nine weeks longer than regular OJT. There was some tendency (though it was far from complete) for employers and clients to negotiate for the maximum training time allowed by the program guidelines. An additional factor in the length of training, which accounts for at least half the nine-week increase for vouchered OJT, was in the mix of specific occupations in the two groups of trainees.

Section F: The Cost of Training.--The slight tendency for voucher clients more often than regular trainees to attend (lower-cost) public schools was apparently more than offset by longer institutional training courses--the average cost of vouchered institutional training was 80 percent greater than that for regular WIN training. There are three important observations to be made in this connection, however. First, shortly before the Portland program began in 1974, several private vocational schools raised their tuitions. This did not account for all the increase in the cost of training, of course, but did mean that the cost of vouchered training was necessarily higher. Second, as mentioned above, voucher clients were able to arrange for longer training under the guidelines for the program. Third, and most importantly from the point of view of costs, there was a tendency among the voucher clients to cluster in one relatively high-priced private school (which had been used for regular training by WIN as well, but somewhat less often). When that school is eliminated from the calculations, the average cost of vouchered institutional training was only 15 percent greater than that for regular WIN training.

Among those in OJT, a major factor in the cost of training is, of course, the employee's pay rate. Voucher OJT clients earned at very slightly higher rates than the regular OJT employees did. Voucher workers in very small firms and those in white collar jobs earned at noticeably higher rates than did their counterparts in regular OJT.

As a consequence of the higher pay rates and (especially) the increased length of training for vouchered OJT, the costs of vouchered OJT were greater than those for regular OJT by 45 percent.

Section G: Early Termination of Training.--While vouchering did not drastically affect the rate at which trainees (in whichever type of training) left before finishing their training, it did lower it slightly in each program in Portland. The dropout rate among vouchered institutional trainees was 35 percent, down from 37 percent among regular WIN institutional trainees. The dropout rate among the voucher clients who had had self-assessment counseling was lower (by eight percentage points) than those who had not.

Dropping out was especially reduced (relative to regular WIN counterparts) among older trainees and those with large families, but was increased

among mandatory women in the voucher program, the most educated, nonwhites, clients with small families, and those in short training courses.

OJT arrangements were terminated before completion for slightly fewer of the voucher trainees (62 percent) than those in regular OJT (67 percent). Early termination rates were especially lower among the women in the voucher program, older trainees, and those with larger families. They were also particularly lowered among employees of small firms and for those who arranged for longer training periods. On the other hand, early termination rates increased among the youngest clients in the voucher group, nonwhites, and those who were to be trained for short periods.

Section H: A General Summary of the Empirical Findings.--Following a review of these findings, we address briefly the occurrence of certain regularities in the data on early termination of training, which is one indicator of how Portland WIN clients fared in the voucher programs. It appears on this single measure that the subgroups of clients who derived the most relative benefit (relative to their regular WIN counterparts) from vouchering were the volunteer women, older clients, those with large families, and those in longer training programs (whether institutional training or OJT). Participation in the voucher program had relative negative effects on this single measure for clients in short training programs, for nonwhite trainees, and for those with small families.

Analyses of a variety of additional measures of the effects of the introduction of vouchers for training in WIN in Portland and Baltimore are under way, and reports will be available at various times during 1977. They will address a broad range of issues, and will deal in particular with a series of longer-run effects of participation in the program, including self-esteem, post-training labor force participation, earnings, job satisfaction, unemployment, and welfare dependency patterns, among others. These analyses will culminate in a general summary assessment of the overall feasibility of vouchered training in the WIN program.

B. INTRODUCTION TO PART II

This is a summary of selected data on the vouchering tests in Portland and, to a more limited extent, Baltimore. The data come from several sources: WIN program records, BSSR field records, and interviews with voucher program participants and regular WIN trainees.[1] They are presented here in summary form to provide information on certain

---

[1] These and other data are analyzed and discussed in considerably more detail in BSSR's series of reports on the project. Several of these reports are still in preparation, and will be published during 1977. Currently available reports include:

Ann Richardson and Laure M. Sharp, The Feasibility of Vouchered Training in WIN: Report on the First Phase of a Study (December, 1974); Bruce B. Dunning and James L. Unger, Schools' Responses to Vouchered Vocational Training: Experiences with the Portland WIN Voucher Training Program (July, 1975); Ann Richardson and Laure M. Sharp, The Early Experience in Vouchering On-The-Job Training: A Report on Progress in the Portland Voucher Project (December, 1975); Bruce B. Dunning, Aspects of Vouchered WIN Trainees' Experiences with Vocational Training Schools: Experiences with the Portland WIN Voucher Training Program (October, 1976); Bruce B. Dunning, Occupational Choices and Vocational School Selections: Experiences with the Portland WIN Voucher Training Program (December, 1976).

Reports currently in preparation cover these topics:

- The Feasibility of Feasibility Testing;
- Client Experience During Institutional Skill Training;
- Labor Market and Welfare Consequences of Institutional Skill Training;
- Decision-making and Commitment of Vouchers for OJT in Portland;
- Labor Market and Welfare Consequences of OJT in Portland;
- Employers who Did and Did not Agree to Provide Vouchered OJT in Portland;
- Clients' Experiences with Vouchers in Baltimore;
- Baltimore Vocational Schools and Employers Approached by Voucher Holders;
- WIN Registrants' Reports on Their Reasons for Not Participating in the Voucher Program in Baltimore; and
- A Final Summary Assessment of the Feasibility of Vouchering in the WIN Program.

administrative questions which may arise in consideration of whether to implement vouchered training systems in other WIN projects. The general topics addressed in this report include these: who took vouchers; who committed them to schools or employers for training, and who did not; occupations for which trainees were trained; characteristics of training schools and employers; the length of training; the cost of training; and who did and did not complete training.

The findings presented here are not intended to represent any attempt at an overall assessment of the general efficacy of vouchering in WIN, but to focus specifically on certain administrative feasibility questions.

C. WHO TOOK VOUCHERS

Portland

Overall, a third of new WIN registrants in Portland opted for institutional vouchers from April through July in 1974. This is probably a slightly inflated estimate of the demand in Portland for vouchered institutional training, because no institutional training funds had been available in the regular WIN program for some time there. Thus, some portion of the group are probably clients who wanted institutional training as such, and might not have taken vouchers if some alternative means to that training had been available.

Institutional vouchers were relatively more attractive to younger clients, volunteer women, and those with more education (Table I).

TABLE I

CHARACTERISTICS OF CLIENTS WHO TOOK INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING VOUCHERS

	Percent of WIN Participants Who Took Vouchers for Institutional Training
All (N=524)	32
Men (189)	21
Mandatory women (158)	27
Volunteer women (177)	49
Fewer than 12 years education (173)	22
12 years (including GED) (277)	36
More than 12 years (74)	40
White (470)	32
Nonwhite (53)	32
16-24 years old (202)	35
25-34 (236)	34
35 or more years old (86)	20

The pattern for OJT vouchers was somewhat different, and in expected ways. Thirty-eight percent of new WIN registrants from June through October in 1975 chose to attempt to arrange vouchered OJT; the vouchers were relatively more attractive to men, to older, clients, and those who were more educated (Table 2).

TABLE 2

CLIENTS WHO TOOK OJT VOUCHERS

	Percent of WIN Participants Who Took Vouchers for OJT
All (N=1,183)	29
Men (546)	37
Mandatory women (355)	26
Volunteer women (282)	20
Few than 12 years education (356)	25
12 years (including GED) (584)	29
More than 12 years (243)	36
White (986)	29
Nonwhite (197)	32
16-24 years old (432)	25
25-34 (515)	30
35 or more years old (236)	34

In the institutional training case, the voucher group was fairly clearly distinguishable from the WIN clientele in general in several respects. Younger clients, women (and especially volunteer women), and those with 12 or more years of education were disproportionately represented in the voucher group (Table 3). OJT voucher holders were also distinguishable, principally in the greater relative representation of men among voucher holders (Table 4).

TABLE 3

DEMOGRAPHIC COMPOSITION OF THE WIN CLIENTELE AND OF THE INSTITUTIONAL VOUCHER GROUP

	WIN Clientele (524)	Institutional Voucher Group (190)
Percent men.	36	23
Percent mandatory women.	30	25
Percent volunteer women.	34	52
Percent with 12 or more years education. . . .	67	77
Percent white.	90	89
Percent 35 years or older.	16	10

TABLE 4

DEMOGRAPHIC COMPOSITION OF THE WIN CLIENTELE AND OF THE OJT VOUCHER GROUP

	WIN Clientele (1,183)	OJT Voucher Group (347)
Percent men.	46	58
Percent mandatory women.	30	26
Percent volunteer women.	24	16
Percent with 12 or more years education . . .	70	74
Percent white.	83	82
Percent 35 years or older.	20	23

Baltimore

Since the two Portland field tests took place in different years and under different administrative and environmental circumstances, valid comparisons between those who took vouchers for institutional training and for OJT are not possible. But the data from the Baltimore field test, in which clients could make a choice between vouchered institutional training and OJT, make a limited comparison of this sort possible.[2] Among the 161 WIN clients in Baltimore who participated in the voucher program during July and August of 1976, equal proportions initially opted for each kind of training (51 percent for institutional training, 49 percent for OJT).[3] Thus, contrary to expectations expressed by many, the basic demand for institutional training did not in fact exceed that for OJT.

While men and women were equally likely to choose one or the other kind of training, OJT was more attractive than institutional training among the more highly-educated, the younger clients, and the handful of whites in the voucher program (Table 5).

[2]One reason the comparison can only be a limited one is that there was a 50 percent quota imposed on the proportion committing a voucher for one or the other sort of training. As it happened, external events forced the suspension of the Baltimore test at roughly the same time that the quota for vouchered institutional training was reached, so that observations on the relative demand for the two types of training can be made with a certain degree of confidence.

[3]Of those originally seeking OJT arrangements, 32 percent later changed their minds and sought institutional training, usually after they had become discouraged about their OJT prospects.

TABLE 5

THE RELATIVE ATTRACTION OF INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING AND OJT AMONG BALTIMORE VOUCHER RECIPIENTS

	Percent Taking a Voucher for:	
	Institutional Training	OJT
All (N=161)	51	49
Men (22)	50	50
Mandatory women (91)	51	49
Volunteer women (48)	52	48
Fewer than 12 years education (93)	49	51
12 years (including GED) (60)	53	47
More than 12 years (8)	62	38
White (9)	100	--
Nonwhite (152)	48	52
Less than 35 years old (133)	53	47
35 or more years old (28)	44	56

D. WHO COMMITTED VOUCHERS FOR TRAINING

Institutional Training

In Portland 167 clients, or 88 percent of those with institutional vouchers, secured a school's agreement to train; this was the case with 81 percent of those in Baltimore.[4] None of the demographic characteristics on which we have data especially distinguished those who were unable to make training arrangements in either city, though men in Baltimore were somewhat less successful than the women in concluding training arrangements. Generally, however, there were no systematic differences in institutional voucher commitment rates so far as these background characteristics are concerned (Table 6).

TABLE 6

CHARACTERISTICS OF THOSE WHO COMMITTED VOUCHERS FOR INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING IN PORTLAND

	Percent Commiting a Voucher
All (N=167)	88
Men (39)	89
Mandatory women (42)	86
Volunteer women (87)	92
Less than 35 years old (151)	90
35 or older (17)	88
Fewer than 12 years education (38)	84
12 years (including GED) (100)	92
More than 12 years (30)	87
White (150)	88
Nonwhite (18)	100

OJT

The story of commitment of vouchers for OJT was very different, in both Portland and Baltimore. In Portland, 65 vouchers (19 percent of those issued for OJT) were converted to training contracts; just two people

[4] This includes those who switched from OJT to institutional training objectives.

who sought OJT in Baltimore (3 percent of OJT aspirants) were able to arrange training positions. The difference between the two cities is not as great as appears to be the case from these data alone, however. For one thing, 40 percent of the 65 "vouchered" OJT arrangements in Portland were in fact located and concluded entirely by WIN staff, and the staff had a significant role in another 18 percent of arrangements.[5] Looking just at the 49 contracts which were either entirely client-arranged or entirely WIN-arranged, it appears that WIN made arrangements most often for women (especially volunteer women) and for the most-educated among the voucher recipients (Table 7).

TABLE 7

WIN-ARRANGED OJTs IN PORTLAND

	Percent of All "Vouchered" OJT Contracts Which Were Arranged by WIN Staff[a]
All	53
Men	38
Mandatory Women	62
Volunteer women	80
Fewer than 12 years education	46
12 years (including GED)	48
More than 12 years	73
White	52
Nonwhite	57
Less than 35 years old	53
35 or more years old	54

[a]Excludes cases in which arrangements were mixed (18 percent of all contracts) or made by third parties.

[5]Three contracts were entirely arranged by third parties: one brother, one mother, and a private employment agency.

Although we were told informally that approximately half of regular OJT contracts in Portland were actually arranged in large part between clients and employers before the clients entered WIN, we were unable to gather more detail from WIN program records on this question. Data from interviews with Portland OJT trainees which are currently being analyzed should help to clarify this matter.

We do not know how much of WIN's involvement in developing OJT arrangements came about at the request of the voucher holders themselves. Surely some of it reflects clients' growing frustration at not finding OJT on their own. On the other hand, when the vouchered OJT (VOJT) administrative structure was changed to centralize operations in a specialized team (as against the earlier structure in which each regular WIN team's caseload could include VOJT clients), the proportion of VOJT agreements which were WIN-arranged dropped sharply, from 71 percent to 44 percent. Thus, it is safe to assume that a good portion of the WIN-arranged agreements were in fact staff-initiated.[6] When client-arranged VOJT contracts are isolated, the Portland commitment rate drops to approximately seven percent.

At the same time, the Baltimore commitment rate for VOJT was probably lower than it would have been had the voucher system there had a thoroughgoing test, because of a different set of staffing problems in that site. Perhaps the greatest problem in Baltimore in this context was the general failure--due primarily to the lack of experience--to make available any job search coaching for VOJT clients, despite an effort to train the voucher team staff in this skill. The result of this, according to interviews with Baltimore voucher program participants, was a feeling among many that they had not been adequately equipped to carry out their responsibilities as voucher clients. (It should be noted in this connection that these respondents also frequently mentioned that their task would have been easier if the voucher program had been publicized among employers, to lay some groundwork before clients attempted to arrange for training.)

A second general comment on the VOJT commitment rate should be made. In both Portland and Baltimore, approximately as many people found unsubsidized work during the OJT search as found

---

[6] Information from on-site observation by BSSR research staff confirms this as well. Staff-initiated "V"OJT arrangments were confined primarily to three of the nine regular WIN teams. A variety of circumstances led to this situation in Portland (which did not develop in Baltimore). One of the most important factors was that VOJT, more than vouchered institutional training, posed special threats to the work of the regular WIN staff, and some of the Job Developers found it impossible to resist intercession on the client's behalf. For details on this problem, and some of its roots, see Ann Richardson and Laure M. Sharp, The Early Experience in Vouchering On-The-Job Training..., cited above.

VOJT positions. In Portland, this amounted to 15 percent of OJT voucher recipients (and was correspondingly small--two people--in Baltimore). This was an unexpected result of the program.[7] It seems likely, though, that the money provided to voucher holders for transportation and lunches during the training search, together with specially-funded SAU child care, enabled clients to make a more regular and more systematic job search than is usually the case in regular WIN.

Third, the Portland VOJT field test was carried out during one of the worst periods of the 1975 economic recession, when both regular WIN OJT activity and direct job placements were noticeably off.

As a final qualifier on what may at first appear to be a distinct lack of client success in arranging VOJT, it might be pointed out that any commitment rate, no matter its magnitude, is difficult to evaluate. For one thing, the process of VOJT is so different from that for regular WIN OJT (ROJT) that comparisons of the two programs in this respect are suspect. On the one--ROJT--hand is a structure in which, typically, a job opening exists and information on it is communicated to an intermediary (a WIN Job Developer) who searches among a group of people for the client who in his or her estimate will make the best match. No record is kept of the number of potential OJT clients never matched to an OJT position. On the other--VOJT--hand is a structure in which a potential OJT client exists first, and (perhaps) a job opening second, and in which there is no intermediary in the matching process. The record here deals with the number of clients never matched, and not with the number of preexisting slots filled. The fact that the two systems have such different dynamics (and record-keeping logic, for that matter) precludes evaluation based on voucher commitment rates. Assessments of the efficacy of VOJT must be based on other criteria.

These qualifications are not intended to gloss over the findings on commitment of vouchers for OJT, but to put them into a slightly broader context. It may also be of interest to examine who was more or

[7] Unfortunately, we were unable to carry out a study directed specifically to this unanticipated effect of the program.

less successful in arranging for VOJT. Here, it will be necessary to examine only the Portland data, since the Baltimore experience offers so few cases for analysis.

In general, the demographic characteristics of the voucher clients show no more influence on commitments than they did on commitment of vouchers for institutional training. At first glance, it appears that volunteer women were more successful than others in finding VOJT (Table 8).

TABLE 8

CHARACTERISTICS OF THOSE WHO COMMITTED VOUCHERS FOR OJT

	Percent Committing a Voucher
All (N=347)	19
Men (200)	18
Mandatory women (91)	19
Volunteer women (56)	23
Less than 35 years old (266)	19
35 or older (81)	17
Fewer than 12 years education (89)	18
12 years (including GED) (170)	19
More than 13 years (88)	18
White (284)	19
Nonwhite (63)	16

But volunteer women were also most likely to have been in WIN-arranged OJTs. Among the 23 clients who made all their own training arrangements, the men rather than the women (mandatory or volunteer) were slightly more likely to find a VOJT position.

A factor of considerably greater importance was the voucher recipient's prior labor force experience (Table 9).

TABLE 9

EFFECTS OF PRE-WIN WORK EXPERIENCE ON PROPORTION COMMITTING VOUCHERS FOR OJT

	Percent Committing a Voucher
Last previous job:	
White collar	36
Blue collar	15
None	2

Those whose last reported job before registering in WIN was a white collar job were more likely to be successful in arranging OJT than previous blue collar workers. Both of these groups were more successful in committing their vouchers than the small group (five percent) of those without any previous work history, almost none of whom found a VOJT position. Given the economic situation prevailing in Portland at the time, these findings are not difficult to interpret. In a labor market in which few jobs are available, certainly people with work experience are more attractive to employers than those without. And in a labor market in which unemployment is higher in blue collar than in white collar occupations (and the pool of laid-off workers upon which an employer can--or must--draw is greater), those with recent blue collar work histories are likely to find it harder than white collar workers to locate a job opening.

E. THE TRAINING OCCUPATIONS FOR WHICH VOUCHERS WERE COMMITTED

Institutional Training

Sixty-nine percent of the institutional training vouchers were committed for training in white collar occupations (professional and administrative, clerical, and sales work). The proportion preparing for white collar work was slightly lower than it was among regular WIN institutional trainees (74 percent) in the year before the establishment of the voucher program.[8] At a more detailed level of analysis, it can be seen in Table 10 that the occupational distributions for the vouchered and regular institutional trainees were very similar indeed.

TABLE 10

MAJOR-GROUP OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTIONS, VOUCHERED AND REGULAR INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING
(In percentages)

	Voucher	Regular
Professional, technical, administrative. .	14	9
Clerical	47	55
Craftsmen and operatives	23	14
Service.	17	22
Total	101	100

The voucher clients were somewhat less highly concentrated in one or the other major occupational group than were the regular trainees, which

[8] Throughout most of the rest of this report, Portland voucher program data will be compared with data on regular WIN skill training, in order to assess the voucher experience relative to that for the regular WIN program. For the OJT data, these comparisons are tentative at best because of the ambiguity with respect to who actually arranged the OJT (whether vouchered or regular). Because data on Baltimore are still being collected and analyzed, information on that voucher program is limited to descriptive notes.

suggests that vouchering slightly increased training options.[9] There was also a noticeable (though minority) tendency for vouchered women more often to select "nontraditional" occupations. The best estimate is that about two percent of the women in regular WIN training were preparing for occupations in which women are not (according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics) often engaged: auto mechanic and upholsterer.[10] By contrast, about eight percent of the vouchered women were getting training in nontraditional occupations: auto mechanic, truck driver, diesel mechanic, welder/auto body, and dog groomer. Another eight percent of the vouchered women were being trained for barbering (another traditionally male-dominated occupation) but they may have preferred cosmetology instead, which was not an eligible training occupation in the Portland voucher program.[11]

A special note on vouchering, autonomy, and occupational choice.-- One of the central elements in vouchering, from the client's point of view, is the grant of autonomy in decision making and in choices which concern training. The regular Portland WIN operation did not, however, conform to the image of an organization acting without regard to clients' wishes; perhaps few WIN projects operate that way in reality. But Portland may be an extreme case: while 95 percent of the voucher program participants reported in interviews that they had had decision-making autonomy, this was also reported by 70 percent of the regular WIN trainees. Thus, the voucher program did not introduce marked changes in this respect.

The exercise by clients of autonomy in the occupational choice, whether in regular WIN or in the voucher program, had an especially noticeable effect on the proportion who were in institutional training for clerical and for service[12] occupations. Participants in either

---

[9] Portland did not normally contract for class-sized training, but had an individual referral system. Had the program relied to any marked extent on class-sized vocational training arrangements, the two occupational distributions would probably have been less similar than they are.

[10] Nationally, one percent of auto mechanics are women, and 17 percent of upholsterers are women.

[11] Training time for cosmetology in Portland schools was 14 months, in excess of the 12 months allowed in the voucher program.

[12] Barbers, florists, dog groomers, etc.

program who were left on their own to choose a training occupation were markedly less likely to be in training for clerical occupations than those who did not make the occupational choice, and more likely to be in service occupations (Table 11).

TABLE 11

TRAINING OCCUPATIONS OF THOSE WITH AND WITHOUT DECISION-MAKING AUTONOMY
(In percentages)

	Voucher		Regular	
	Client Was Given Autonomy	Was Not Autonomous	Client Was Given Autonomy	Was Not Autonomous
Professional, technical, administrative.	16	8	10	8
Clerical	40	67	43	69
Craftsmen and operatives.	24	20	15	13
Service	21	6	32	9
Total	101	101	100	99

This raises a general question about the efficacy of WIN's usual heavy reliance on clerical training and direct placement into clerical positions.

There are other interesting aspects of the data on occupational choice. The most influential factors affecting the proportion in training for a white collar[13] occupation were the client's sex and the occupation s/he had had in mind at the time s/he joined the voucher program.[14]

[13]For purposes of more elaborate analysis, the training occupations are grouped into two categories: white collar and blue collar. Grouping the occupations into such gross categories is an unfortunate necessity dictated by the small numbers available for the analysis.

[14]In this and following sections, most of the Portland findings which are presented result from multiple regression analyses of the data. Regression analysis allows for observation of the effect of one variable on another (say, the effect of sex on training occupation) while at the

Not surprisingly, women more than men--and especially volunteer women--chose training for white collar jobs, as had also been the case in regular WIN vocational training (Table 12).

TABLE 12

WHITE COLLAR TRAINING OCCUPATIONS BY SEX AND LEGAL STATUS

	Estimated Percent White Collar[a]	
	Voucher	Regular
All	69	74
Men	37	27
Mandatory women	73	75
Volunteer women	80	90

[a]Controlling for the effects of education, race, age, family size, and occupation the respondent had in mind when s/he entered WIN.

same time adjusting (or controlling) for other variables which are related to both. For example, we know that poor women have more education than poor men do and that education is related to occupational level. Thus, the relation between sex and occupation is to some extent contaminated by the joint relation of each with education. It would be most desirable to be able to look at the effect of sex on occupation net of (controlling for) education, to arrive at an uncontaminated estimate of the relationship. Multiple regression analysis is one of the analytic procedures which allows for this. Thus, the relationships reported are net relationships, and are adjusted for the effects of all the other variables shown at the bottom of each table. Each of the full regression tables is to be found in Appendix V.

It will be noted that we have controlled for family size. Family size is not, in and of itself, of particular interest in most of the regression runs, and is not usually discussed as an influential factor. It does, however, confound the effects of certain other variables which are of intrinsic interest, such as age, legal status in WIN, and education. It is routinely taken into account,then, in order to remove any contaminating effects it may have on the relationships of clients' other background characteristics with the program variables of interest in any given section of the report.

Majorities of each group entered WIN with an occupation already in mind for which they wished to be trained (84 percent of voucher clients, 76 percent of regular clients--Table 13).

TABLE 13

INFLUENCE OF OCCUPATION ALREADY IN MIND ON TRAINING OCCUPATION

Occupation in Mind:	Voucher			Regular		
	White Collar	Blue Collar	None	White Collar	Blue Collar	None
Training occupation:[a]						
White Collar. . .	87	37	85	88	51	79
Blue Collar . . .	13	63	15	12	49	21
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

[a]Controlling for the effects of sex, legal status, education, race, age, and family size.

That occupation was a strong determinant of the training the client received, among those in both vouchered and regular groups (but more so in the voucher group). The effects of sex, education, and age on the occupations for which clients were trained were the same in the voucher and regular training programs, and the advent of vouchering made no essential difference in these relationships. Nor was the relationship between the occupation the client had in mind which s/he entered WIN and the training occupation changed by vouchering (Appendix Table V-1). By contrast, vouchering appeared to open up some white collar options which had not regularly been available in Portland for nonwhite clients; nonwhites in the voucher program were 15 percentage points more likely than their regular WIN counterparts to be preparing for white collar work (Appendix Table V-1).

It will be recalled that voucher clients who wanted it were to be provided self-assessment counseling to help in the occupational and school choices. The data on who actually received self-assessment

counseling are not entirely satisfactory,[15] and are limited. Nonetheless, they are presented for what additional insight on the program they afford. When it came to the choice of a training occupation, self-assessment appears to have increased the likelihood (by six percentage points) of choosing a white collar job for training. It should be noted, though, that this effect is clearly less important than that of the kind of job which voucher clients had in mind when they entered WIN. The relatively small size of the effect of counseling is intrinsically neither good nor bad, of course, and may very well reflect nothing more than that clients came to the voucher program with clearly-focussed occupational goals which had been frustrated by the substantial backlog of demand for regular institutional training in Portland at the time the voucher program was established. It does suggest, however, that additional research specifically focused on the effects of counseling would be desirable.

Another way to assess the effects of vouchering (relative to regular WIN training) is to focus on the differences which vouchering made for comparable subgroups of clients, and isolate those for whom vouchering made a difference relative to the regular WIN experience of their counterparts.[16] Using this approach, it appears (Appendix Table V-1) that vouchered institutional training made a particular difference in the

---

[15]Neither client reports in interviews nor WIN staff reports on who did and did not receive self-assessment proved to be valid, and it was necessary to rely on observational data from BSSR's on-site research staff for this information. We have a fair amount of confidence in these reports on who received self-assessment, but were unable to develop information for approximately a third of the voucher clients. Moreover, there are no data available on another aspect of this question: the quality of the counseling. Therefore, the data on the effects (or not) of self-assessment are presented with caution. In neither the Portland OJT test nor the Baltimore test was self-assessment counseling made available to voucher clients, even though the staffs in each city had been trained in its use. Examination of the effects of the counseling is necessarily confined to the Portland voucher institutional training program.

[16]An example: the overall voucher-regular difference in the proportion preparing for white collar occupations was -5 (voucher: 69 percent; regular: 74 percent). Any subgroup of voucher trainees who differed from their regular WIN counterparts on this variable by more than -15 or +5 is taken as a group which was especially affected by the advent of vouchering. The change data are to be found in the Appendix tables as indicated.

general occupational level only for the men (who were more often in white collar training than regular men were, by 10 percentage points: +10), and for the nonwhite trainees (+15). No other subgroups of voucher trainees differed from similar people in regular WIN institutional training by as much as -15 or +5.

Essentially, then, vouchering effected few changes in the work for which people were trained by WIN. This is in sharp contrast to early gloomy predictions of many persons at several levels of the WIN program that vouchering skill training--in particular, allowing WIN clients to choose an occupation and to pursue that choice--would result in chaos or program failure. The voucher clients did not act much differently when they were left on their own than when the WIN staff had a more direct decision-making role.

OJT

Unfortunately, because there are so few cases of fully client-arranged vouchered OJT, it is not possible to analyze them separately in detail. Whenever it is possible, however, differences between client- and WIN-arranged OJTs are noted in the following sections of the report.

The occupational distributions for vouchered and regular OJT were not as similar as those for institutional training [17] (Table 14).

TABLE 14

MAJOR GROUP OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTIONS, VOUCHERED AND REGULAR OJT
(In percentages)

	Voucher	Regular
Professional, technical, administrative . . .	16	5
Clerical.	20	25
Craftsmen and operatives.	40	55
Service	25	15
Total	101	100

[17] The two VOJT contracts in Baltimore were for a dental assistant and a housekeeping aide.

The proportion of people in the craftsmen-operative group was noticeably smaller among the VOJT employees than among the ROJT participants. Generally speaking, the VOJT people were working at slightly higher occupational levels than the regular trainees, and were in particular more likely to be in the lower reaches of managerial and administrative occupations.

In getting into one or the other level of training occupation (white or blue collar), sex appears again to be a major factor; women were clearly more likely than men to be in white collar OJTs (which was the pattern for prevoucher OJT clients--Table 15).

TABLE 15
WHITE COLLAR OJTs BY SEX

	Estimated Percent White Collar[a]	
	Voucher	Regular
All	40	23
Men	27	6
Mandatory women	62	48
Volunteer women	45	62

[a]Controlling for the effects of education, race, age, family size, and last occupation.

About half of the difference by sex is probably due to the fact that women in the voucher group were also more likely to be in WIN-arranged OJT situations, and is not due entirely to gender in and of itself. When clients themselves made all the OJT arrangements, the proportion in white collar jobs dropped to 17 percent (from 46 percent of the WIN arrangements).

Education, too, was a factor here, though a somewhat less important one. The more highly-educated the client, the greater the likelihood that s/he was working in a white collar VOJT (unlike ROJT,

in which the least-educated were more likely than the average to be in white collar jobs--Table 16).

TABLE 16
WHITE COLLAR OJTs BY EDUCATION[a]

	Estimated Percent in White Collar Jobs[a]	
	Voucher	Regular
All	40	23
Fewer than 12 years education.	23	28
12 years (including GED)	38	18
More than 12 years	62	28

[a]Controlling for the effects of sex, legal status, race, age, family size, and last occupation.

Again, however, it should be noted that the most-educated voucher clients were also especially likely to be in WIN-arranged jobs. Thus, the effects of education as such may be smaller than these data would suggest.

Judging by the experience of the voucher clients relative to that of their ROJT counterparts (Appendix Table V-2), vouchering seemed to make the most difference for the volunteer women (-17 percentage points in white collar occupations) as well as those with the least (-5) and the most (+34) education.

In summary, then, vouchering seemed to make somewhat more difference in the distribution of occupations for which people received OJT than was the case with the institutional training voucher program, and to have made a difference for more subgroups of clients. Nonetheless, these changes are not so large as to suggest that vouchering has the potential to change the occupational mix of the OJT operation radically.

F. THE SCHOOLS AND EMPLOYERS TO WHICH VOUCHERS WERE COMMITTED

Institutional Training

Just over half (55 percent) of the Portland voucher clients in institutional training arranged for training in private vocational schools,[18] a somewhat smaller proportion than went to private schools for regular institutional training (61 percent). It is interesting to note that of approximately 90 public and private schools in Portland available for skill training, only 29 were used by the voucher clients. What is more, there was nearly complete overlap in the particular schools in which the vouchered and regular groups received their training. (Voucher clients used nine schools that had not been used for regular WIN institutional training.) Doubtless, a good deal of this similarity is due to a tendency for voucher clients and WIN staff alike to make convenience of transportation an important consideration in the selection of a training school. (In interviews, 30 percent of the voucher clients reported that convenience to home or transportation was the most important reason for choosing the school they did.[19])

Mandatory clients in the voucher program (both men and women) were more likely than volunteer women to attend public schools (Table 17). This contrasts with the regular WIN training program, in which the mandatory women were most often trained in private schools. The least-educated among the voucher trainees chose private over public schools by a rather substantial margin, again in distinction from the regular WIN case.

---

[18] In Baltimore, 85 percent went to private vocational schools. But 59 percent of all private school contracts were at two schools, for keypunch, computer operator, and nurse's aide.

[19] For details, see Bruce B. Dunning, Occupational Choices and Vocational School Selections. . ., cited earlier.

TABLE 17

INFLUENCES ON THE PROPORTION IN TRAINING IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS

	Estimated Percent in Private Schools[a]	
	Voucher	Regular
All	55	61
Men	44	40
Mandatory women	40	88
Volunteer women	65	56
Fewer than 12 years education	82	49
12 years (including GED)	55	68
More than 12 years	20	55
White collar training	49	53
Blue collar training	68	80

[a]Controlling for the effects of race, age, and family size.

Another factor of comparable importance in the choice of private over public schools--and which was common to both the voucher and regular groups--was what kind of training occupation the trainee was to undertake. Trainees for blue collar occupations were clearly the more likely to be in private schools. This can be explained partially in terms of the structure of training opportunities in Portland. The public schools generally offered courses and programs related to a wide variety of occupations. Private schools, on the other hand, tended to be much more specialized; some offered training in only a single occupation, while others offered a variety of courses and programs, but within a specific occupational area (e.g., secretarial schools). Overlap in the availability of offerings in the public and private sectors was by no means uniform for the various occupational groups. The structure of training opportunities in Portland is summarized on the following page.

RELATIVE COVERAGE OF OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS BY PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS IN PORTLAND

Professional, Technical, Administrative	
Professional	- Available almost entirely in public schools; very few offerings by private schools.
Subprofessional/Technical	- About evenly divided between public and private schools, with a number of choices of schools for many occupations.
Managerial/Administrative	- About a 3:2 edge for private schools, but a limited selection of schools in either case.
Clerical	
High Clerical	- About a 2:1 edge in favor of private schools, but with a fair choice of schools in either category.
Low Clerical	- More private schools by a substantial margin for most occupations.
Craftsmen, Operatives	
Craftsmen	- For most occupations, public schools provide appropriate courses and programs by about a 2:1 margin.
Operatives	- About equally available from public and private schools overall, but with availability highly constricted for some occupations.
Service	- Usually available from either public or private schools, but with availability highly constricted for some occupations, and private schools predominating in the barbering/cosmetology field.

Among the voucher clients, self-assessment counseling was of no importance in determining the choice between public and private schools (although, of course, it may very well have influenced the choice of a particular school as against another).

A more important factor in this decision was the booklet published by the Federal Trade Commission mentioned earlier, "Our Vocational Training Can Guarantee You the Job of a Lifetime,"[20] which was to be distributed to each person in the voucher institutional training program. The effect of receiving and correctly understanding the message of this booklet, which warns against the practices of some private vocational schools, actually increased the likelihood that a client would select a private school, among those who were already predisposed to attend private schools[21] (Table 18).

TABLE 18

EFFECTS OF THE FTC BOOKLET ON THE PROPORTION CHOOSING PRIVATE SCHOOLS

	Predisposed to Private School		Predisposed to Public School	
	Understood booklet	Did not understand, or did not receive it	Understood booklet	Did not understand, or did not receive it
Percent attending private school	82	50	59	57

[20] FTC Consumer Bulletin No. 13 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, Stock Number 1800-00153), 1973.

[21] For more detail, and discussion of the construction of the "predisposition" variable, see Bruce B. Dunning, Occupational Choices and Vocational School Selections. . ., cited above.

Of those who were inclined to attend private schools, 73 percent eventually enrolled in a private institution (as did 58 percent of those predisposed to public schools). But among people who leaned toward private schols and understood the FTC booklet, 82 percent committed their vouchers to private schools. (The booklet had no effect on the commitments of those predisposed to public schools.) For some of the recipients of the booklet, then, the message seems offhand to have had an effect opposite to that which might have been intended. But that was generally not the case. Among those predisposed to private schools who also understood the booklet, 77 percent reported that the chief determining consideration in the choice of school was the quality and reputation of the institution (by contrast with 47 percent of all those who chose a private school). This may be grounds for some reassurance about the bases upon which these clients made the school decision.

In terms of the subgroups for which vouchering made the greatest difference relative to the regular WIN training program (Appendix Table V-3), vouchering seems especially to have enhanced the probability of attending a private school among the volunteer women (+9), those with the least education (+33), nonwhite clients (+7), and those in the oldest age category (+23). On the other hand, the voucher program particularly reduced the chances of attending a private school (relative to regular WIN counterparts) for the mandatory women (-48) and the most-educated (-35).

To summarize, then, the establishment of the voucher institutional training program had only a modest effect on the balance of public and private schools used for training, and did not alter the list of individual schools in which the training took place by much. It did, however, make rather clear changes in the kind of school in which particular subgroups of people received their training.

OJT

Clients in VOJT were working in somewhat smaller-sized firms than was the case for ROJT people[22] (Table 19).

[22] In considering the size of the VOJT employers, it is not so necessary as in other cases to take into account whether the OJT was WIN- or client-arranged. The median employer size was equal for each group, about 12.

TABLE 19

FIRM-SIZE DISTRIBUTION OF OJT TRAINEES
(In percentages)

	Voucher	Regular
1-5 employees	34	34
6-25 employees	38	34
26 or more employees	28	32
Total	100	100

The voucher clients were concentrated relatively more in middle-sized firms, those in ROJT in larger firms.[23] At the other extreme, 15 of the small VOJT employers were in fact too small legitimately to provide OJT under the one-fourth rule.[24] This represents about three-fourths of the small-firm category, and just under a fourth of all VOJT employers.

Relative to regular WIN OJT (Appendix Table V-4), vouchering had the effects of moving volunteer women away from middle-sized firms (-9) and into large ones (+7), but did not especially affect the distribution by firm size of the mandatory clients. Further, VOJT clients were not especially more or less likely than their educational or racial counterparts to be working in larger or smaller firms.

But vouchering did affect the distribution into firm size by age. Specifically, the youngest VOJT employees moved into the smallest firms (+23) and out of middle-sized ones (-14), while the oldest group, those 35 years old or older, moved away from the smallest firms (-34), and into middle-sized (+17) and large ones (+12).

[23] "Larger" means somewhat different things for the two groups of trainees. Of the 48 ROJT contracts with "large" firms, 27 percent were with employers of more than 500 workers. This was true for only 1 of the VOJT contracts.

[24] WIN itself is not immune from this, of course. Forty percent of the contracts with firms who would not qualify under the one-fourth rule were "vouchered" OJT contracts which were WIN-arranged.

Finally, voucher clients in white collar jobs moved away from the smallest firms (-13) and more into middle-size ones (+21); the distribution of the blue collar workers was not noticeably affected by the advent of vouchering.

Thus, although the overall distribution of OJT employees into the three employer-size categories was not materially affected by vouchering, there were rather substantial changes for several subgroups of voucher trainees relative to similar people who had been in ROJT earlier. This will take on additional meaning when we move to analysis of determinants of the rate at which OJT was terminated before the completion of training.

G. THE LENGTH OF VOUCHERED TRAINING

Institutional Training

Vouchered institutional training lasted for about 10 weeks longer than regular institutional training did, on the average (34 vs. 24 weeks).[25]

The higher average for vouchered training is not due to marked shifts in the demographic composition of the group relative to the regular training group, but rather to a series of small shifts which accumulate to increase the projected average training period. For instance, the voucher group contained slightly larger proportions of trainees with 12 or more years of education and people who were between 25 and 34 years old, both characteristics associated with longer training.

Some of the longer training for vouchered clients is also explained by the fact that a slightly larger proportion attended public schools, which in and of itself increased the average length of training for both vouchered and regular trainees.

An additional consideration here is the fact that the voucher program participants were able to negotiate any length of training within 52 weeks, while arrangements for regular trainees were subject to such restrictions as the six-month average for institutional training. At the same time, however, both groups were also subject to schools' regular course schedules, a factor which would tend to minimize the difference between the averages.

The background characteristics with the greatest influences on the length of vouchered institutional training were sex and educational level. Men were to be trained for about four fewer weeks than the women (Table 20).

---

[25] This is the length of training projected in the contract. The actual length of training was longer for some who required extensions, and shorter for others who dropped out of training or completed it more quickly than projected. We are unable to refine these length-of-training data to take extensions and dropouts into account, because the WIN record system does not routinely include this information.

TABLE 20

THE INFLUENCES OF SEX, EDUCATION, AND TRAINING INSTITUTION ON THE LENGTH OF INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING

	Estimated Mean Weeks of Training[a]	
	Voucher	Regular
All	34	24
Men	31	24
Mandatory Women	35	17
Volunteer Women	35	27
Fewer than 12 years education	24	27
12 years (including GED)	35	22
More than 12 years	40	29
Private school	32	23
Public School	36	25

[a]Controlling for the effects of race, age, family size, and training occupation.

Educational attainment was positively related to the length of training: the greater the client's education completed before entering WIN, the longer the training. And, as mentioned earlier, being trained in a public school lengthened the average training by about a month (from 32 to 36 weeks).

Relative to the experience of the regular institutional trainees (Appendix Table V-5), only the least-educated in the voucher group were especially affected by vouchering; they were in training for three fewer weeks than were their regular counterparts, on the average. Otherwise, the increase in length of training was fairly evenly spread among all subgroups of vouchered trainees.

OJT

The increase in the average length of training for OJT for the voucher group over that for ROJT was about the same as it was for institutional training--nine weeks (31 weeks versus 22 weeks).[26]

Again, sex and educational attainment affected the length of training. Men were trained for longer periods than women--eight weeks longer than the mandatory women, and 12 weeks longer than the volunteer women (Table 21).

TABLE 21

THE INFLUENCES OF SEX, EDUCATION, AND FIRM SIZE ON THE LENGTH OF OJT

	Estimated Mean Weeks of Training[a]	
	Voucher	Regular
All	31	22
Men	36	22
Mandatory women	27	22
Volunteer women	24	22
Fewer than 12 years education	34	23
12 years (including GED)	28	20
More than 12 years	35	25
Firm has 1-5 employees	30	25
6-25 employees	31	24
26 or more employees	34	18

[a]Controlling for the effects of race, age, family size, and training occupations.

This is in clear contrast with the ROJT case, in which there were no differences in the length of the OJT by sex or by legal status that could be detected at all.

[26] Again, this is the length of training projected in the contract. The average length of training for vouchered OJT arranged by clients alone was one week longer than the "voucher" arrangements made entirely by WIN.

In both the vouchered and regular OJT programs, education was related to the length of training, but not in a straight-line fashion. Instead, those who were high school graduates (or had the GED) were in training for slightly less time than those with either more or less education (and it will be recalled that this was the pattern for regular institutional training, as well). This pattern may reflect a "certification" effect; there may be some tendency to trade prior education of a certain level which is documented by a diploma or a GED certificate[27] in exchange for skill training, and to provide as a substitute additional time in training for those without certification.

An additional determinant of the length of vouchered OJT was the size of the employing firm: employees of "large" firms (firms with 26 or more workers) were to be trained for three to four weeks longer than those in smaller firms. Again, this differs from the ROJT case, in which larger firms concluded training contracts which were shorter by about six or seven weeks.

There were no subgroups of VOJT people whose average length of training became especially longer or shorter with the advent of vouchering (Appendix Table V-6). The longer training periods were rather evenly distributed among all the vouchered trainees.

Another way to evaluate the data on training time is to ask about the relation between the length of training contracted for and the maximum length of training permitted under program guidelines. It will be recalled that the Portland OJT voucher program started with a flat 52-week maximum for training, regardless of occupation. This was changed very early in the operational phase of the program, when it appeared that the first few employers to agree to train were exploiting the limit. Thereafter, the maximum length of training was defined as the length of training allowed under the usual Dictionary of Occupational Titles criterion used by WIN, plus (arbitrarily) eight weeks (DOT+8). The median[28] maximum length of VOJT for the occupations held by the voucher

---

[27] Almost none of those with more than 12 years of education had gotten as far as a college degree.

[28] The median is used here rather than the mean, which was used earlier, because it is the better measure of the average for these kinds of data (weeks). The mean is required in the regression analysis, however.

employees would have been 32 weeks under the DOT rule; if all contracts had been written for the maximum DOT+8 period, it would have been 40 weeks. As it was, the actual median length of VOJT contract was 26 weeks, not 40 nor 32. To contrast this with the ROJT case, the median maximum length of training for the occupations held by the regular OJT clients would have been 26 weeks; the actual median of the contracts was 17 weeks.

Thus, part of the increase in the length of vouchered OJT over ROJT was due to changes in the occupational distribution between the two groups, in addition to that accounted for by the greater flexibility afforded by the eight-week additional allowable maximum training time.

Nonetheless, there was a clear tendency for VOJT contracts to converge on the maximum more than was the case for ROJT contracts (Table 22). While 30 percent of the ROJT contracts equalled or exceeded the maximum length of training by the DOT criterion, 41 percent of the vouchered contracts were written for training periods of DOT+8 or more.

TABLE 22

ACTUAL AND DOT-DETERMINED LENGTH OF OJT
(In percentages)

	Voucher (DOT+8)	Regular (DOT)
Contract was for less than maximum allowed. .	59	70
Contract equalled maximum.	28	25
Contract exceeded maximum.	13	5
Total	100	100

H. THE COST OF VOUCHERED TRAINING

As could be expected from the longer training courses for vouchered clients--whether institutional or OJT--the costs of training were also higher than they were for regular WIN training.

Institutional Training

The mean total cost of vouchered institutional training was $1,007, or 80 percent higher than the $559 mean for regular institutional training.[29]

Before moving to a description of factors affecting the cost of vouchered training, it is important to point out that the estimates are partially contaminated by the fact that, shortly before the Portland program began in 1974, several private vocational schools raised their tuition costs, as part of the more general inflation in the economy at the time. Thus, the cost of vouchered institutional training in Portland was necessarily higher due to that factor alone, a factor which cannot be controlled in these data. (Of course, the tuition increase was far below 80 percent.)

One of the factors which contributed most heavily to the cost of vouchered (as well as regular) training was, obviously enough, the length of training. Total cost rose with the length of training in both programs, although by somewhat fewer dollars for the voucher group than for those in the regular program (Table 23).

---

[29] The difference in the median cost for training in the two programs was slightly smaller: the increase to $919 for vouchered training from the $534 for regular training was 72 percent. The median cost for vouchered institutional training in Baltimore was a good deal lower than it was in Portland--$552.

TABLE 23

EFFECTS OF THE LENGTH OF TRAINING ON THE TOTAL COST OF INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING

	Estimated Mean Total Cost[a]	
	Voucher	Regular
All	$1,007	$ 559
Training was to last through		
13 weeks	655	408
14-26 weeks	716	512
27-39 weeks	1,029	581
40 or more weeks	1,227	1,144

[a]Controlling for the effects of sex, legal status, education, race, age, family size, training occupation, and training institution.

Another major factor in cost of training (again, for both institutional training programs) was whether the training was conducted in a private or a public school. (Here, the difference in dollars was greater for vouchered than for regular training, probably because of the tuition increase in some private schools.)

It should be noted that the average cost of training was strongly affected by a tendency for the voucher clients to cluster in one or another school. In Portland, 29 percent of all private school training arrangements were for training in one high-priced school (which had also been frequently used for regular WIN training, but for a smaller proportion of trainees). If that school is eliminated from the calculations, the median total cost of training drops to $645, or 15 percent greater than that for regular institutional training. At the other extreme, as mentioned earlier, 59 percent of all training arrangements in Baltimore were made with just two schools. If they are eliminated from the data, the median cost of vouchered institutional training in Baltimore was $1,137.

Only one other factor had an effect of any noticeable magnitude on the cost of training: the cost of training the men was greater than it was for the women, whether they were in vouchered or regular training (Table 24).

TABLE 24

THE INFLUENCE OF SEX ON THE TOTAL COST OF INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING

	Estimated Mean Total Cost[a]	
	Voucher	Regular
All	$1,007	$ 559
Men	1,351	732
Mandatory women	990	286
Volunteer women	877	623

[a]Controlling for the effects of education, race, age, family size, training occupation, training institution, and length of training.

It appears that at least part of the explanation for this difference lies at a more detailed level of occupation than the white collar-blue collar distinction used in the regression: judging by the per-instructional-hour cost of training in Portland schools (in both sectors, but especially in private schools), training for "men's" work simply costs more than that for "women's" work.[30] This may be primarily a reflection of the capital equipment needed for the school to provide training. For example, to train welders and truck drivers (of whichever gender) requires the acquisition and maintenance of more expensive equipment than is required to train keypunchers, secretaries, or file clerks.[31]

[30]Certain health-related "women's" occupations, such as inhalation and occupational therapy, are partial (but only partial) exceptions.

[31]Although some of the voucher women did get training for non-traditional ("men's") occupations, they apparently did not represent a large enough proportion of the women to affect the average cost of training substantially.

The average training costs for several subgroups of trainees were especially changed with the advent of vouchers (Appendix Table V-7).[32] Most affected were the mandatory women in the voucher program, whose training cost was 246 percent greater than that for their regular WIN institutional training counterparts. Training costs were also unusually greater among those with 12 years of prior education or the GED (but not more),[33] whose training costs rose by 105 percent; nonwhites (+170 percent); trainees who were 35 years old or older (+115); and those preparing for blue collar work (+175).

Smaller increases in the total cost of institutional training were to be seen among the volunteer women (+41), and trainees with the least or the most education (+53 for each group).

Those who find these data on the total cost of training a cause for concern may raise questions about how it may be reduced, either by controlling costs directly, or by manipulating it indirectly through, say, limits on the length of training. Any such system of control will, of course, affect who will receive training and for what. We have examined the implications of two possible cost-control mechanisms: maintenance of an average cost of training equal to that for regular WIN institutional training; and maintenance of a six-month average training period. If the Portland voucher institutional trainees had been limited to a median cost of about $530, it would have reduced the proportion preparing for white collar occupations--specifically, some subprofessional and data-processing occupations--and eliminated some of the least-educated trainees. (The composition of the voucher group in terms of such other demographic characteristics as sex and legal status would not have been changed.)

---

[32] The arbitrary criterion here for especially noticeable changes is an increase of more than 100 percent in the total cost of training or an increase of less than 60 percent (and, of course, any decreases).

[33] Like the other data in this section, those on the relationships between cost of training and educational attainment are controlled for the length of training and size of family. What might be a reflection of a tendency to trade longer training periods off for educational certification may also be appearing here in another form; a trade of more expensive training for educational certification in the regular WIN program.

If the Portland clients had been limited to a six-month average for training, the proportion preparing for white collar jobs (especially clerical work) would have been reduced slightly, and the proportion in training for jobs as operatives would have been increased. Better-educated clients and volunteer women would have been a smaller proportion of the voucher group. Limiting training to a six-month average would have had fairly little effect on the median cost of vouchered institutional training, though, lowering it by 13 percent (and leaving it still 50 percent greater than the median cost of regular training).

OJT

The mean total cost of vouchered OJT was also greater than that for regular OJT, by 45 percent ($2,239 vs. $1,545). The cost to WIN of OJT is, of course partly a function of pay rates, and a slight increase in hourly pay rate contributed to the overall increase in the cost of vouchered OJT (though not nearly so much as the increase in the length of training). The average hourly pay rate for VOJT employees of $3.53 was just over one percent greater than the $3.48 for ROJT employees. Voucher OJT employees who made their own training arrangements were in better-paying work than were workers in WIN-arranged "vouchered" OJT jobs. The median hourly pay for the former group was $3.93; that for the latter was $3.06, or about $1,800 less for a year of full-time work. As a consequence, the total cost to WIN of OJT for those who made their own training arrangements was higher than the total cost of the WIN-arranged OJTs by $474, or 28 percent.[34]

The largest influence on pay rate in both the vouchered and regular OJT programs was the trainee's sex--the men in each program earned substantially more than the women, by 70 cents or more an hour (or by nearly $1,500 for a year of full-time work--Table 25).

[34] The median total cost to WIN for WIN-arranged "vouchered" OJT was $1,710; that for client-arranged VOJT was $2,184.

TABLE 25

THE EFFECT OF SEX ON HOURLY EARNINGS IN OJT[a]

	Estimated Mean Hourly Pay Rate	
	Voucher	Regular
All	$3.53	$3.48
Men	3.93	3.74
Mandatory women	3.09	3.00
Volunteer women	3.02	3.03

[a]Controlling for the effects of education, race, age, family size, employer size, and training occupation.

Factors with secondary influence on pay rates included age (but only among ROJT clients) and whether the training was for a white collar occupation (though the relationship was opposite for the two OJT programs).

Several subgroups of voucher clients were earning at hourly pay rates which were substantially different from those of their ROJT counterparts (Appendix Table V-8). Among those who were earning at relatively higher rates were workers in very small firms (+7 percent, or 23 cents an hour) and white collar employees (+7 percent, or 31 cents). Older workers, on the other hand, were earning at comparatively lower rates, by 8 percent (or 32 cents an hour).

Longer training periods and higher hourly pay rates among those in vouchered OJT combined to increase the cost of VOJT over that for regular OJT by 45 percent, as described earlier. By comparison with regular OJT counterparts (Appendix Table V-9), the costs for vouchered OJT were especially greater among the most-educated (+19 percent, or $338) and workers in middle-sized firms (+24 percent, or $411).

I. COMPLETION OF VOUCHERED TRAINING

The last variable with which thes report deals is the rate at which trainees left before completing their training. While voucher-regular differences in early termination rates were slight, they favored the voucher group in each training program.

Institutional Training

For vouchered clients in institutional training, the dropout rate[35] was barely lower than that for the regular trainees, by two percentage points (35 percent vs. 37 percent). Sex made less difference in the dropout rate than legal status did--mandatory clients, whether male or female, were more likely than volunteer women to drop out before they finished training. This is in sharp contrast to the pattern for regular WIN institutional trainees, among whom the mandatory women dropped out least often, while the men and the volunteer women dropped out considerably more often (and at nearly equal rates--Table 26).

TABLE 26

THE EFFECTS OF SEX AND LEGAL STATUS ON DROPPING OUT OF INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING

	Estimated Dropout Rate[a]	
	Voucher	Regular
All	35	37
Men	39	48
Mandatory women	47	22
Volunteer women	29	41

[a]Controlling for the effects of education, race, age, family size, training occupation, training institution, and length of training.

[35] Unlike the OJT case, it is accurate to use the term "dropout" here--only two vouchered institutional trainees were asked to leave by the school; two others left training early when their school unexpectedly went out of business, but were issued second vouchers.

Among those in the voucher group, the clients with the least education were more likely than those with more education to drop out before finishing training (as had been the case for the regular WIN trainees), nonwhites more than white students (not the case for the regular group), younger (under 35 years) people, and those from the smallest families.[36]

The magnitude of the effect on the dropout rate of the (projected) length of training is comparable to that of the clients' background characteristics, but the direction of the effect is opposite to that which might be expected.[37] Those who made arrangements for the shortest training were more likely than others to drop out before finishing their training.

Finally, clients preparing for white collar occupations were more likely than those in blue collar training to drop out, whether they were in vouchered or regular WIN training.

Among the voucher trainees, those who had received self-assessment counseling were less likely (31 percent) than those who had not (39 percent) to drop out of training. It is here, among all the variables treated in this report, that self-assessment counseling had its most noticeable effect, by reducing the dropout rate by eight percentage points. While the effect is not very large, and does not seriously rival those of the length of training and of the training occupation, it does make a detectable difference in the dropout rate.

Vouchering had different effects on the dropout rates of different subgroups of trainees (Appendix Table V-10). Relative to the experience in regular WIN institutional training, vouchering reduced the dropout rate below that for regular training for older trainees (-36) and people in larger families (especially those with four or more dependents: -23). Vouchering increased the relative dropout rate for the mandatory women (+25), those with more than 12 years of education (+12), for people 25 through 34 years old (+14), nonwhites (+28), those from the smallest families (+25), and those in very short training courses (+24).

---

[36] Here, family size as such is of interest because it bears on the effects vouchering may have on offsetting the influence of the competing demands for time, energy, and attention represented by a larger number of dependents.

[37] On the hypothesis that longer training periods increase the chances for problems to develop which may result in early termination of training. Of course, one set of potential problems, competing family responsibilities, is controlled in the regression.

OJT

The general rate at which people left OJT before the projected training was finished was considerably higher than it was for institutional training, for both vouchered and regular OJT groups. Among the VOJT trainees, though, it was slightly smaller--by five percentage points--than it was among those who had been in regular OJT (62 percent vs. 67 percent).

One factor in the rate at which trainees left VOJT before finishing was whether WIN or the client made the training arrangements. Sixty-four percent of those whose OJT was entirely arranged by WIN left training early; those who made their own arrangements were less likely--57 percent--to do so.

Leaving vouchered OJT early was most likely among the most-educated in the group, the youngest trainees, and those with the largest families (Table 27).

TABLE 27

THE EFFECTS OF EDUCATION, AGE, AND FAMILY SIZE ON LEAVING OJT BEFORE FINISHING IT

	Estimated Early Termination Rate[a]	
	Voucher	Regular
All.	62	67
Fewer than 12 years education.	61	70
12 years (including GED)	51	62
More than 12 years	82	77
16-24 years old.	89	62
25-34.	58	63
35 years or older.	36	83
0-1 dependents	71	53
2 dependents	50	60
3 dependents	56	79
4 or more dependents	82	77

[a]Controlling for the effects of sex, legal status, race, training occupation, employer size, hourly pay rate, and length of training.

In both vouchered and regular OJT groups, white collar employees left training early less often than blue collar workers. Unlike the case for ROJT, in which the early leaving rate was slightly higher from smaller than from larger firms, the vouchered OJT clients employed in the smallest establishments were the ones who were least likely to leave training early. (Table 28).

TABLE 28

THE EFFECTS OF THE LENGTH OF TRAINING ON LEAVING OJT BEFORE FINISHING IT

	Estimated Early Termination Rate [a]	
	Voucher	Regular
All.	62	67
Training was to last through 13 weeks. .	82	38
14-26 weeks.	56	72
27-39 weeks.	44	100
40 or more weeks	72	97

[a]Controlling for the effects of sex, legal status, education, race, age, family size, training occupation, employer size, and hourly pay rate.

The data for both vouchered and regular groups are consistent with the hypothesis that longer periods of training increase the chance for the development of competing problems to develop, either on or off the job. In each program, those who were (initially) to be trained for 40 or more weeks showed very high early termination rates (but so did the voucher people with very short--up to 13 weeks--training contracts).

Relative to the experience for regular WIN OJT (Appendix Table V-11), the greatest reduction of the VOJT early-leaving rate occurred among the women (mandatory women: -34; volunteers: -21), older trainees (-47), those with larger, but not the largest, families (three dependents: -23), employees of small firms (-21), and those with relatively long projected training (especially training which was to last between 27 and 39 weeks: -56). On the other hand, vouchering increased the early

termination rate (relative to the ROJT experience) among the men (+7), nonwhites (+20), the youngest trainees (+27), those in the smallest families (+18), white collar employees (+11), and people who were to be trained for no more than three months (+44).

J. A GENERAL SUMMARY OF SOME OF THE EFFECTS OF VOUCHERING SKILL TRAINING IN WIN

What follows, in greatly summarized form, is a review of some of the data presented above. The subgroups singled out for comment are these isolated according to the criteria established earlier as "especially" affected by the voucher program.

Relative to regular WIN institutional training, vouchering:

- decreased the proportion preparing for white collar work,
  but increased it among
  - men
  - nonwhites
- decreased the proportion in private training institutions, especially for
  - mandatory women
  - people with more than 12 years of education

  but increased it among
  - volunteer women
  - those with fewer than 12 years of education
  - nonwhites
  - those who were 35 or more years old
- increased the average length of training
  but reduced it for
  - those with fewer than 12 years of education
- increased the average total cost of training, especially for
  - mandatory women
  - those with just 12 years of education, but not more
  - nonwhites
  - those who were 35 or more years old
  - people preparing for blue collar work

  but not so much for
  - volunteer women
  - people with less than or more than 12 years of education
- decreased the dropout rate, especially for
  - those who were 35 or more years old
  - people with small (but not the smallest) and the largest families

but increased it for

- mandatory women
- the most-educated
- nonwhites
- people who were 25-34 years old
- those with the smallest families
- those originally arranging for training which would last no more than 13 weeks

Relative to regular WIN OJT, vouchering:

- increased the proportion in white collar jobs, especially for
  - those with more than 12 years of education

  but decreased it for
  - volunteer women
  - those with fewer than 12 years of education
- decreased the proportion working in firms with 26 or more workers

  but increased it for
  - volunteer women
  - those who were 35 or more years old

  increased the proportion in firms with 5-25 workers, especially for
  - those who were 35 or more years old
  - white collar workers

  but decreased it for
  - volunteer women
  - young workers less than 25 years old

  did not change the proportion in very small (1-5) firms, but increased it for
  - young workers less than 25 years old

  and decreased it for
  - those who were 35 or more years old
  - white collar workers
- increased the average length of training
- increased the average hourly pay rate, especially for
  - workers in very small firms (1-5 employees)
  - white collar workers

  but reduced it for
  - those 35 or more years old

- increased the average total cost of training,

  but not so much for

  - those with more than 12 years of education
  - workers in middle-sized firms (6-25 employees)

- decreased the early termination rate, especially for

  - women, both mandatory and volunteer
  - those 35 or more years old
  - people with large (but not the largest) families
  - workers in very small firms (1-5 employees)
  - those for whom training originally was to last for 14 or more weeks

  but increased it for

  - men
  - nonwhites
  - young workers less than 25 years old
  - those with the smallest families
  - white collar workers
  - those for whom training originally was to last for fewer than 13 weeks

A More General Look at Early Termination Rates

While direct comparisons between the vouchered institutional and OJT groups are not valid, it might be useful here to observe that there are certain regularities in the early termination data which give some preliminary indication of how different subgroups of trainees fared in the voucher program, relative to their regular WIN counterparts. To be sure, there are more--and much better--indicators of relative success of individuals with vouchered training, including labor force participation, unemployment, self-esteem, job and training satisfaction, occupational mobility, rates f pay, and so forth. These post-training outcomes are being analyzed in detail in the report series described above, but lie outside the scope of this report. This description of relative reductions in early termination rates is included because they are one indication of program outcomes.

Judging only from the data on leaving training before completion, it appears that volunteer women, older (35 or more years) people, those with larger families, and those who were in longer training programs derived the most relative benefit from participation in the voucher programs. Participation had relative negative effects for people with small families, for nonwhites, and for those in the shortest training programs. It will be most interesting to observe patterns in the relative advantages and disadvantages of vouchering in terms of the longer-run outcomes of participation in the program.

APPENDIX I

"About the Voucher Program," AN INFORMATION SHEET
FOR PROSPECTIVE VOUCHER PROGRAM CLIENTS

ABOUT THE VOUCHER PROGRAM

The WIN program is carrying out a special project which may interest you. It will provide vocational training for WIN participants. If you decide to join the program, you will be entitled to free vocational training, either in a vocational school or with an employer on the job.

As a member of the voucher project, you will have several special rights and responsibilities. You will have the right to choose the occupation for which you will be trained, one which you feel is best suited to your own interests, abilities, and preferences. You will also choose the type of training--either in a vocational school or on the job with an employer (OJT), whichever would be best for you. Whichever kind of training you choose, it will also be up to you to choose the school or employer, and make your own arrangements for training.

Limits on Vocational School Training

There are a few limitations on vocational school training. First, the training cannot last for longer than one year, and must prepare you for a job when you are finished. Second, the school must be located in the metropolitan area.

Limits on OJT

There are some limitations on choices for OJT:

1. The length of the training is determined by local WIN policy; it could be as short as four weeks and as long as a year or more;
2. The training must prepare you for a job when you are finished;
3. The training must be with an employer in the metropolitan area;

4. An OJT voucher requires special approval if it to be used for a job which pays very low wages, a job which usually has high turnover, a job which requires little or no training, or for a job that requires a state licensing examination;
5. An OJT voucher may not be used with any employer who is engaged in a strike or other labor dispute.

In deciding about whether to join the voucher project, you should consider the decisions you will make, and whether you want to make them or would prefer to have them made by the WIN staff:

- For what occupation do I wish to be trained?
- What method of training (vocational school or OJT) should I choose?
- What school do I wish to attend, or what employer do I want to contact for OJT?

You should also remember that it will be your responsibility to arrange for your own training. You will have a reasonable time to make training arrangements.

Although the members of the Voucher Unit staff are always available to help you think about your plans, the final decisions will be yours. It will be up to you to investigate and evaluate your choice of occupation, your choice of the method of training, and your choice of the school or employer. In making these choices, you may use whatever sources of information you want to. The Voucher Unit staff has some information available, but you do not need to limit your information-gathering to that--you might want to consult others who work in the occupation you are interested in, for example, or check with students at various schools, or talk with possible employers before making your final decisions.

You will not be left entirely on your own unless you wish to be. In all of your thinking about occupations, type of training and places for training, your Voucher Unit counselor will be ready to help you think about these decisions at any time. That person can help with special counseling, with information on occupations and the labor market, and on how to go about looking for training.

Whether you want to participate in the voucher program is entirely up to you. If you do not feel that you want to do so, you have the right to refuse this offer. If you decide not to participate, you will be assigned to another WIN activity which the staff feels is suitable to your needs and wishes.

If you are interested in joining the voucher program, or learning more about it, you should tell your WIN worker, who will arrange for you to talk with the Voucher Unit staff.

APPENDIX II

SAMPLE COPIES OF A VOUCHER AND OF PRELIMINARY AGREEMENTS

VOUCHER

This document is to certify that _____ is participating in a voucher training program sponsored by the Employment Security Administration, Work Incentive Program. This may be institutional training or on-the-job training (OJT), and may last for up to _____. (OJT will be subject to training time restrictions based upon the occupation this individual is selecting.)

The voucher program will pay for tuition, books, supplies, and other necessary training-related expenses for institutional training. Employers will be reimbursed for the costs of training during the period that they are providing OJT.

The voucher program places no limitations on the subject matter or field of study to be undertaken for institutional training, other than to require that it is in a field in which there is a reasonable expectation of employment after completion of the training.

The program has some restrictions on OJT:

1. special approval is required for occupations which pay wages below the Federal minimum wage rate;

2. the starting hourly pay rate must be the wage prevailing in the occupation in question;

3. employers who are not licensed to do business in the _____ area, or whose employees are on strike or have been locked out are not eligible to provide OJT.

The length of training and the tuition (for institutional training) or the starting hourly pay rate (for OJT) are to be negotiated between the school or employer and the voucher recipient. All agreements will be reviewed by the voucher program staff, but will not be renegotiated except by the voucher recipient.

If you are interested in providing training for the person named above, please complete and sign the relevant Preliminary Agreement.

If you have any questions at all please feel free to call _____.

This voucher is valid until _____.

Date _____

_____
Supervisor

PRELIMINARY AGREEMENT TO PROVIDE ON-THE-JOB TRAINING

Subject to the conclusion of a contract with the Employment Security Administration, Work Incentive Program, this employer agrees to hire _____ and to provide on-the-job
participant
training as described below.

Occupation: _____

Description of job
to be performed: _____

_____

Date that training will start: _____

Total weeks of training: _____

Starting hourly pay rate: _____

_____	_____
Name of Employer	Authorized signature
_____	_____
Address	Title
_____	_____
Telephone	Date

AFTER IT IS SIGNED, THE ORIGINAL OF THIS AGREEMENT IS TO BE RETURNED TO THE EMPLOYMENT SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, WORK INCENTIVE PROGRAM, BY THE VOUCHER RECIPIENT. A COPY OF THE AGREEMENT IS TO BE RETAINED BY THE EMPLOYER.

PRELIMINARY AGREEMENT TO PROVIDE INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING

Subject to the conclusion of a contract with the Employment Security Administration, Work Incentive Program, this training institution agrees to provide _____ with vocational
participant
training as described below.

Occupation: _____

Date that training will start: _____

Total weeks of training: _____
(NOTE: May not exceed __ weeks)

Total hours of instruction: _____

Training costs:

Tuition $_____

Books, supplies $_____

Other costs (SPECIFY) $_____

_____ _____
Training institution Authorized signature

_____ _____
Address Title

_____ _____
Telephohe Date

AFTER IT IS SIGNED, THE ORIGINAL OF THIS AGREEMENT IS TO BE RETURNED TO THE EMPLOYMENT SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, WORK INCENTIVE PROGRAM, BY THE VOUCHER RECIPIENT. A COPY OF THE AGREEMENT IS TO BE RETAINED BY THE TRAINING INSTITUTION.

APPENDIX III

SAMPLE PAGES FROM THE TWO TYPES OF VOCATIONAL SCHOOL LISTINGS USED IN THE PORTLAND FIELD TESTS

OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING IN PORTLAND AREA SCHOOLS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OCCUPATIONS AND PORTLAND AREA SCHOOLS
WHICH OFFER TRAINING IN EACH

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Business Administration

Clackamas Community College
19600 South Molalla, Oregon City 97045
656-2631

Mt. Hood Community College
26000 S.E. Stark Street, Gresham 97030
666-1561

Northwestern College of Business
1950 S.W. 6th Avenue, Portland 97201
224-6410

Pacific Business College
Education Center
1019 S.W. 10th Avenue, Portland 97205
228-6345

Portland Community College
12000 S. W. 49th Avenue, Portland 9/219
244-6111

Western Business College
505 S.W. Sixth, Portland 97204
222-3225

Middle Management

Franklin Institute of Sales, Inc.
1101 S.W. Washington Street, Portland 97205
227-2608

John Robert Powers School
203 S.W. 9th Avenue, Portland 97205

Mt. Hood Community College
26000 S.E. Stark Street, Gresham 97030
666-1561

Pacific Business College
Education Center
1019 S.W. 10th, Portland 97205
228-6345

Portland Community College
12000 S.W. 49th Avenue, Portland 97219
244-6111

Industrial Editing

Mt. Hood Community College
26000 S.E. Stark Street, Gresham 97030
666-1561

Office Management

Beaverton Business College
10835 S.W. Canyon Road, Beaverton 97005
644-6500

Franklin Institute of Sales, Inc.
1101 S.W. Washington Street, Portland 97205
227-2608

SECRETARIAL TRAINING

Secretarial Science

Beaverton Business College
10835 S.W. Canyon Road, Beaverton 97005
644-6500

Clackamas Community College
19600 South Molalla, Oregon City 97045
656-2631

Mt. Hood Community College
26000 S.E. Stark Street, Gresham 97030
666-1561

Northwestern College of Business
1950 S.W. 6th Avenue, Portland 97201
224-6410

Pacific Business College
Education Center
1019 S.W. 10th Avenue, Portland 97205
228-6345

Portland Community College
12000 S.W. 49th Avenue, Portland 97219
244-6111

Western Business College
505 S.W. 6th, Portland 97204
222-3225

Medical Secretary

Beaverton Business College
19835 S.W. Canyon Road, Beaverton 97005
644-6500

Clackamas Community College
19600 South Molalla, Oregon City 97045
656-2631

Mt. Hood Community College
26000 S.E. Stark Street, Gresham 97030
666-1561

Northwestern College of Business
1950 S.W. 6th Avenue, Portland 97201
224-6410

Pacific Business College
Education Center
1019 S.W. 10th Avenue, Portland 97205
228-6345

Portland Community College
12000 S.W. 49th Avenue, Portland 97219
244-6111

Legal Secretary

Beaverton Business College
10835 S.W. Canyon Road, Beaverton 97005
644-6500

Clackamas Community College
19600 South Molalla, Oregon City 97045
656-2631

Mt. Hood Community College
26000 S.E. Stark Street, Gresham 97030
666-1561

Northwestern College of Business
1950 S.W. 6th Avenue, Portland 97201
244-6410

Pacific Business College
Education Center
1019 S.W. 10th Avenue, Portland 97205
228-6345

Portland Community College
12000 S.W. 49th Avenue, Portland 97219
244-6111

Insurance Secretary

Audio Educational Enterprises, Inc.
119 S.W. Park Avenue, Portland 97205
222-3674

Real Estate School of Oregon
904 S.W. Main Street, Portland 97205
222-7112

SCHOOLS IN THE PORTLAND AREA AND THE
OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING THEY OFFER

Advertising Art School
420 S. W. Washington Street, Portland 97204
223-5304

commercial art

BJ's Keypunch School
4707 S. E. Belmont, Portland 97215
238-0865

key punch

Bassist Institute
923 S. W. Taylor Street, Portland 97205
228-6528

fashion merchandising and retailing
architecture
sales

Beau-Monde College of Beauty
821 S. W. 11th Avenue, Portland 97205
226-7355

cosmetology

Beaverton Business College
10835 S. W. Canyon Road, Beaverton 97005
644-6500

accounting and general business
bookkeeping
business machine operation
clerk typist
legal secretary
medical secretary
office management
receptionist
stenographic

Bryman School
520 S. W. Hall Street, Portland 97201
222-3801

secretary
medical office assistant
dental assistant
nursing or medical assistant

Career Trends
726 S. E. Grand Avenue, Portland 97214
234-0258

business machine operation
key punch
super market checker
PBX switchboard
bartending
wig styling

Caryl Edeline Finishing and Modeling School
1969 N. E. 42nd Avenue, Portland 97213
288-5864

interior design
self-improvement
modeling

Century 21 Real Estate Academy
5201 S. W. Westgate Drive, Portland 97221
297-1381

real estate

Clackamas College (North) of Hair Design
846 S. E. 32nd Avenue, Milwaukee 97222
659-2834

cosmetology

Clackamas Community College
19600 South Molalla, Oregon City 97045
656-2631

- agriculture
- ornamental horticulture
- landscape architecture
- accounting
- automative parts sales
- business administration
- business education
- fashion merchandising and retailing
- clerical accounting
- clerical technology
- key punch
- merchandising
- legal secretary
- medical office assistant
- medical secretary
- secretarial science
- law enforcement
- water quality and sanitation
- forestry
- educational aide
- applied design
- video technology
- automotive service station
- graphic art
- general arts
- T.V. broadcasting
- speech
- child care service
- art education
- electronics engineering technology
- automotive mechanics
- body and fender
- civil drafting technology
- fluid power technology
- industrial mechanics
- machine tool
- welding
- nursing or medical assistant
- medical technology
- nursing
- practical nursing
- applied design

College of Beauty
3925 N. E. Hancock, Portland 97212
282-0985

- cosmetology

Commercial Drivers Training
2416 North Marine Drive, Portland 97217
285-7542

- truck driving
- driver pick-up delivery
- driver transport operations

APPENDIX IV

ONE FORM OF ADMINISTRATIVE INTEGRATION OF REGULAR WIN AND VOUCHER OPERATIONS

ILLUSTRATION OF ONE FORM OF ADMINISTRATIVE INTEGRATION
OF REGULAR WIN OPERATIONS WITH THOSE OF A VOUCHER UNIT

All AFDC recipients registered by WIN will be given an initial general description of the voucher program, as a new option available to WIN clients. This description will form part of a more general explanation of the regular WIN program.

A case file should be started for each recipient by intake staff, which notes the date and particulars of the initial orientation.

* * * * *

Clients who are interested in exploring further the possibilities of joining the voucher project (and for whom certification has been requested from SAU) will be scheduled for a more detailed Special Orientation to the program. The intake staff will establish an appointment for this orientation by calling the Voucher Unit to reserve a place in the next available scheduled group orientation session.

* * * * *

Following the Special Orientation, each registrant will be given three days in which to decide whether to participate in the voucher program; . . .

Three days after each orientation session, copies of the appointment list will be forwarded to WIN intake identifying the status of each registrant:

1. Attended orientation, decided to become a participant;
2. Attended orientation, decided to participate in the regular WIN program instead;
3. Did not attend orientation.

* * * * *

The Voucher Unit will request from WIN intake and WIN SAU the case files of each registrant who has decided to join the voucher program.

The case files will be transferred daily via interdepartmental mail.

* * * * *

If a recipient has not made arrangements for training by the end of the specified decision-making and training search period, s/he will be reassigned to regular WIN intake and will be allowed to develop and pursue a new Employability Plan just as is any new WIN registrant.

APPENDIX V

FULL REGRESSION RESULTS ON INFLUENCES
ON THE VARIABLES UNDER STUDY, AND DATA
ON CHANGES DUE TO VOUCHERING

Each estimate of effect in the following tables is controlled for the effects of all other variables shown in the table or noted in its footnote.

Underscored change values are these which lie outside the range specified in the table footnote, and are taken as indicative of "especially" large positive and negative effects of vouchering.

TABLE V-1

INFLUENCES ON THE PROPORTION OF THOSE IN INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING PREPARING FOR WHITE COLLAR OCCUPATIONS AND CHANGES DUE TO VOUCHERING

	Estimated Proportion in White Collar Training[a]		
	Vouchered Training	Regular Training	Change Due to Vouchering[b]
Overall	69%	74%	- 5
Men	37	27	+10
Mandatory women	73	75	- 2
Volunteer women	80	90	-10
Fewer than 12 years education	67	72	- 5
12 years (including GED)	70	77	- 7
More than 12 years	68	68	no change
White	67	75	- 8
Nonwhite	80	65	+15
16-24 years old	64	68	- 4
25-34 years old	70	74	- 4
35 years or older	74	79	- 5
Had a white collar occupation in mind	87	88	- 1
Had a blue collar occupation in mind	37	51	-14
Had no occupation in mind	85	79	+ 6

[a] These estimates are also controlled for family size.

[b] "Especially" large effects of vouchering are those lying outside the -15 and +5 range.

TABLE V-2

INFLUENCES ON THE PROPORTION OF THOSE IN WHITE COLLAR OJT WORK, AND CHANGES DUE TO VOUCHERING

	Estimated Proportion in White Collar OJTs[a]		
	Vouchered OJT	Regular OJT	Change Due to Vouchering[b]
Overall	40%	23%	+17
Men	27	6	+21
Mandatory women	62	48	+14
Volunteer women	45	62	-17
Fewer than 12 years education	23	28	- 5
12 years (including GED)	38	18	+20
More than 12 years	62	28	+34
White	40	22	+18
Nonwhite	43	31	+12
16-24 years old	47	28	+19
25-34 years old	38	20	+18
35 years or older	35	20	+15
Last job was white collar	57	40	+17
Last job was blue collar	28	20	+ 8
No work history	c	22	c

[a]*These estimates are also controlled for family size.*

[b]"Especially" large effects of vouchering are those lying outside the +7 to +27 range.

[c]Not reliable: only one voucher person in this category.

TABLE V-3

INFLUENCES ON THE PROPORTION OF THOSE IN PRIVATE TRAINING INSTITUTIONS, AND CHANGES DUE TO VOUCHERING

	Estimated Proportion in Private Schools[a]		
	Vouchered Training	Regular Training	Change Due to Vouchering[b]
Overall	55%	61%	- 6
Men	44	40	+ 4
Mandatory women	40	88	-48
Volunteer women	65	56	+ 9
Fewer than 12 years education	82	49	+33
12 years (including GED)	55	68	-13
More than 12 years	20	55	-35
White	50	59	- 9
Nonwhite	83	76	+ 7
16-24 years old	60	72	-12
25-34 years old	47	63	-16
35 years or older	69	46	+23
White collar training	49	53	- 4
Blue collar training	68	80	-12

[a] These estimates are also controlled for family size.

[b] "Especially" large effects of vouchering are those lying outside the -16 to +4 range.

TABLE V-4

INFLUENCES ON THE FIRM-SIZE DISTRIBUTION OF OJT EMPLOYEES, AND CHANGES DUE TO VOUCHERING

	Employer Size[a]								
	Vouchered OJT			Regular OJT			Change Due to Vouchering		
	1-5	6-25	26+	1-5	6-25	26+	1-5[b]	6-25[c]	26+[d]
Overall	34%	38%	28%	34%	34%	32%	no change	+ 4	- 4
Men	35	34	28	36	25	37	- 1	+ 9	- 9
Mandatory women	37	40	28	31	46	25	+ 6	- 6	+ 3
Volunteer women	28	47	27	29	56	20	- 1	- 9	+ 7
Fewer than 12 years education	44	32	24	37	35	27	+ 7	- 3	- 3
12 years (including GED)	22	47	32	26	39	39	- 4	+ 8	- 7
More than 12 years	49	25	24	53	13	22	- 4	+12	+ 2
White	36	37	27	36	34	30	no change	+ 3	- 3
Nonwhite	22	42	39	17	43	43	+ 4	- 1	- 4
16-24 years old	51	35	16	28	49	24	+23	-14	- 8
25-34 years old	37	40	25	37	27	35	no change	+13	-10
35 years or older	4	38	52	38	21	40	-34	+17	+12
White collar training	32	38	27	45	17	41	-13	+21	-14
Blue collar training	36	38	29	31	39	29	- 5	- 1	no change

[a]These estimates are also controlled for family size.

[b]"Especially" large effects of vouchering are those lying outside the -10 to +10 range.

[c]Values outside the -6 to +14 range are "especially" large.

[d]Values outside the -14 to +6 range are taken as large.

TABLE V-5

INFLUENCES ON THE LENGTH OF INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING, AND CHANGES DUE TO VOUCHERING

	Estimated Mean Weeks of Training[a]		
	Vouchered Training	Regular Training	Change Due to Vouchering[b]
Overall	34 weeks	24 weeks	+10
Men	31	24	+ 7
Mandatory women	35	17	+18
Volunteer women	35	27	+ 8
Fewer than 12 years education	24	27	- 3
12 years (including GED)	35	22	+13
More than 12 years	40	29	+11
White	34	24	+10
Nonwhite	35	22	+13
16-24 years old	31	23	+ 8
25-34 years old	37	23	+14
35 years or older	30	26	+ 4
White collar training	35	23	+12
Blue collar training	32	25	+ 7
Private school	32	23	+ 9
Public school	36	25	+11

[a]These estimates are also controlled for family size.

[b]"Especially" large effects of vouchering are those lying outside the 0 to +20 range.

TABLE V-6

INFLUENCES ON THE LENGTH OF OJT, AND CHANGES DUE TO VOUCHERING

	Estimated Mean Weeks of Training[a]		
	Vouchered Training	Regular Training	Change Due to Vouchering[b]
Overall	31 weeks	22 weeks	+ 9
Men	36	22	+14
Mandatory women	27	22	+ 5
Volunteer women	24	22	+ 2
Fewer than 12 years education	34	23	+12
12 years (including GED)	28	20	+ 8
More than 12 years	35	25	+10
White	30	22	+ 8
Nonwhite	35	25	+10
16-24 years old	32	19	+13
25-34 years old	30	24	+ 6
35 years or older	31	23	+ 8
Employer size = 1-5	30	25	+ 5
Employer size = 6-25	31	24	+ 7
Employer size = 26+	34	18	+16
White collar job	31	22	+ 9
Blue collar job	31	21	+10

[a]These estimates are also controlled for family size.

[b]"Especially" large effects of vouchering are those lying outside the -1 to +19 range.

TABLE 7-7

INFLUENCES ON THE TOTAL COST OF INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING, AND CHANGES DUE TO VOUCHERING

	Estimated Mean Total Cost of Training[a]		
	Vouchered Training	Regular Training	Change Due to Voucheringb
Overall	$1,007	$ 559	+ 80%
Men	1,351	732	+ 85
Mandatory women	990	286	+246
Volunteer women	877	623	+ 41
Fewer than 12 years' education	977	637	+ 53
12 years (including GED)	999	487	+105
More than 12 years	1,074	703	+ 53
White	1,023	590	+ 74
Nonwhite	919	341	+170
16-24 years old	940	551	+ 71
25-34 years old	1,052	616	+ 71
35 years or older	1,002	466	+115
White collar training	1,100	670	+ 64
Blue collar training	790	287	+175
Private school	1,453	784	+ 85
Public school	425	215	+ 98

[a]These estimates are also controlled for family size and for length of training.

[b]"Especially" large effects of vouchering are those lying outside the range of +60 percent to +100 percent of the costs for regular institutional training.

TABLE V-8

INFLUENCES ON HOURLY PAY RATES FOR OJT, AND CHANGES DUE TO VOUCHERING

	Estimated Mean Hourly Pay Rate[a]		
	Vouchered OJT	Regular OJT	Change Due to Vouchering[b]
Overall	$3.53	$3.48	+ 1%
Men	3.93	3.74	+ 5
Mandatory women	3.09	3.00	+ 3
Volunteer women	3.02	3.03	no change
Fewer than 12 years education	3.38	3.44	- 3
12 years (including GED)	3.46	3.41	+ 1
More than 12 years	3.53	3.34	+ 6
White	3.56	3.48	+ 2
Nonwhite	3.37	3.45	- 2
16-24 years old	3.38	3.28	+ 3
25-34 years old	3.61	3.49	+ 3
35 years or older	3.52	3.84	- 8
Employer size = 1-5	3.65	3.42	+ 7
Employer size = 6-25	3.35	3.28	+ 2
Employer size = 26+	3.62	3.69	- 2
White collar job	3.69	3.38	+ 9
Blue collar job	3.42	3.51	- 3

[a]These estimates are also controlled for family size.

[b]"Especially" large effects of vouchering are those falling outside the range of -4 percent and +6 percent.

TABLE V-9

INFLUENCES ON THE TOTAL COST OF OJT,
AND CHANGES DUE TO VOUCHERING

	Estimated Mean Total Cost of Training[a]		
	Vouchered OJT	Regular OJT	Change Due to Vouchering[b]
Overall	$2,239	$1,545	+45%
Men	2,565	1,634	+57
Mandatory women	1,722	1,322	+30
Volunteer women	2,038	1,515	+35
Fewer than 12 years education	2,291	1,618	+42
12 years (including GED)	2,255	1,407	+60
More than 12 years	2,155	1,817	+19
White	2,248	1,539	+46
Nonwhite	2,411	1,606	+50
16-24 years old	2,050	1,479	+39
25-34 years old	2,274	1,578	+44
35 years or older	2,400	1,602	+50
Employer size = 1-5	2,404	1,540	+56
Employer size = 6-25	2,094	1,683	+24
Employer size = 26+	2,222	1,438	+55
White collar job	2,435	1,521	+60
Blue collar job	2,108	1,538	+37

[a]These estimates are also controlled for family size and for length of training.

[b]"Especially" large effects of vouchering are those outside the range of +25 percent and +65 percent of the costs for regular OJT.

TABLE V-10

INFLUENCES ON THE DROPOUT RATE FROM INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING, AND CHANGES DUE TO VOUCHERING

	Estimated Dropout Rate		
	Vouchered Training	Regular Training	Change Due to Vouchering[a]
Overall	35%	37%	- 2
Men	39	48	- 9
Mandatory women	47	22	+25
Volunteer women	29	41	-12
Fewer than 12 years education	50	51	- 1
12 years (including GED)	29	34	- 5
More than 12 years	37	25	+12
White	33	39	- 6
Nonwhite	50	22	+28
16-24 years old	36	43	- 7
25-34 years old	44	30	+14
35 years or older	7	43	-36
0-1 dependents	48	23	+25
2 dependents	25	41	-16
3 dependents	29	41	-12
4 or more dependents	34	57	-23
Training up to 13 weeks	57	33	+24
14-26 weeks	25	37	-12
27-39 weeks	36	45	- 9
40 weeks or more	29	35	- 6
White collar training	40	39	+ 1
Blue collar training	24	31	- 7
Public school	37	33	+ 4
Private school	33	39	- 6

[a]"Especially" large effects of vouchering are those outside the -12 to +8 range.

TABLE V-11

INFLUENCES ON THE RATE OF EARLY TERMINATIONS OF OJT, AND CHANGES DUE TO VOUCHERING

	Estimated Proportion Leaving OJT Before Completing It[a]		
	Vouchered OJT	Regular OJT	Change Due to Vouchering[b]
Overall	62%	67%	- 5
Men	67	60	+ 7
Mandatory women	51	85	-34
Volunteer women	64	85	-21
Fewer than 12 years education	61	70	- 9
12 years (including GED)	51	62	-11
More than 12 years	82	77	+ 5
White	61	68	- 7
Nonwhite	64	44	+20
16-24 years old	89	62	+27
25-34 years old	58	63	- 5
35 years or older	36	83	-47
0-1 dependents	71	53	+18
2 dependents	50	60	-10
3 dependents	56	79	-23
4 or more dependents	82	77	+ 5
Employer size = 1-5	55	76	-21
Employer size = 6-25	63	76	-13
Employer size = 26+	69	68	+ 1
White collar job	52	41	+11
Blue collar job	69	74	- 5
Training up to 13 weeks	82	38	+44
14-26 weeks	56	72	-16
27-39 weeks	44	100	-56
40 or more weeks	72	97	-25

[a]These estimates are also controlled for hourly pay rates.

[b]"Especially" large effects of vouchering are those outside the range of -15 to +5.