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## ABSTRACT

The follow-up study evaluating the effectiveness of occupational education programs in Illinois focused on six principal dimensions: the basis on which occupational decisions were made: the post-high school status of occupational program completers; employment experience of program completers; alumni assessments of program helpfulness and recommendations for programimprovement; employer/supervisor appraisals of employee preparation for employment: and entry level personal qualities and job skills considered important for employment. Findings, reported by program areas, varied according to program. Occupational program alumni from 102 Illinois high schools provided questionnaire data. The 5,203 usable responses constituted 46.4 percent of the total number sent and 9 percent of the total number of Illinois 1971 program completions. Another 2,651 responses were obtained from employers of alumni. Among the several recommendations for improving the follow system are: develop better identification of occupational programs and standardization of terms; appropriate funds for additional software; make the data available at appropriate times; discover new ways to relate subsequent employment to training taken; increase emphasis on career education; provide schocl district placement services; re-evaluate evaluative criteria; and base programs on job analysis. (Statistical tables are included.) (AG)
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## PREFACE

Ebaluation of the effectiveness of programs of occupational preparation is mandated by Congress in the Vocational Education Acts of 1963 and 1968. If occupationa: education is to be responsive to the changing needs of society, it must be monitored by an early warning system. The strengths and weaknesses of programs of employment preparation must be identified if they are to influence curricular modifications. Followup information, based upon the assumption that the former occupational student and his employer know the strengths and weaknesses of the program taken, is essential in assessing the effectiveness of occupational education in relation to program outcomes.

The Followup Project at Easterr Illinois University has developed and tested a system for delivering a continuous flow of uniform followup data to satisfy state and federal accountability requirements and assist state and local school personne in decision making.

The project was funded through the Research and Development Unit of the [?] inois Division of Vocat:onal and Technical Education. Dr. Ronald McCage, Dr. Garth Yeager, and Mr. John Washburn of the Research and Development Unit staff have been of invaluable service to the project in offering advice and help whenever needed

A un que aspect of the project has been the cooperative arrangement between the project staff, Research and Development Unit staff, and the Program Approval and Evailiation Unit staff of the D.V.T.E. Followup data was supplied to visitation team members participating in on-site evaluations under the
direction of the Program Approval and Evaluation Unit. Mr. James Galloway, Dr. John Klit and Dr. Tim Wentling assisted the project staff with that phase of activities.

The reader will be interested to note that students in 102 Illinois high schools were surveyed. This was approximately 20 percent of the secondary level schools with federally reimbursed occupational education programs. Of the $12,0 ? 1$ former occupational students surveyed, 46.4 percent provided usable followup data. Three thousand one hundred forty nine $(3,149)$ employer/ supervisors were identified by respondents employed at the time of the survey and mailed survey instruments. Eighty-five percent $(2,651)$ of the employer/ supervisors provided usable followup data.

The impact of this particular project is already being felt in terms of program change at Eastern Illinois University. Analysis of the data and inferences that can be drawn from the data will be of great interest to vocational educators throughout the nation. Mrs. Joyce Felstehausen, director of the project, has performed superbly in her position. She and members of her staff deserve much credit for their effort.

Charles L. Joley<br>Coordinator, Occupational<br>Teacher Education<br>Eastern Illinois University
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## COMPENDIUM

Summarized information presented in this compendium is to facilitate the reader in quickly persuing salient findings of the study. Since the purpose of the Followup Project was twofold, findings and recommendations that are related to improving the followup system will be separated from those related to improving the effectiveness of occupational education in Illinois. This section of the report will be divided into the following parts: context of the survey; findings and recommendations related to the followup system; and findings and recommendations related to improving occupational education in Ill inois.

## CONTEXT OF THE SURVEY

Twelve thousand twenty one ( 12,021 ) "Class of '71" unduplicated occupational program alumni from 102 Illinois high schools were polled for questionnaire data. This was approximately 20 percent of the total Illinois 1971 occupational program completions. The U.S. Postal Service returned 6.6 percent of the mailed instruments as undeliverable. Five thousand two hundred three $(5,203)$ responses were usable for data analysis. This was 46.4 percent of the alumni who were assumed to have received survey instruments and constituted nine percent of the total Illinois 1971 program completions. The sample was representative of Illinois geographical regions and occupational program areas.

Responding alumni employed at the time of the survey were asked to provide the name and business address of their employer or supervisor. Three thousand one hundred forty-nine $(3,149)$ employer/supervisors were identified and polled for questionnaire data. Eighty-five percent $(2,651)$ responded.

The followup study focused on six principle dimensions in evaluating occupational program effectiveness in Illinois: the basis upon which students made occupational decisions; the post-high school status of occupational program completers; employment experience of program completers; their assessments of the contribution of the training to their employability and their recommendations for program improvement; employer/supervisor appraisals of employee preparation for employment; and entry level personal qualities and job skills considered important for employment.

In order to avoid broad generalizations about occupational training, findings have been reported by program areas as well as by the total for all program areas. An attempt was made to determine the effect of program area and training related employment on alumni assessments of training effectiveress and recommendations for program improvement. Multiple linear regression techniques were used for this analysis.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING THE FOLLOWUP SYSTEM
Finding: The definition of an occupational program varies from school to school. Because of this variation, a student who is taking one course or several unrelated courses is often undistinguishable from a student who is pursuing a sequence of occupational courses as his/her major field of study. Many LEA's have not yet established occupational course sequences leading to career objectives. In addition, a majority of the LEA's do not have the type of pupil records subsystem that facilitate obtaining names and addresses of identified occupational program completers with a minimum of staff involvement. As a result, the identification of former students who completed occupational programs and the procurement of their mailing addresses was a time consuming and expensive process.

Recommendation: If the effectiveness of programs of occupational instruction is to be assessed using followup techniques, those programs must be defined and standard terminology and O.E. Code numbers used to identify them. A pupil record subsystem must be designed, tested, and implemented for the identification of those individuals who have completed specified programs or sequences of occupational courses for the purpose of developing marketable entry level employment skills or pursuing further related educational avenues.

Finding: Some of the computer software needed to fully automate the Followup System is not presently available. This is due, in part, to the time consumed by developmental project activities for the identificacion of various users of followup data and formats that would facilitate data reporting.

Recommendation: A second phase of the project be funded for the primary purpose of developing additional software to process and analyze data and prepare reports. This activity should be conducted in close cooperation with the Management Information System presently under development to insure its future integration as a subsystem.

Finding: The present followup time frame does not make data available to users at an appropriate time.

Recommendation: During the second phase of the project, a time frame must be established that would allow data to be collected, processed, analyzed and made available to decision-makers at appropriate times.

Finding: The technique employed in this study for measuring the relatedness of employment at the time of the survey to the occupational training taken proved to be valid and reliable but is too expensive and time consuming to be practical. It is not possible to computerize the process.

Recommendation: Alternative ways need to be examined for determining the relatedness of subsequent employment to training taken. In order to be feasible, a decision model must be developed that will assure validity and reliability in the measurement of relatedness as well as allow for computerization of the process.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION IN ILLINOIS Finding: The educational decisions related to career objectives made by high school students tend to be left to chance. While there is much verbal support and developmental activities for exploration of the world of work, occupational information, and occupational orientation, evidence shows that these concepts have not yet had much influence upon secondary level students. Recormendation: A massive infusion of career development education into the daily instruction of all subject matter at the junior and senior high school level is needed to develop realistic knowledge about available jobs and career decision making and planning skills. Attention needs to be given in the junior high school curriculum to developing a readiness for making tentative career decisions. Youth need the kind of exposure to the world of work that will help them know what kinds of jobs they might obtain at different educational spin-off levels, what types of skills and knowledge are required to successfully perform and advance in these jobs, and what kind of further educational avenues they might need to pursue.

Finding: While at the time of the survey only 6.4 percent of the unemployed respondents were actively seeking a job, active high school placement services could have benefited many of the former occupational students. Many respondents indicated a need for the assistance of school personnel in obtaining and re-obtaining employment when necessary.

Recommendation: The local school district should provide placement service for every student leaving school for the world of work. Each student should be given assistance, if desired, in finding initial employment. Beyond initial placement, school personnel should be available to assist former students in adjusting to the job and in obtaining any needed new job placement for a specified period of time. Placement responsibility should be shared by both counseling and occupational instruction personnel. Schools that cannot place their former students should seek the reason why.

Finding: The overall percentage of respondents who were found in training related employment at the time of the survey was low. However, respondents were generally well satisfied with their jobs. Satisfied alumni were thought of by their employer/supervisors as well suited for their jobs. Respondents indicated a preference for cluster oriented employment preparation and felt more emphasis should be placed upon the common job skills and related basic knowledge needed by all workers.

Recommendation: The emphasis given training related employment as an evaluative criteria should be carefully reconsidered. Use of other criteria-particularily at the secondary level--should recognize such considerations as:

1. students enroll in programs for reasons other than career interests, e.g., Easiest route to a diploma or attractive alternatives are not open so the least unattractive curriculum is selected;
2. youth often change their career interests; and
3. students may gain broad skills and attitudes which enable them to perform in a broad spectrum of occupations.

Other criteria which may be more useful than related employment for determining curricular modification might include job satisfaction, alumni assessments of program effectiveness and recommendations for program improvement, and employer
appraisals of employment preparation and identification of important entry level skills.

Finding: Alumni respondents found their employment preparation programs to be most effective in preparing them to use job tools and equipment but recommended that training could be more realistic--more like the real job. Employer/supervisors rated alumni as less prepared in this aspect of employment than in several other aspects.

Recommendation: Occupational instructional programs need to be developed from a careful and systematic analysis of the jot tasks performed on each level of an occupational cluster. Skills and the related technical information taught need to be realistic in terms of what is required to perform successfully on the job. Provisions must be made for the constant reevaluation and modification of curricular content in light of changing job requirements.

Finding: Alumni respondents found their employment preparation to be least effective in preparing them to interact with the public to be served, handle new or unpleasant job situations and talk to the boss about job problems. Employer/supervisors indicated the ability to get along with others as an important entry level skill.

Recommendation: Emphasis should be placed on identifying human interaction skills needed by workers in the occupational clusters and instructional methods for teaching these skills should be devised, tested and implemented. Teachers should be prepared at both the pre-service and in-service levels to teach these skills.

Finding: Employer/supervisors of employed respondents responded well to the survey request for program assessment. They were generally well pleased with the product of occupational education in Illinois. Illinois occupational
!
programs must provide basic enough 'preparation for the type of entry level positions program alumni obtain.

Recommendation: The willingness of employer/supervisors to participate in an evaluative role for the improvement of occupational education should be built on by local school personnel throughout Illinois. The involvement of these employment representatives who are knowledgeable about the needs of a technical society should be sought. Their advice and counsel on worker qualifications, training needs, job placement and program evaluation could have great impact on the improvement of those programs that utilize their competence.

## CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

Occupational education as defined by the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and 1968 Amendments is to provide skills and knowledge which will enable youth and adults to enter in or advance within a specific occupation or group of related occupations which require less than a baccalaureate degree. Evaluatior. of programs of occupational education is mandated by the same legislation. National advisory committees on vocational education since 1938 have continually identified the lack of systematic followup of students after graduation or placement as a weakness in need of attention.

The technique of assessing the quality of program products via followup survey is believed to be an essential component of an evaluation system. Followup assessment is viewed by many as an important element in improving the responsiveness of occupational education to the needs of society. In early 1972, the Illinois Division of Vocational and Technical Education (hereafter referred to as the I,D.V.T.E.) Research and Development Unit cortracted with the Center for Educational Studies at Eastern Illinois University to develop and test a system which would deliver followup data on a continuous basis. This continuous flow of uniform data is needed to replace the sporadic and isolated research activity of the past. The data will facilitate the establishment of priorities for the allocation of fiscal resources and guard against ineffective or misdirected educational programs.

The initial study design underwent modifications for a number of reasons. The survey sample was to consist of a population of "Class of '71" occupational
advisory personnel in local schools it became apparent that this approach was not feasible. After consultation with I.D.V.T.E. personnel,it was decided that followup procedures be designed to be initiated by the I.D.V.T.E. rather than the local districts. Survey results would then be transmitted back to the local districts. This approach will assist LEA personnel in evaluating program outcomes and enable them to devise better educational strategies and programs.

## DEFINITIONS

The terminology and definitions--in effect, a language of communication-concerning different components of career education are in a state of flux. In order to communicate specific information concerning the scope of this project the following definitions, taken from Standard Terminology for Curriculum and Instruction in Local and State School Systems (U.S.O.E. publication, 1970), were adopted:

Course--An organization of subject matter and related learning experiences provided for the instruction of pupils on a regular or systematic basis, usually for a predetermined period of time (e.g., a semester, a regular school term, and a 2-week workshop). Credit toward graduation or completion of a program of studies generally is given pupils for the successful completion of a course. 1

Vocational Course--A course approved under State Plan requirements for vocational and technical education. 2

A program of studies--is a combination of related courses and/or selfcontained classes organized for the attainment of specific educational objectives e.g., a program of special education for handicapped, a college preparatory

[^0]* program, an occupational program (in a given occupation or cluster of occupations), a general education program, and a transfer program. ${ }^{3}$

Occupational training program--A secondary school, junior college, or an adult education program of studies designed primarily to prepare pupils for entrance into a specific occupation or cluster of occupations. This includes aspects of programs such as "vocational education", "cooperative on-the-job training." 4

Vocational Program--A program of studies designed primarily to prepare pupils for work in the occupational area between that of the unskilled employee and that of the technician. 5

A program completion--is an indiviaual who has completed a program.

## OBJECTIVES

Study objectives were predicated on the assumptions that: (1) the basic purpose of career education curriculum is to insure gainful employment in a specific or related occupation; ${ }^{6}$ if the graduate cannot be placed in the field for which he is prepared something is wrong, 7 and (2) the graduate and his employer know the strengths and weaknesses of the program of employment preparation. 8 The overall objectives of the project were to:

1. Design and develop a system to gather, process and interpret followup data in formats usable by local vocational administrators with emphasis
${ }^{3}$ Ibid., p. 42.
${ }^{4}$ Ibid., p. 88 ( X 21 43.10)
${ }^{5}$ Ibid., p. 88 ( $\times 21$ 43.30)
${ }^{6}$ Professional and Curriculum Development Unit. A Research Model for Curriculum Development in Vocational/Technical Education, pg. 35.

7Rupert N. Evans, Garth L. Mangum, and Otto Pragan. Preparation. For Employment: The Background and Potential of the 1968 Vocational Education Amendments. Ainn Arbor, Michigan: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, The University of Michigan - Wayne State University Washington, D.C.: National Manpower Policy Task Force, May, 1969, pg. 55.

8 Ibid., pg. 54.
on followup of students after graduating, completing, a program, or dropping out to determine (a) relatedness between any training program and any employment situation, and (b) to measure the effectiveness of occupational programs.
2. Test the system by conducting an extensive in-depth followup study to determine the impact of occupational training programs on post-high school employment experiences, individual career development, and readiness for employment of students completing occupational programs in those schools scheduled for evaluation in FY 1973 under the DVTE Three Phase System for Statewide Evaluation of Occupational Education Programs.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE DESIRED SYSTEM
In order to meet various state and local needs for data on program effectiveness the desired system should:
?. Provide information on program outcomes rather than processes;
2. Enable measurement of the progress of efforts toward achieving program objectives;
3. Provide feedback of followup data in formats usable by local vocational administrators and instructional personnel; and
4. Provide followup data to meet the needs of state personnel in reporting statewide data and determining educational needs and priorities.

## CHAPTER II

PROCEDURES

## INTRODUCTION

Programs of occupational training by nature differ in course content and physical facilities because they reflect the unique characteristics of dissimilar geographic areas. Therefore, it was necessary to identify characteristics which are common to successful occupational education programs, regardless of level, setting or location. Instruments and procedures for assessing program effectiveness can be designed only when these common objectives have been identified.

Based on the findings of literature review, meetings and interviews with occupational educators and utilization of special consultants, goal statements were formulated which reflected common characteristics of occupational education programs in the state of Illinois. Design of study survey instruments was predicated on the following assumptions concerning occupational education in Illinois:

Curriculum

1. The curriculum is designed to provide students opportunities to acquire and practice manipulative skills, technical knowiedge, and related subject matter essential to qualify them for employment.
2. The curriculum provides opportunities for the development of competence in using tools, machines and materials of the occupation.
3. In programs to prepare students for entry into an occupation, the curriculum is designed to develop required abilities, including:

Requisite skills and knowledge, desirable work habits and attitudes, pride in workmanship, habits of occupationally acceptable personal grooming and dress, understanding appropriate employer-employeecustomer relationships, knowledge of personal and business ethics. necessary communication skills, and habits of good health and safety practices.
4. Curricular content is based upon current employment practices.
5. The curriculum is planned to be articulated with advanced technical post-high school programs, as well as to provide training for entry employment in specific occupations.

## Instruction

1. Occupational instruction develops to a marketable degree the abilities required by the occupation and the abilities to reason, solve problems, think independently, and make judgments necessary for employment in the chosen occupation.
2. Care is taken to assure that students understand and can meet licensing requirements, union memberships and other factors that may affect their employability.
3. Employment instruction includes such topics as: How to seek and obtain employment, social security, workman's compensation, the preparation of applications and resumes, the acquisition of personal tools and equipment, appropriate grooming, employment testing, and social and attitudinal skills neceasary for obtaining employment and for advancing on the job.

Vocational Guidance

1. Students have had early occupational orientation and experience vital to making immediate and long range career decisions.
2. Students are enrolled in occupational programs in which they have reasonable chance for successful completion and probability of successful employment.
3. The student's occupational progran is planned around his career objective.

## ALUMNI SAMPLE

Personnel from the Program Approval and Evaluation Unit of the I.D.V.T.E. requested that the followup sample consist of program completions from the secondary schools scheduled for on-site evaluation under the unit's Three Phase Evaluation System. Summarized followup data would then be available to members of the visitation teams to assist them in identifying target areas for evaluation of a school.'s occupational training programs.

Occupational alumni from the "Class of '71" would comprise the alumni population. The majority of occupational programs in Illinois under the 1968 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act of 1963 became operational in 1970. Therefore, 1971 would be the first class with alumni completing an occupational training program sequence.

Illinois is divided into six geographical regions. Region $I$, which includes Cook County, has two regional directors (one for Cook County and one for the rest of the region). In this study, Cook County was treated as a separate region. Under the Three Phase Evaluation System, approximately one-fifth of those school districts receiving reimbursement for occupational training programs are scheduled for on-site visitation each year. The Regional Director in each region selects the schools to te evaluated. In the selection process, efforts were made to see that schools were geographically distributed throughout the region. (See Figure 1)

A flyer describing the followup project accompanied the official notice of jisitation that was sent to the LEA's scheduled for evaluation in FY 1973. A

FIGURE 1
GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS PARTICIPATING IN THE SURVEY BY REGIONS

week later each of the individual school superintendents was mailed an introductory le.ter from the followup project director and asked to name a contact person within the school system if the LEA desired to participate in the study. Ninety-une of the 96 secondary school districts scheduled for evaluation participated in the study representing 102 individual schools (See Table 1). Reasons for not participating were: no program completions for the specified year, followup had already been done on "Class of '71" students, school personnel preferred to do their own followup survey, or personnel changes made it impossible to participate.

TABLE 1

## SUMMARY OF SCHOOLS PARTICIPATING BY REGION

|  | Number of <br> Secondary Districts <br> Being Evaluated | Number of <br> Districts Participating <br> in Followup Study | Number of <br> Indiviclual Schools |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region | 8 | $7 *$ | $12 * *$ |
| Cook County | 14 | 13 | 16 |
| Region I | 15 | 15 | 18 |
| Region II | 14 | 13 | 13 |
| Region III | 18 | 17 | 17 |
| Region IV | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Region V | 13 | 12 | 12 |
| Region VI | $\overline{96}$ | $\overline{102}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

[^1]Table 2 compares the sample to the total program completions in Illinois by program areas for the 1970-71 school year. The evaluation cycle is planned so that every school receiving federal reimbursement is evaluated once every five years. Survey questionnaires were mailed to approximately 20 percent of the total Illinois occupational program completions. All unduplicated "Class of '7l" occupational training program alumni whose names and usable addresses
were provided by participating school personnel were mailed survey instruments.
Five program areas are recognized by the I.D.V.T.E. for occupational programs in Illinois. One of the problems encountered by LEA's in the O.E. Coding of occupational training programs was the non-existence of an appropriate code to designate "interrelated" or "cooperative work experience" programs. Many LEA's used either a general $01.0000,04.0000,07.0000$, etc., code or a $01.9900,04.9900,07.9900$, etc., code to designate such programs. Other LEA's used the Code Number 16.9900 which is a number designating a Special Program-Secondary Level. This does not allow for classification of the specific program area in which the student was trained. As a result, a sixth category-Special Programs was utilized to report the findings for programs coded 18.9900. Programs coded within a program area ( 01.0000 or 01.9900 ) were included in the appropriate program area but measuring the relatedness of the training taken to subsequent employment was not always possible because of the broad nature of these code numbers.

The largest number of questionnaires sent by program area was to alumni of Business, Marketing and Management occupational programs (49.2 percent). Industrial programs accounted for 34.4 percent of the alumni sampie. The remaining 16.4 percent of the questionnaires sent were to alumni of all other program areas. (See Table 2)

In this document, the following abbreviations appear at the head of data column when findings are reported by program areas:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { AGRI BUS: App1ied Biological and Agricultural Occupati ; } \\
& \text { BUS OCC : Business, Marketing and Management occupations (includes } \\
& \text { HLTH OCC: } \begin{array}{l}
\text { Distributive Occupations) }
\end{array} \\
& \text { INealth Occupations } \\
& \text { IND OCC } \\
& \text { P\&P SERV } \\
& \text { SPEC PROG: Personial Oriented Occupations } \\
& \text { Sublic Service Occupations } \\
& \\
& \text { Cooperative Work Experience of interrelated on-the-job } \\
& \text { training programs under the 0.E. Code } 18.9900 \text { in which the } \\
& \text { STATE } \quad \text { Specific job for which trained was not identified }
\end{aligned}
$$

## SURVEY SAMPLE AS COMPARED TO TOTAL PROGRAM COMPLETIONS IN ILLINOIS (FY 1971) BY PROGRAM AREA

|  | Illinois completions* |  | Sent** |  | Usable Response |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Program Area | Number | \% | Number | \% | Number | \% |
| Total BUS OCC | 34,369 | 56.0 | 5,912 | 49.2 | 2,787 | 53.6 |
| Total IND OCC | 17,237 | 28.1 | 4,133 | 34.4 | 1,607 | 30.9 |
| Total P\&P SERV | 4,662 | 7.6 | 553 | 4.6 | 259 | 5.0 |
| Total AGRI BUS | 4,123 | 6.7 | 542 | 4.5 | 223 | 4.3 |
| Total HLTH OCC | 954 | 1.6 | 298 | 2.5 | 160 | 3.1 |
| Total SPEC PROG, N.E.C.*** | 0 | 0.0 | 582 | 4.8 | 167 | 3.2 |
| GRAND TOTAL | 61,372 | 100.0 | 12;020 | $19.6{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 5,203 | 8.9 b |

*Taken from O.E. Form 3139, Illinois, Secondary level, dated 5 '71
**A11 unduplicated "Class of '71" occupational program alumni whose names and addresses were provided by local districts were mailed survey instruments.
***N.E.C.-- "Not Elsewhere Classified", are Cooperative Work Experience or
Interrelated on-the-job training programs under the O.E. Code 18.9900. The specific program areas in which training was taken was not specified.
apercent of Grand Total completions (column 1)
bPercent of Grand Total completions (column 1)
Table 3 summarizes the response rate of alumni to the survey by regions.
Column 2 represents the percentage of questionnaires returned by the U.S.
Postal Service as undeliverable. The number of questionnaires postally returned was subtracted from the number of questionnaires sent to determine the number of questionnaires assumed received. The response rate was calculated using this adjusted number. Column 4 represents the percentage of responses received that were unusable due to inaccurate or incomplete data. It was discovered that some schools included other than "Class of '71" program alumni. Two schools
participating in the survey sent only "Class of '72" alumni and these responses were coded non-usable in order to keep the sample as originally specified. The percentage of usable alumni responses to the survey was 46.4 percent.

TABLE 3
ALUMNI RESPONSE RATE BY REGION

|  | Number of <br> Questionnaires <br> Sent | Percent <br> Postally <br> Returned | Number of <br> Responses | Percent of <br> Nonusable <br> Responses | Percent of <br> Usable <br> Responses |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region | 3,547 | 9.41 | 1,411 | 2.83 | 42.67 |
| Cook County | 2,571 | 5.52 | 1,152 | 5.03 | $45 . C 3$ |
| Region I | 1,638 | 4.95 | 781 | 9.22 | 45.51 |
| Region II | 918 | 4.47 | 480 | 2.78 | 53.36 |
| Region II | 1,306 | 4.59 | 609 | 8.05 | 45.27 |
| Region IV | 1,195 | 6.44 | 630 | 2.22 | 55.19 |
| Region V | 846 | 6.38 | 394 | 2.04 | 48.73 |
| Region VI |  |  | 6.56 | 5,457 | 4.65 |
| State Totals |  | 12,021 |  |  | 46.36 |

## EMPLOYER/SUPERVISOR SAMPLE

Responding alumni employed at the time of the survey were asked to provide the name and business addresses of their employer or supervisor. Three thousand one hundred and forty-nine $(3,149)$ employer or supervisors were identified and mailed survey instruments. Table 4 summarizes the employer response by region.

TABLE 4
EMPLOYER RESPONSE RATE BY REGION

|  | Number of <br> Questionnaires <br> Sent | Number of <br> Posta 1 <br> Returns | Number of <br> Responses | Percent of <br> Responses |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region | 848 | 13 |  |  |
| Cook County | 731 | 6 | 677 | 81.1 |
| Region I | 447 | 0 | 613 | 84.6 |
| Region II | 250 | 1 | 384 | 85.9 |
| Region III | 370 | 0 | 214 | 85.9 |
| Region IV | 306 | 3 | 324 | 87.6 |
| Region V | 197 | 1 | 267 | 88.1 |
| Region VI |  | 24 | 172 | 87.8 |
| State Totals |  |  |  |  |

Employer/Supervisors polled responded well to the request for help in evaluating occupational program effectiveness. This high response rate appears to indicate that employers are willing to participate in evaluating the preparation for, employment that is provided for students in secondary programs.

## DEVELOPMENT AND USE OF SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

Design of survey instruments was predicated on the statements reflecting cormon characteristics of occupational training programs in the state of Illinois. These statements were presented in the first section of this chapter.

One indication of a successful occupational training program is the ability of the training institution to develop occupational competency in students. Indications that this objective has been reasonably achieved are:

1. Program completions obtain, hold, and advance in jobs related to their proparation;
2. Program completions feel that their preparation has been relevant to their employment needs;
3. Employers feel program completions have been well prepared for their job;
4. Program completions feel satisfied with their jobs;
5. Program completions recommend the program to others; and
6. Negative (undesirable) outcomes are minimal. Negative outcomes and indices of negative outcomes include:
a. program completions and/or employers of program completwons express dissatisfaction with preparation received.
b. program completions' job performance is unsatisfactory, and/or
c. program completions fail to obtain or hold a job in the field of preparation.

Followup data measuring the progress of occupational training programs toward achieving general objectives should include:

1. Employment status: employed, unemployed, never employed, not available to the labor force;
2. Field of employment: related, somewhat related, not related, not employed;
3. Job mobility profile;
4. Education since leaving high school;
5. Satisfaction with job held; and
6. Satisfaction with occupational preparation frovided by the training institution.

The survey instruments were designed to collect data usable by administrators at both state and local leveis. Survey instruments were originally developed in doctoral research at The Ohio State University. Personnel from The Center for Vocational and Tecinnical Education reviewed and verified data items. From May 15, 1971 through August 31, 1971, personnel in the School of Home Economics at Eastern Illinois University under contract with the Research and Development Unit of the I.D.V.T.E., conducted an exploratory study of Illinois Cooperative Home Economics Occupational Program graduates. This study was designed to test the use of certain procedures and instruments for possible use in a statewide investigation of all occupational training programs. Revisions were made to adapt the instruments to all five occupational program areas. Revised instruments were reviewed by I.D.V.T.E. personnel in the Research and Development, the Program Approval and Evaluation, and the Special Programs--Guidance units and by guidance and administrative personnel in small, medium and large school districts. The alumni instrument was then pilot tested using former occupational students from the different program areas. Further refinements were made to accomodate suggestions made by reviewers and the pilot test group.

The Educational Testing Service on behalf of the State of Illinois Advisory Council on Vocational Education reviewed survey instruments and procedures
developed for followup study. The review of the followup materials was quite favorable. The report of the study states:
"The followrup procedures that were prepared for pilot use by the Center for Educational Studies at Eastern Illinois University include many of the features that should be found in good follow-up instrumentation."!

## DATA COLLECTION

Three mailings were utilized to obtain maximum response. The first request consisted of a cover letter from the local school district, a survey instrument and a stamped addressed return envelope. A reminder postcard to nonrespondents was sent ten days after the initial mailing. After another ten day interval, a third riailing consisting of a second copy of the questionnaire, local district cover letter, and stamped return envelope was posted to nonrespondents. Mailing procedures were the same for both alumni and employer/supervisor populations. (See Appendix D for instruments, cover letters and postcard reminders.)

PROCESSING OF DATA
Returned instruments were reviewed and coded for processing. Data was then keypunched. When an alumni indicated leaving school in a year other than during or upon compietion of the 1970-71 school year, the LEA contact person was asked to verify the date of completion or leaving school. In cases where the leaving date was not consistent with the specified survey requirements, the response was considered non-usable.

[^2]
## CHAPTER III

## DESCRIPTION OF ALUMNI RESPONDENTS

The major purpose of the followup survey was to determine the status of occupational program completions after one years availability to the labor force. However, some data concerning the characteristics of the sample were gathered. This general information is presented in this chapter.

RESPONSE RATE OF ALUMNI POPULATION
Alumni of Health Occupations programs responded best (53.7 per cent). Business, Marketing and Management alumni responded at a 47.1 percent rate and Personal and Public Services alumni at a 46.9 percent rate. Only 28.3 percent of the Special Programs (Interrelated, CWE, etc.) alumni responded. (See Table 5.) Alumni from Region $V$ responded above state averages in all program areas. Region III alumni responded above state averages in all but the Business, Marketing, and Management Occupations program area. The overall response rate for Cook County and Region IV alumni was below the state average.

STATUS OF RESPONDENT WHEN LEAVING HIGH SCHOOL
One of the characteristics desired in design of the alumni survey instrument was that alumni leaving school prior to graduation could complete the questionnaire as well as high school graduates. For the study, an occupational training program completion was defined as an individual who completed an occupational training program and (1) graduated from high school, or (2) left school without graduating. Therefore, dropouts of programs were not followed up but those members of the "Class of '7l" who completed a program and left school without graduating were included.

Table 6 shows that only 1.4 percent of the respondents had completed an occupational training program and left school without graduating. This number was not large enough to allow separate reporting of findings and so they are included in other tables with graduates of high school. Approximately 10 percent of those completing Special Programs (Cooperative Work Experience or Interrelated Programs not classified by specific program codes) left school prior to graduating. Only 1.8 percent of these alumni indicated they left school to enter the labor force. Another 6.8 percent gave "personal reasons" or "didn't like school" as reasons for not completing high school. The other 1.2 percent left school to enter another school or training program. Approximately 99 percent of the respondents were high school graduates.

SEX
In the total sample (See Table 6) femãles constituted 54.6 percent of the population, males 45.3 percent. Applied Biological and Agricultural Occupations (Agri. Bus.) and Industrial Oriented Occupations (Ind. Occ.) were typically male program areas. Typically female program areas included Health Occupations (Hlth. Occ.) and Personal and Public Service (P\&P Serv.). Witin the exception of some programs in the Business, Marketing, and Management Occupations (Bus. Occ.) program completions were generally female. (See Table 7 for exceptions.) Males predominated in Special Programs but not to the extent that it could be considered an area in which one sex or another generally enrolled.

## SPECIFIC PROGRAMS' COMPLETED

Two hundred and thirteen specific occupational training programs are recognized by the I.D.V.T.E. in the publication Vocational and Technical Education: Descriptions, Definitions and D.E. Coding. For the punpose of clarity, programs are reported in Table 6 by subject matter and principal

TABLE 5
RESPONSE RATE* BY PROGRAM AREA, REGION AND STATE

*Not adjusted to exclude postal returns.

TABLE 6
CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS BY PROGRAM AREA.

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AGRI } \\ & \text { BUS } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BUS } \\ \text { OCC } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | HLTH OCC \% | $\begin{gathered} \text { IND } \\ \text { OCC } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | P\&P SERV \% | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { SPPEC } \\ \text { PROG } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { STATE } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. $\frac{\text { Graduate Status }}{\text { Graduated }}$ | 98.7 | 99.1 | 98.7 | 98.8 | 95.9 | 90.2 | 98.6 |
| Completed program; did not graduate | 1.3 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 3.1 | 9.8 | 1.4 |
| Number responding | 223 | 2764 | 159 | 1589 | 257 | 163 | 5155 |
| 2. $\frac{\text { Sex }}{\text { Male }}$ | 98.7 | 19.5 | 4.4 | 90.2 | 10.4 | 68.9 | 45.3 |
| Female | 1.3 | 80.5 | 95.6 | 9.8 | 89.4 | 31.1 | 54.6 |
| Number responding | 223 | 2786 | 160 | 1604 | 259 | 167 | 5199 |

segment (first four digits in the 0.E. Code, e.g., 01.01) with the exception of Home Economics Occupations (gainful) and Technical Education which need six digits to specify training prog̉ram. Since the 74 principle programs identified by LEA's participating in the survey would be unwieldy, findings are reported in the rest of this document by the six program areas described in Chapter 2.

## ENCOURAGERS TO ENROLL IN OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING PROGRAM

Approximately one-half of the respondents indicated no one encouraged them to enroll in the occupational training program they completed ( 46 percent). Program selection was influenced by school personnel (Table 7, rows three and four combined) in 20.3 percent of the cases. Parents, guardian, or other family member were ideritified as influencers by 20.2 percent of the respondents. Peer group encouragement (rows five and six combined) was indicated by 11. 5 percent of the respondents.

## SEX OF RESPONDENTS BY PROGRAM TAKEN

| 0.E. <br> Program Code | Program Title | $\underset{\%}{\text { Male }}$ | Female <br> \% | Number <br> in <br> State |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AGRI BUS |  |  |  |  |
| 01.00 | Applied Biological \& Agricultural Occupations | 100.0 | 0.0 | 26 |
| 01.01 | Agicultural Production | 96.2 | 3.8 | 106 |
| 01.02 | Agricultural Supply \& Services | 100.0 | 0.0 | 10 |
| 01.03 | Agricultural Mechanics | 100.0 | 0.0 | 36 |
| 01.04 | Agricultural Products | 100.0 | 0.0 | 2 |
| 01.05 | Ornamental Horticulture | 91.7 | 8.3 | 12 |
| 01.06 | Agricultural Resources | 100.0 | 0.0 | 8 |
| 01.07 | Forestry | 100.0 | 0.0 | 1 |
| 01.99 | Agriculture; Other | 100.0 | 0.0 | 22 |
| BUS OCC |  |  |  |  |
| 04.00 | Distributive Education | 32.7 | 67.3 | 52 |
| 04.01 | Advertising Services | 100.0 | 00.0 | 1 |
| 04.02 | Apparel \& Accessories | 50.0 | 50.0 | 2 |
| 04.03 | Automotive | 100.0 | 00.0 | 3 |
| 04.06 | Food Distribution | 16.7 | 83.3 | 12 |
| 04.08 | General Merchandise | 48.3 | 51.7 | 87 |
| 04.09 | Hardware, Building Materials, Farm \& Garden Supplies \& Equipment | 00.0 | 100.0 | 2 |
| 04.10 | Home Furnishings | 100.0 | 00.0 | , |
| 04.20 | Retail Trade; Other | 80.0 | 20.0 | 20 |
| 04.99 | Distributive: Other (Businesses not Classifiable as either Wholesale or Retail) | 42.5 | 57.5 | 179 |
| 14.00 | Office Occupations | 07.7 | 92.3 | 91 |
| 14.01 | Accounting \& Computing Occupations | 44.0 | 56.0 | 489 |
| 14.02 | Business Data Processing Systems Occupations | 40.7 | 59.3 | 91 |
| 14.03 | Filing, Cffice Machines, \& General Office <br> Clerical Occupations | 05.5 | 94.5 | 381 |
| 14.04 | Information Communication Occupations | 33.3 | 66.7 | 3 |
| 14.05 | Materials Support Occupations | 71.4 | 28.6 | 7 |
| 14.06 | Personnel, Training, \& Related Occupations | 50.0 | 50.0 | 2 |
| 14.07 | Stenographic, Secretarial, \& Related Occupations | 02.1 | 97.9 | 906 |
| 14.08 | Supervisory \& Administrative Management Occupations | 72.7 | 27.3 | 11 |
| 14.09 | Clerk-Typist | 14.9 | 85.1 | 269 |
| 14.99 | Office Occupations; Other (n.e.c.) | 12.2 | 87.8 | 139 |
| 16.0117 | Scientific Data Processing | 34.2 | 65.8 | 38 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { SPEC PRO } \\ & 18.99 \end{aligned}$ | Special Program, Secondary | 68.9 | 31.1 | 167 |

Table 7 continued

| 0.E. <br> Program Code | Program Title | $\underset{\%}{M a l e}$ | Female \% | Number in State |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HLTH OCC |  |  |  |  |
| 07.00 | Health Occupations | 05.6 | 94.4 | 18 |
| 07.01 | Dental | 00.0 | 100.0 | 1 |
| 07.02 | Medical Laboratory Technology | 100.0 | 00.0 | 1 |
| 07.03 | Nursing | 01.8 | 98.2 | 112 |
| 07.04 | Rehabilitation Assistant | 33.3 | 66.7 | 3 |
| 07.05 | Radiologic | 00.0 | 100.0 | 2 |
| 07.09 | Miscellaneous Health Occupations | 08.3 | 91.7 | 12 |
| 07.99 | Health Occupations; Other | 09.1 | 90.9 | 11 |
| P\&P SERV |  |  |  |  |
| 09:00 | Home Economics | 00.0 | 100.0 | 4 |
| 09.0200 | Occupational Preparation | 05.7 | 94.3 | 35 |
| 09.0201 | Care and Guidance of Children | 00.0 | 100.0 | 37 |
| 09.0202 | Clothing Management, Production, \& Services | 00.0 | 100.0 | 26 |
| 09.0203 | Food Management, Production, \& Services | 19.4 | 80.6 | 36 |
| 09.0204 | Home Furnishings, Equipment, \& Services | 00.0 | 100.0 | 14 |
| 09.0205 | Institutional \& Home Management \& Supporting Services | 00.0 | 100.0 | 17 |
| 09.99 | Occupatiunal Preparation; Other | 08.0 | 92.0 | 25 |
| 17.26 | Personal Services (Cosmetology) | 07.3 | 92.7 | 41 |
| 17.29 | Quantity Food Occupations | 54.2 | 45.8 | 24 |
| IND OCC |  |  |  |  |
| 16.0100 | Engineering Related Technology | 100.0 | 00.0 | 8 |
| 16.0103 | Architectural Technology | 100.0 | 00.0 | 6 |
| 16.0105 | Chemical Technology | 100.0 | 00.0 | 1 |
| 16.0108 | Electronic Technology | 100.0 | 00.0 | 15 |
| 16.06 | Miscellaneous Technical Education (n.e.c.) | 50.0 | 50.0 | 2 |
| 17.00 | Trade and Industrial Occupations | 71.2 | 28.8 | 66 |
| 17.01 | Air Conditioning | 100.0 | 00.0 | 4 |
| 17.02 | Appliance Repair | 85.7 | 14.3 | 7 |
| 17.03 | Automotive Services | 96.6 | 03.4 | 236 |
| 17.04 | Aviation Occupations | 93.8 | 06.3 | 16 |
| 17.07 | Commercial Art Occupations | 40.5 | 59.5 | 37 |
| 17.09 | Commercial Photography Occupations | 50.0 | 50.0 | 4 |
| 17.10 | Construction \& Maintenance Trades | 99.2 | 00.8 | 133 |
| 17.13 | Drafting | 95.8 | 04.2 | 288 |
| 17.14 | Industrial Electrician | 92.3 | 07.7 | 26 |
| 17.15 | Electronics Occupations | 99.3 | 00.7 | 142 |
| 17.19 | Graphic Arts Occupations | 89.4 | 10.6 | 94 |
| 17.23 | Metalworking | 100.0 | 00.0 | 236 |
| 17.27 | Plastics Occupations | 00.0 | 100.0 | 4 |
| 17.31 | Small Engine Repair, Internal Combustion | 90.9 | 09.1 | 11 |
| 17.33 | Textile Production \& Fabrication | 41.2 | 58.8 | 17 |
| 17.35 | Upholstering | 100.0 | 00.0 | 1 |
| 17.36 | Wocdworking | 100.0 | 00.0 | 46 |
| 17.99 | Trade and Industrial Occupations (n.e.c.) | 69.6 | 30.4 | 204 |

SOURCE OF ENC.OURAGEMENT TO ENROLL IN OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING BY PROGRAM AREA

| Encouragers | AGRI BUS <br> \% | $\begin{gathered} \text { BUS } \\ \text { OCC } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | HLTH <br> OCC <br> \% | $\begin{gathered} \text { IND } \\ \text { OCC } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Fixp } \\ \text { SERV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { SPEC } \\ \text { PROG } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { STATE } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No one | 43.7 | 46.6 | 40.8 | 46.7 | 44.9 | 39.3 | 46.0 |
| Parent(s), guardian, or family member | 24.6 | 22.9 | 13.6 | 16.4 | 15.7 | 17.2 | 20.2 |
| Guidance counselor or administrator | 9.6 | 9.8 | 15.0 | 12.3 | 16.1 | 21.4 | 11.4 |
| A teacher | 11.1 | 8.4 | 9.5 | 9.5 | 9.3 | 6.2 | 8.9 |
| A student who took the program | 5.0 | 4.7 | 9.5 | 6.2 | 5.9 | 11.0 | 5.6 |
| A friend | 4.0 | 5.6 | 10.9 | 6.6 | 5.5 | 4.1 | 5.9 |
| Other | 2.0 | 1.9 | 0.7 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 0.7 | 2.0 |
| Number responding | 199 | 2553 | 147 | 1427 | 236 | 145 | 4707 |

## CHAPTER IV

## POST HIGH SCHOOL EXPERIENCE OF ALUMNI RESPONDENTS

## INTRODUCTION

In assessing the progress of occupational education toward meeting Congressional mandates set forth in the Vocational Education Amendment of 1968, data on the post high schocl experience of program completions must be considered. Larson reports that quality programs of employment preparation grow out of the needs of people. If individuals can be taught how to work and be provided with employment skills, knowledges, habits and attitudes in keeping with the needs of employers, the costs of welfare and institutional care will be diminished. 1 Swanson observed that vocational education has little value to the individual or to the economy unless the skills which are learned enable a person to obtain and hold a job. Students must be able and willing to perform services and produce products which are in demand in the labor market. 2

Unider the broad concepts of occupational training in Illinois, students should be encouraged to enroll in occupational programs in which they have reasonable chance for successful completion and probability of successful employment. Students who have successfully completed occupational training programs should be able to obtain, hold and advance in jobs related to their

[^3]preparation.
Findings reported in this chapter are concerned with the status of occupational program completions after one years availability to the labor force; length of time it took to find initial employment; number of jobs held since leaving school; reasons for job changes; relatedness of employment at the time of the survey to training taken; reasons for non-related employment; satisfaction with job held at the time of the survey.

STATUS OF RESPONDENTS AT THE TIME OF THE SURVEY
The percentage of alumni who were in the labor force at the time of the survey ranged from a high of 86 percent in Industrial Oriented Occupations to a low of 58.4 percent in Health Occupations. A high of 28.3 percent of the Health Occupations alumni were not available to the labor force, however. The percentage of alumni who were unemployed and actively seeking empioyment at the time of the survey ranged from 3.6 percent in Agri-Business Occupations to a high of 11.6 percent of those prepared in Special Programs. (See Table 9).

STATUS OF RESPONDENTS IN CONTINUING EDUCATION
While it can be argued that failure to enter the labor market coristitutes failure of occupational instruction, it is considered by many that further education, perhaps induced by the training program is not contrary to the best interest of occupational alumin or to the interests of society in general. The strict interpretation of the stated purpose of occupational education to prepare students to enter the labor market limits the broad scope envisioned for such education. One amplification of the directives of the 1968 Amendments may be found in the following statement considered worthy of "serious consideration" by the House Committee on Education and Labor (House Report No. 1647). "Vocational programs should be developmental, not terminal, providing maximum options for
TABLE 9
STATUS OF RESPONDENTS AT THE TIME OF THE SURVEY BY PROGRAM AREA＊

| Program Area |  | Employed Labor Force |  |  |  |  |  | Unemployed Labor Force | Military Labor Force | Not Available to the Labor Force |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AGRI BUS | 220 | 48.6 | 01.8 | 01.4 | 01.4 | 18.2 | 71.4 | 03.6 | 10.9 | 12.7 | 00.0 | 01.4 | 14.1 |
| BUS OCC | 2762 | 48.6 | 04.1 | 02.5 | 03.1 | 14.0 | 72.3 | 06.0 | 01.9 | 13.0 | 04.3 | 02.1 | 19.4 |
| HLTH OCC | 159 | 37.1 | 02.5 | 01.9 | 03.1 | 13.8 | 58.4 | 10.9 | 02.5 | 15.7 | 05.0 | 07.6 | 28.3 |
| IND OCC | 1598 | 49.8 | 16.0 | 02.6 | 04.1 | 13.5 | 86.0 | 06.0 | 09.5 | 09.9 | 00.5 | 01.3 | 11.7 |
| P\＆P SERV | 255 | 45.9 | 09.0 | 00.4 | 01.2 | 07.5 | 64.0 | 09.8 | 02.8 | 07.1 | 13.3 | 03.1 | 23.5 |
| SPEC PROG | 164 | 51.8 | 07.9 | 02.4 | 02.4 | 05.5 | 70.0 | 11.6 | 01.8 | 03.7 | 04.3 | 0 0． 5 | 16.5 |
| STATE | 5158 | 48.6 | 04.0 | 02.4 | 03.2 | 13.4 | 71.6 | 06.4 | 04.9 | 11.5 | 03.4 | 02.2 | 17.1 |

students to go to college, pursue postsecondary vocational and technical training or find employment."3

Of the 30.5 percent of the survey respondents who were continuing their education at the time of the survey, 62.2 percent were also in the labor market and 81.7 percent were full-time students. Whether the secondary occupational training induced further education or provided employment skills which enabled respondents to help pay their way, was not determined in this study. However, this large percentage who combined work and study must be taken into consideration when assessing labor force participation. (See Table 10).

LENGTH OF INITIAL JOB SEARCH
Sixty percent of the respondents who have been employed at some time sinco leaving high school found their first job within a month after leaving school. Approximately 12 percent of the alumni had never been employed since leaving high school. (See Table 11). Alumni of Health Occupations ( 20.8 percent) and Personal and Public Service (13 percent) program areas had the highest percentage of never employed respondent. Programs completions in these areas were female in nature. Only 9.8 percent of the Industrial Oriented alumni (largely male in nature) and 9.2 percent of the Special Program alumni had not been employed since leaving high school.

## REASONS FOR NEVER HAVING BEEN EMPLOYED

A majority of those respondents who had never been employed since leaving high school were in school (59.2 percent). Those alumni indicating they had

[^4]TABLE 10

## STATUS OF RESPONDENTS IN CONTINUING EDUCATION AT THE TIME OF THE SURVEY BY PROGRAM AREA

| Status | $\begin{gathered} \text { AGRI } \\ \text { BUS } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BUS } \\ \text { OCC } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | HLTH OCC $\qquad$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { IND } \\ \text { OCC } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { P\&P } \\ \text { SERV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { SPEC } \\ \text { PROG } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { STATE } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percent of all respondents who are in continuing education | 33.7 | 32.6 | 43.5 | 30.1 | 16.2 | 14.0 | 30.5 |
| School part-time; work part-time | 1.4 | 2.5 | 1.9 | 2.6 | 0.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 |
| School part-time; work fuil-time | 1.4 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 4.1 | 1.2 | 2.4 | 3.2 |
| Full-time student; work part-time | 18.2 | 14.0 | 13.8 | 13.5 | 7.5 | 5.5 | 13.5 |
| Full-time student | 12.7 | 13.0 | 15.7 | 9.9 | 7.1 | 3.7 | 11.5 |
| Percent of respondents in continuing education who are also in the labor force |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent of those in continuing education who are full-time students | 91.9 | 82.8 | 85.5 | 77.7 | 90.2 | 65.2 | 81.7 |
| Number responding | 74 | 902 | 55 | 480 | 41 | 23 | 1575 |

"not been able to get a job" ranged from a high of 22.5 percent (Personal and Public Service) to a low of 2.4 percent (Agri-Business) with an overall average for the state of 12.9 percent. Respondents who did not want a job ranged from a high of 27.5 percent in Personal and Public Service and 21.2 percent in Health Occupations (female areas in enrollment) to a low of 1.5 percent in Industrial Occupations and 0 percent in Agri-Business (generally male areas of enrollment). In assessing program effectiveness based on these findings, women's work patterns should be taken into consideration. Overall, only . 6 percent of the never employed respondents indicated they couldn't earn enough money to make it work working. (See Table 12).

TABLE 11
LENGTH OF TIME TO FIND FIRST JOB BY PROGRAM AREA

|  | AGRI <br> BUS <br> $\%$ | BUS <br> OCC <br> $\%$ | HLTH <br> OCC <br> $\%$ | IND <br> OCC <br> $\%$ | P\&P <br> SERV <br> $\%$ | SPEC <br> PROG <br> $\%$ | STATE <br> $\%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Less than one month | 66.2 | 57.6 | 59.7 | 65.4 | 42.4 | 64.7 | 59.9 |
| One to three months | 11.0 | 15.2 | 11.0 | 14.7 | 19.3 | 11.1 | 14.8 |
| Three to six months | 03.3 | 06.7 | 02.6 | 05.6 | 10.5 | 09.8 | 06.4 |
| Over six months | 07.1 | 08.0 | 05.8 | 04.6 | 14.7 | 05.2 | 07.1 |
| No job since leaving <br> high school | 12.4 | 12.5 | 20.8 | 09.8 | 13.0 | 09.2 | 11.8 |
| $\quad$ Number responding | 2.0 | 2613 | 154 | 1467 | 238 | 153 | 4835 |

TABLE 12
REASONS FOR NEVER HAVING BEEN EMPLOYED SINCE LEAVING HIGH SCHOOL BY PROGRAM AREA

|  | AGRI <br> BUS <br> $\%$ | BUS <br> OCC <br> $\%$ | HLTH <br> OCC <br> $\%$ | IND <br> OCC <br> $\%$ | P\&P <br> SERV <br> $\%$ | SPEC <br> PROG <br> $\%$ | STATE <br> $\%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Reasons | 68.3 | 65.9 | 57.6 | 52.9 | 30.0 | 42.7 | 59.2 |
| I'm. in school | 02.4 | 12.3 | 12.1 | 13.7 | 22.5 | 19.1 | 12.9 |
| I have not been able to <br> get a job | 22.0 | 04.8 | 00.0 | 27.0 | 02.5 | 14.3 | 12.0 |
| I'm in the military <br> service | 00.0 | 10.4 | 21.2 | 01.5 | 27.5 | 14.3 | 08.8 |
| Do not want a job | 02.4 | 05.1 | 09.1 | 02.9 | 10.0 | 09.5 | 04.9 |
| Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Poor Health |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Couldn't get intc the <br> union | 02.4 | 01.1 | 00.0 | 01.0 | 02.5 | 00.0 | 01.1 |
| I can't make enough <br> money to make it <br> worth working | 02.4 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 01.0 | 02.5 | 00.0 | 00.6 |
| $\quad$Number responding | 00.0 | 00.5 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 02.5 | 00.0 | 00.6 |

REASONS FOR PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT
Approximately 20 percent of the employed respondents were employed parttime (see Table 9). These respondents were asked whether this was all they could get or if this was al? they wanted. Part-time work was chosen by 62.4 percent and 37.6 percent indicated this was all they could find. (See Tabie 13.)

TABLE 13
REASONS FOR PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT BY PROGRAM AREA

|  | AGRI <br> BUS <br> $\%$ | BUS <br> OCC <br> $\%$ | HLTH <br> OCC <br> $\%$ | IND <br> OCC <br> $\%$ | P\&P <br> SERV <br> $\%$ | SPREC <br> PROG <br> $\%$ | STATE <br> $\%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Reasons | 51.4 | 67.1 | 69.6 | 59.5 | 43.9 | 38.1 | 62.4 |
| That's all I care to work | 58.6 | 32.9 | 30.9 | 40.5 | 56.1 | 61.9 | 37.6 |
| That's all I can get | 35 | 474 | 23 | 247 | 41 | 21 | 841 |

NUMBER OF JOBS HELD
In a rapidly changing industrial society, the chances for individuals to make several job changes a zincreasing. National advisory concils on vocational education have long indica. ed that the job changing profile of program completions has been less than desirable. One of the purposes of the broad concept of career development is to enable students to have the type of pre-employment experience that will help them make immediate.and long range career decisions. Early job information, orientation and experience are designed to help eliminate aimless wandering in the labor market in an attempt to find a satisfying job. While the nature of entry-level employment is such that job changes can be expected, it appears that after availability to the labor market for one year 46.3 percent of the occupational alumni have held only one job. An additional 30.6 percent have held only two different jobs. Only 4.2 percent have changed jobs four or more times. (See Table 14.)

## isumber Of JOBS HELD SINCE LEAVING HIGH SCHOOL

 BY PROGRAM AREA|  | AGRI <br> BUS <br> $\%$ | BUS <br> OCC <br> $\%$ | HLTH <br> OCC <br> $\%$ | IND <br> OCC <br> $\%$ | P\&P <br> SERV <br> $\%$ | SPEC <br> PROG <br> $\%$ | STATE <br> $\%$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Jobs | 41.3 | 46.2 | 47.8 | 39.8 | 42.0 | 46.3 | 43.9 |  |
| One job | 26.8 | 30.3 | 22.6 | 32.5 | 32.3 | 29.3 | 30.6 |  |
| Two jobs | 12.2 | 09.7 | 09.4 | 14.5 | 08.6 | 12.2 | 11.3 |  |
| Three jobs | 06.6 | 03.2 | 01.9 | 05.6 | 05.1 | 04.9 | 04.2 |  |
| Four or more jobs | 26.8 | 10.7 | 18.2 | 07.6 | 12.1 | 07.3 | 10.0 |  |
| No job | 213 | 2719 | 159 | 1545 | 257 | 164 | 5057 |  |
| $\quad$Number responding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

REASONS FOR JOB CHANGES
In Table 15, the reason "took a better job" was most frequently cited for changing jobs ( 26.8 percent). Another 17.3 percent of the respondents left jobs to enter school. If amount of education does influence job options, with more education bringing concommitant advances up the job ladder, then it might be conjectured that 44.1 percent of the total job changes (first two rows combined) were made in pursuit of better jobs. Another 24.3 percent of the job changes were because respondents were in temporary jobs or were laid off. Alumni experiencing job change due to temporary jobs ranged from a high of 24.3 percent of the Agri-Business alumni to a low of 7.4 percent of the Special Program alumni. Only 2.6 percent of, the Health Occupations alumni were "laid off". Approximately 10 percent of the Special Programs ( 9.5 percent) and the Personal and Public Service ( 9.1 percent) alumni changed jobs because of low pay. Table 15 summarizes the reasons for the 4,296 job changes made by the respondents. These changes are broken down into reasons for leaving first job, second job, third job, and fourth job in Appendix Tables C-1, C-2, C-3, and C-4.

TABLE 15
REASONS FOR LEAVING JOBS HELD BY PROGRAM AREA

|  | AGRI <br> BUS <br> $\%$ | BUS <br> OCC <br> $\%$ | HLTH <br> OCC <br> $\%$ | IND <br> OCC <br> $\%$ | P\&P <br> SERV <br> $\%$ | SPEC <br> PROG <br> $\%$ | STATE <br> $\%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Reasons | 23.8 | 26.8 | 23.1 | 28.1 | 20.9 | 27.7 | 26.8 |
| Took a better job | 17.8 | 19.8 | 26.5 | 15.1 | 07.7 | 10.1 | 17.3 |
| Entered school | 24.3 | 14.7 | 07.7 | 13.5 | 12.3 | 07.4 | 14.1 |
| Temporary job ended | 11.4 | 07.7 | 02.6 | 13.3 | 12.3 | 13.5 | 10.2 |
| Laid off | 03.2 | 06.6 | 06.8 | 08.0 | 09.1 | 09.5 | 07.2 |
| Pay too low | 01.1 | 04.8 | 02.6 | 04.7 | 06.4 | 06.1 | 04.7 |
| Disliked the work | 10.3 | 01.8 | 01.7 | 06.9 | 02.3 | 06.8 | 04.1 |
| Military service | 00.5 | 04.9 | 03.4 | 02.6 | 06.4 | 05.4 | 03.9 |
| Moved away | 00.0 | 03.3 | 03.4 | 00.9 | 05.9 | 02.0 | 02.4 |
| Got married | 02.2 | 02.0 | 04.3 | 02.4 | 00.9 | 05.4 | 02.3 |
| Disliked the hours | 02.7 | 02.4 | 03.4 | 01.8 | 01.8 | 01.4 | 02.2 |
| Disliked the people | 00.5 | 02.2 | 02.6 | 01.4 | 03.2 | 00.7 | 01.8 |
| Too far to drive | 01.1 | 01.8 | 05.1 | 00.6 | 06.4 | 01.4 | 01.7 |
| Family reasons | 01.1 | 01.4 | 06.8 | 00.6 | 04.6 | 02.7 | 01.5 |
| Health problems | 185 | 2107 | 117 | 1519 | 220 | 148 | 4296 |

THE MEASUREMENT OF JOB RELATEDNESS TO OCCUPATIONAL INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS One of the purposes of this survey was to test a method of measuring the relatedness of respondent's employment to training taken. The importance of such measurement depends upon ones' perception of the purpose of occupational training. If the primary purpose of job training is to prepare students for entry into the labor force where they may then acquire necessary job skills, employment may be used as a principle measure of program effectiveness. However, under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the subsequent 1968 Amendments,
occupational education is perceived to have a responsibility for providing knowledge, skills and competences relevant to a specific occupation or related group of occupations. Thus, it is necessary to be able to specify, for a given instructional program and occupation the degree of relatedness.

The method utilized for measuring the relatedness of employment to training taken is based on the U.S. Office of Education document, Vocational Education and occupations, which links occupational education programs to occupations. The purpose of matching instructional programs to occupations is to:

1. Assist State agency personnel in describing job market in terms of occupational programs;
2. Assist occupational educators in planning programs; and
3. Provide counseling and guidance personnel with realistic information concerning the relationship between occupational education programs and occupations in which program completers may find employment.

The selection of occupations associated with instructional programs is based largely on the experiences of vocational technical educators. An Ad Hoc committee in each of the seven recognized occupational education areas applied the following rationale for the selection of items in each of the subject-matter areas: 1) the items were determined by consensus of the committee to be appropriate to the subject-matter area; 2) the items could be defined in brief form using only salient descriptive elenients; and 3) the various items classified under a subject-matter area were identifiable by titles, which the Ad Hoc committee considered to be most commonly used in the subject-matter area. Each occupational program was assigned an Office of Education Code (0.E. Code) number, e.g., 01.0200-Agricultural Supplies/Services; 04.0800--General Merchandise; 07.0303--Nursing Assistance (Aide); 09.0201--Care and Guidance of Children, etc.

The O.E. Code Number is divided into three segments:
14.0702 -- O.E. Code Number for Secretaries
14. -- Subject-Matter Area (in this case disignating Business, Marketing, and Management Occupations)
.07 -- Principle Segment (in this case designating Steographic, Secretarial, and Related Occupations)

02 -- Specific Division of Principle Segment (in this case designating
Within the Principle Segment 14.0700--Stenographic, Secretarial, and Related Occupations, three Specific Divisions are recognized by the I.D.V.T.E. They are:
14.0701 -- Executive Secretary,
14.0702 -- Secretaries, and
14.0703 -- Stenographers.

Each Specific Division prepares workers for occupations having substantial similarities, e.g., similarity in the work performed; similarity in the abilities and knowledge required of the worker for successful job persormance; similarity in the tools, machines, instruments and other equipment worked on or with. For example, the Specific Division 14.0702--Secretaries prepares workers for the following occupations:

| O.E. Code | Program Name | D.O.T. Code | Occupational Title |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14.0702 | Secretaries | 201.268 | Social Secretary |
|  |  | 201. 368 | Legal : c cretary |
|  |  | 201.368 | Medical Secretary |
|  |  | 201.368 | Secretary |

Each employed surivey respondent was asked to provide: 1) the title of his/her job: 2) the type of business; and 3) a list of job duties. Almost any job title has a description in the Dictionary of Occupational Titles, Volume I, (D.O.T.), this information was used to assign a D.O.T. Code number for the job the respondent held. (An explanation of the D.O.T. Classification System appears in Appendix A.) Since each occupational training program is related to a specific group of occupations by. D.O.T. Code number, it was then a simple matter to match the D.O.T.

Code Number of the job with the $0 . E$. Code number of the training program completed to determine the relatedness of the job to the training taken. Categories for describing the relatedness of training to employment are as follows:
"Same" or "Closely Related" occupation. When a respondent was found in either a 201.268--Social Secretary or a 201.368--Secretary, including Legal and Medical, occupation and that respondent was trained in a 14.0702--Secretaries program, the respondent was in the "same" occupation for which trained or in a "closely related" occupation. "Related" occupation. When a respondent was found in either a 201.268-Social Secretary or a 201.368--Secretary, including Legal and Medical, occupation and that respondent was trained in a $140700-$-Stenographic, Secretarial and Related Occupation or a $14.0101--E x e c u t i v e ~ S e c r e t a r y ~ o r ~$ a 14.0703-..Stenographers coded program (all programs are within the same Principle Segment as the 14.0702--Secretaries), the respondent was in a "related" occupation. All programs within a Frinclinessegent are related to each other and to the corresponding related occupations. "Non-related" occupation. When a respondent was found in either a 201.268-Social Secretaries or a 201.368--Secretaries, including Legal and Medical, occupation and that respondent was not trained in a program coded 14.0702-Secretaries ("closely related") or in a 14.0700--Stenographic, Secretarial, and Related Occupations, a 14.0701--Executive Secretaries, or a 14.0703-Stenographers (all "related"), the respondent was in a "non-related" occupation. Even though the respondent may have been in another 14.XXXX program there are not the type of substantial similarities necessary to qualify it as a "related" training program.

A fourth category for describing the relatedness of training to employment was necessary where broad occupational O.E. Code numbers were assigned to programs, e.g., 01.0000--Agricultural Occupations; 18.9900--Cooperative Work Experience, etc. Since these programs do not have matching occupations, it is not possible to use the matching procedure. In cases where the respondents indicated they were not working in occupations for which trained, they were coded as "non-related" and when relatedness was not determinable they were coded "not measurable".

The jobs held by respondents employed at the time of the survey are listed in Appendix A. The extreme right column of Table A-2 contains the instructional programs that are related to the occupation or group of related occupations. Appendix B contains the instrument used in this study to determine the relatedness of the occupation found in to the training taken.

The relatedness (Table 16--rows one and two combined) of training to job found in at the time of the survey ranged from a high of 62 percent among Healtn Occupations alumni to a low of 17 percent among Industrial Oriented Occupations alumni. (Special Program alumni excluded.) Overall, 23 percent of the employed respondents were in related occupation, 68 percent were in non-related occupations and 8 percent of the respondent's jobs and training were not measurable.

REASONS FOR NON-TRAINING RELATED EMPLOYMENT
In Table 17, the reason most frequently cited for employment in a job not related to training was, "Couldn't find a job for which I was trained". Overall, 31.6 percent checked this category with a range from a high of $\dot{3} 7.8$ percent (Industrial Occupations) to a low of 12.7 percent (Special Prograns). Note that 25.5 percent of the Speciai Program alumni indicated they couldn't earn enough money while 21.4 percent of the Health Occupations alumni didn't like the jobs for which they were trained. The "other" category was checked by 26.8 percent of the respondents to this item. Reasons written in the blank by this category

TABLE 16
RELATEDNESS OF TRAINING TO EMPLOYMENT AT THE TIME OF THE SURVEY BY PROGRAM AREA

| Relatedness | $\begin{gathered} \text { AGRI } \\ \text { BUS } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BUS } \\ & \text { OCC } \\ & \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { HLTH } \\ \text { OCC } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { IND } \\ \text { OCC } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { P\&P } \\ \text { SERV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { SPEC } \\ \text { PROG } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { STATE } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Same or closely related occupation | 13.0 | 08.0 | 40.0 | 10.0 | 20.0 | 01.0 | 10.0 |
| Related occupation | 07.0 | 19.0 | 12.0 | 07.0 | 09.0 | 00.0 | 13.0 |
| Non-related occupation | 72.0 | 68.0 | 37.0 | 75.0 | 66:0 | 38.0 | 68.0 |
| Not measurable | 08.0 | 05.0 | 12.0 | 09.0 | 06.0 | 61.0 | 08.0 |
| Number responding | 145 | 1945 | 95 | 1127 | 175 | 114 | 3601 |

TABLE 17
REASONS FOR EMPLOYMENT IN A NON-RELATED OCCUPATION

| Reasons for non-related jobs | $\begin{gathered} \text { AGRI } \\ \text { BUS } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BUS } \\ \text { OCC } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | HLTH OCC $\qquad$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { IND } \\ \text { OCC } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { P\&P } \\ \text { SERV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { SPEC } \\ \text { PROG } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { STATE } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Couldn't find a job for which I was trained | 36.6 | 28.7 | 21.4 | 37.8 | 21.2 | 12.7 | 31.6 |
| Other | 21.2 | 29.6 | 21.4 | 24.9 | 27.1 | 20.0 | 26.8 |
| I didn't like the jobs for which I was trained | 11.3 | 16.4 | 21.4 | 08.2 | 11.7 | 12.7 | 12.7 |
| Needed more training and couldn't get it | 08.5 | 12.2 | 14.3 | 12.5 | 09.4 | 14.6 | 12.1 |
| I couldn't earn enough money | 11.3 | 06.3 | 10.7 | 07.3 | 12.9 | 25.5 | 07.9 |
| Didn't know what the job was really like | 05.6 | 03.3 | 00.0 | 03.9 | 02.4 | 03.6 | 03.5 |
| Not presently employed | 02.8 | 02.0 | 07.1 | 02.8 | 08.2 | 05.5 | 02.9 |
| No chance for promotion | 02.8 | 01.5 | 03.6 | 02.7 | 07.1 | 05.5 | 02.5 |
| Number responding | 71 | 797 | 28 | 674 | 85 | 55 | 1710 |

frequently cited: "Didn't know I was being trained for a job"; "What occupational program"; "Didn't look for a job in that area";"It was better than the other courses the school offered"; Wanted to get out of school early"; etc. Most of the "other" reasons specified were related to a lack of guidance in high school program selection or a lack of understanding the nature of occupational training.

## JOB SATISFACTION

Another indication of the success of an occupational training program is the degree of job satisfaction felt by program alumni. The importance of the satisfaction dimension to the labor market has been recognized but vocational followup information available on job satisfaction is fragmentary.

Respondents employed at the time of the survey were asked how they felt about the job they held. Thirty-six percent of the respondents indicated very high job satisfaction, 31.4 percent indicated high job satisfaction and 23.8 percent indicated moderate job satisfaction. Only 7.7 percent (Table 18 , rows four and five combined) indicated low or very low job satisfaction. Note that 53.9 percent of the Health Occupations Alumni were very highly satisfied with their jobs. The highest percentage of low job satisfaction was experienced by Industrial Occupations respondents.

FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO JOB SATISFACTION
Information on factors which act as job satisfiers adds a psychological dimension to program appraisal. The job factors listed in the survey instrument were identified by respondents to the pilot (Home Economics Cooperative) study in 1971. The mcst frequently mentioned job satisfier (Table 19) was "everything" (26.7 percent). Another 21.1 percent liked the "nature of the work". Job context factors (i.e., security of having a job, good pay, fellow workers, possibilities for advancement, the hours, and employer) were named as job

TABLE 18
EMPLOYED RESPONDENT'S SATISFACTION WITH JOB HELD AT THE TIME OF THE SURVEY BY PROGRAM AREA

|  | AGRI <br> BUS <br> $\%$ | BUS <br> OCC <br> $\%$ | HLTH <br> OCC <br> $\%$ | IND <br> OC <br> $\%$ | P\&P <br> SERV <br> $\%$ | SPEC <br> PROG <br> $\%$ | STATE <br> $\%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Satisfaction | 33.6 | 39.7 | 53.9 | 29.6 | 33.5 | 31.8 | 36.1 |
| I like it very much | 36.3 | 31.5 | 26.4 | 30.4 | 34.9 | 34.6 | 31.4 |
| I like it | 26.0 | 21.8 | 15.4 | 27.4 | 22.4 | 28.0 | 23.8 |
| It's ok | 2.7 | 5.6 | 3.3 | 10.1 | 8.7 | 5.6 | 7.0 |
| Not what I'd hoped | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 2.6 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.7 |
| It's awful | 146 | 1953 | 91 | 1136 | 161 | 107 | 3594 |

satisfiers by 38 percent of the respondents. Job content factors (i.e., nature of the work, meeting people, and pleasant job duties) were named 32 percent of the time. The category "everything" contains both context and content factors.

TABLE 19
FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO JOB SATISFACTION BY PROGRAM AREA

|  | AGRI <br> BUS <br> $\%$ | BUS <br> OCC <br> $\%$ | HLTH <br> OCC <br> $\%$ | IND <br> OCC <br> $\%$ | P\&P <br> SERV <br> $\%$ | SPEC <br> PROG | STATE <br> $\%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job factors | 25.2 | 28.6 | 35.8 | 23.2 | 25.9 | 24.7 | 26.7 |
| Everything | 38.5 | 19.9 | 30.9 | 21.4 | 15.0 | 16.1 | 21.1 |
| Nature of the work | 08.6 | 10.5 | 04.9 | 13.8 | 10.9 | 10.8 | 11.3 |
| Security of having a job | 11.9 | 08.5 | 03.7 | 15.8 | 08.8 | 14.0 | 11.0 |
| Good pay | 01.5 | 06.5 | 08.6 | 03.6 | 15.0 | 03.2 | 05.8 |
| Meeting people | 05.9 | 06.2 | 03.7 | 04.0 | 08.2 | 06.5 | 05.5 |
| Fellow workers | 03.7 | 06.5 | 03.7 | 03.1 | 04.1 | 07.5 | 05.1 |
| Pleasant job duties | 02.2 | 04.0 | 04.9 | 10.5 | 02.7 | 08.6 | 04.8 |
| Possibilities for advancement | 02.2 | 04.5 | 01.2 | 03.5 | 06.1 | 03.2 | 04.1 |
| The hours | 00.0 | 03.2 | 01.2 | 04.7 | 01.4 | 02.2 | 03.3 |
| Nothing | 01.5 | 01.6 | 01.2 | 00.6 | 02.0 | 03.2 | 01.2 |
| Employer | 135 | 1805 | 81 | 1046 | 148 | 97 | 3307 |

FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO JOB DISSATISFACTION
Job context factors (low pay, the hours, no possibilities for advancemens, working conditions, fellow workers, the boss) were identified by 39.4 percent of the respondents as job dissatisfiers. Job content factors (nature of the work, some customers, patients, etc., unpleasant job duties) were identified by 22.2 percent of the respondents as job dissatisfiers. (See Table 20.) Note that 37.6 percent of the respondents to this item indicated that there
were no disliked job factors while only 1.1 percent disliked everything about the job they held.

TABLE 20
FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO JOB DISSATISFACTION BY PROGRAM AREA

|  | AGRI <br> BUS <br> $\%$ | BUS <br> OCC <br> $\%$ | HLTH <br> OCC <br> $\%$ | IND <br> OCC <br> $\%$ | P\&P <br> SERV <br> $\%$ | SPEC <br> PROG <br> $\%$ | STATE <br> $\%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job factors | 36.7 | 39.6 | 44.2 | 35.4 | 27.5 | 35.7 | 37.6 |
| No dislikes | 17.3 | 17.9 | 20.9 | 15.7 | 26.1 | 15.3 | 17.6 |
| Low pay | 05.8 | 09.8 | 07.0 | 08.9 | 06.5 | 06.1 | 09.1 |
| Nature of the work | 05.8 | 07.7 | 01.2 | 05.0 | 07.8 | 11.2 | 06.7 |
| Some customers, patients, etc. | 16.6 | 04.9 | 05.8 | 07.8 | 03.9 | 08.2 | 06.4 |
| Unpleasant job duties | 04.3 | 05.1 | 08.1 | 07.7 | 09.2 | 07.1 | 06.2 |
| The hours | 04.3 | 05.9 | 04.7 | 06.8 | 07.8 | 03.1 | 06.1 |
| No possibilities for advancement | 06.5 | 03.0 | 07.0 | 07.5 | 03.3 | 10.2 | 04.9 |
| Working conditions | 01.4 | 03.1 | 00.0 | 02.2 | 05.2 | 01.0 | 02.7 |
| Fellow workers | 01.4 | 02.0 | 01.2 | 01.6 | 02.0 | 02.0 | 01.0 |
| The boss | 00.0 | 01.0 | 00.0 | 01.6 | 00.7 | 00.0 | 01.1 |
| Dislike everything | 139 | 1871 | 86 | 1067 | 153 | 98 | 3414 |

AREAS OF DIFFICULT ADJUSTMENT IN INITIAL EMPLOYMENT
Fifty percent of the difficult adjustments in initial employment were related to performance factors characteristic to a given job in a given place of employment. (See Table 21.) Twenty-six percent of the respondents experienced no difficult adjustment in initial employment. Twenty-one percent of the respondents felt the most difficult adjustments were related to personal factors such as making decisions, efficient use:of fime and getting along with other people.

## AREAS OF MOST DIFFICULT ADJUSTMENT IN INITIAL EMPLOYMENT BY PROGRAM AREAS

| Area of adjustment | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AGRI I } \\ & \text { BUS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BUS } \\ \text { OCC } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { HLTH } \\ \text { OCC } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IND } \\ & \text { OCC } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { P\&P } \\ \text { SERV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { SPEC } \\ \text { PROG } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { STATE } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Factors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Learning the layout, routine, machines, etc. | 32.0 | 31.0 | 24.0 | 27.0 | 28.0 | 22.0 | 29.0 |
| Speed | 12.0 | 12.0 | 08.0 | 14.0 | 16.0 | 13.0 | 13.0 |
| Certain job tasks | 08.0 | 08.0 | 06.0 | 08.0 | 05.0 | 09.0 | 08.0 |
| Subtotal | 52.0 | 51.0 | 38.0 | 49.0 | 49.0 | 44.0 | 50.0 |
| Personal Factors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Making decisions | 08.0 | 07.0 | 12.0 | 05.0 | 05.0 | 08.0 | 07.0 |
| Managing time efficiently | 06.0 | 07.0 | 10.0 | 07.0 | 08.0 | 07.0 | 07.0 |
| Patience, courtesy, initiative, etc. | 04.0 | 03.0 | 03.0 | 04.0 | 04.0 | 05.0 | 03.0 |
| Getting along with the pubiic | 02.0 | 02.0 | 02.0 | 02.0 | 04.0 | 07.0 | 02.0 |
| Working with fellow workers | 01.0 | 01.0 | 02.0 | 02.0 | 01.0 | 02.0 | 02.0 |
| Subtota 1 | 21.0 | 20.0 | 29.0 | 20.0 | 22.0 | 29.0 | 21.0 |
| Nothing | 25.0 | 25.0 | 33.0 | 28.0 | 23.0 | 20.0 | 26.0 |
| Everything | 02.0 | 01.0 | 01.0 | 01.0 | 03.0 | 02.0 | 01.0 |
| Other | 01.0 | 03.0 | 02.0 | 03.0 | 02.0 | 03.0 | 03.0 |
| Number responding | 171 | 2160 | 123 | 1204 | 208 | 127 | 3996 |

[^5]OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES OF JOBS HFID BY RESPONDENTS
In the Dicitionary of Occupational Titles, 21,741 separate occupations have been defined, classified, and identified by 6-digit numbers. The three digits to the left of the decimal identify the Occupational Group Arrangement. The first digit identifies a broad occupational category according to work field, purpose, material, product, subject matter, service, generic term, and/or industry. There are nine occupational categories. Appendix A contains an explanation of the D.O.T. Classification System.

Table 22 shows that the sargest number of employed respondents were found in the clerical and sales occupational category ( 46.4 percent). Fourteen percent were found in service occupations. Processing, machine trades, bench work and structural work occupations accounted for 24.1 percent of the jobs employed respondents found. Specific occupations are listed in Appendix Table A-2.

JOB DIVISIONS IN WHICH MORE THAN FIFTY RESPONDENTS WERE EMPLOYED
The nine broad occupational categories in the Occupational Group Arrangement are divided into 84 broad subject matter divisions, reflected in the first and second digits of the D.O.T. Code. The eighteen job divisions reported in Table 23 were divisions in which the largest groups of respondents found employment. Appendix Table A-2 lists all the jobs employed respondents were found in at the time of the survey.

## SPECIFIC JOBS IN WHICH MORE THAN FIFTY RESPONDENTS FOUND EMPLOYMENT

The third digit in the Occupational Group Arrangement identifies the occupational groups, which range from two to twenty-six within each subject matter division. Each of the jobs in an occupational group contain many identical or very similar tasks. The greatest number of employed respondents
held jobs at the time of the survey in the occupational group for clerktypist (305) or in the secretarial group (272). (See Table 24.) One hundred fifty-three respondents were working as nurse aides, medical attendants, orderlies or psychiatric aides. Note that only 1.7 percent of the salespersons (flying squad) were trained in a related program while 67.2 percent of the receptionists were making some use of their training. Appendix Table A-2 lists all the specific jobs in which employed respondents were found at the time of the survey.

TABLE 22
JOBS HELD BY RESPONDENTS AT THE TIME OF THE SURVEY BY OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY

| Occupational category | Number <br> Employed | Percent of <br> Total Employed |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Clerical and Sales Occupations | 1672 | 45.4 |
| Service Occupations | 505 | 14.0 |
| Machine Trades Occupations | 314 | 08.7 |
| Structural Work Occupations | 283 | 07.9 |
| Miscellaneous Occupations | 247 | 06.9 |
| Professional, Technica1, and <br> Managerial Occupations | 204 | 05.7 |
| Bench Work Occupations | 172 | 04.8 |
| Farming, Fishery, Forestry, and <br> Related Occupations | 102 | 02.8 |
| Processing Occupations | 96 | 02.7 |

TABLE 23

## D.O.T. JOB DIVISIONS IN WHICH MORE THAN FIFTY RESPONDENTS WERE EMPLOYED AT THE TIME OF THE SURVEY

D.O.T. Job DivisionNumberJob Division TitleEmployed
200.-209. Stenography, Typing, Filing \& Related Occupations ..... 735
210.-219. Computing \& Account Recording Occupations ..... 339
250.-299. Salès Occupations ..... 268
310.-319. Food \& Beverage Preparations \& Service Occupations ..... 207
350.-359. Miscellaneous Personal Service ..... 166
230.-239. Information \& Message Distribution Occupations ..... 146
620.-629. Mechanics \& Machinery Repairmeh ..... 141
220.-229. Material \& Production Recording Occupations ..... 126
860.-869. Construction Occupations ..... 112
920.-929. Packaging \& Materials Handling Occupations ..... 97
610.-619. Metalwork Occupations ..... 68
910.-919. Transportation Occupations ..... 63
070.-079. Medical \& Dental Assistants \& Technicians ..... 60
420.-429. Miscellaneous Farming \& Related Occupations ..... 59
240.-249. Miscellaneous Clerical Occupations ..... 58
330.-339. Barbering, Cosmetology, \& Related Occupations ..... 57
600.-609. Metal Machining Occupations ..... 53
180.-189. Managers and Officials, N.E.C. ..... 53

OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS IN WHICh MORE THAN FIFTY RESPONDENTS WERE EMPLOYED AT THE TIME OF THE SURVEY

| D.0.T. <br> Code | Job Title | Number Employed | Percent Who Were Trained in Related Programs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clerical and Sales Occupations |  |  |  |
| 209.388 | Clerk-Typist; Mortgage Clerk; Statement Clerk; Tax Clerk | 305 | 33.6 |
| 201.368 | Secretaries, including Legal and Medical | 272 | 62.9 |
| 210.388 | Bookkeeper | 61 | 14.8 |
| 237.368 | Receptionist | 61 | 67.2 |
| 289.458 | Salesperson--Flying Squad | 60 | 1.7 |
| 219.388 | General Office Clerk; Billing Clerk; Medical Ward Clerk | 55 | 47.3 |
| 203.588 | Typist; Telegraphic Typewriter Operator | 51 | 58.8 |
| Service Occupations |  |  |  |
| 355.878 | Nurse Aide; Medical Attendant; Orderly; Psychiatric Aide | 153 | 46.2 |
| 311.878 | Waiter; Waitress; Counterman; Busboy | 93 | 11.6 |
| 313.381 | Cook; Food Service Worker | 60 | 20.0 |
| 332.271 | Cosmetologist | 53 | 34.0 |
| Machine Trades Occupations |  |  |  |
| 620.381 | Automobile Service Mechanic | 79 | 41.8 |
| 616.380 | Machine Operator; Set-up Man | 53 | 17.0 |

## CHAPTER V

## ALUMNI AND EMPLOYER/SUPERVISOR ASSESSMMENTS OF OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

One of the basic assumptions upon which this study was predicated was that the former student and his/her employer know the strengths and weaknesses of programs of occupational preparation. ${ }^{1}$ Information was gathered from former students and their employers at the time of the survey to determine their satisfaction with secondary level occupational instruction. Reported in this chapter are: alumni assessments of the effectiveness of the occupational training they received in high school, alumni recommendations for program improvement, emp?oyer/supervisor assessments of alumni preparation for employment, alumni suitability for the job held, and entry level skills considered important by employer/supervisors.

## ALUMNI RATINGS OF TRAINING EFFECTIVENESS

Respondents to the alumni survey were asked to rate the helpfulness of their high school occupational training in preparing them for eleven aspects of employment. Rating was done on a four point scale: $1=$ None, $2=$ Little, 3 = Some, and $4=$ Much. Ratings were averaged by program areas and by total responses. Average ratings below 2.5 on the four point scale were considered indicators of program ineffectiveness while ratings of 3.0 and above were

[^6]considered desirable. It appears that while only three aspects of employment received less than a 2.5 average rating, overall, the alumni assessments of the helpfulness of their training is low (see Table 25). Alumni of Health Occupations programs consistently rated their training higher than overall averages. Six aspects of program preparation were rated above 3.0 with preparation for getting along with the patient being rated at 3.48 and knowing what to do on the job being rated at 3.36. Personal and Public Service respondents rated their occupational training most effective in getting along with the customer, patient, etc., (3.07) and in getting along with other workers (3.03). Special Program respondents found most help in getting along with other workers (3.14), applying for a job (3.06) and interviewing for a job (3.02).

Overall ratings show that programs of occupational preparation in Illinois are most effective in teaching students how to use job tools and equipment (2.94) and in efficient use of time and energy (2.81). Helpfulness in getting along with the public served was ranked eight in order of program effectiveness while being able to talk to the boss abn!!t job related problems and understanding union membership were ranked tenth and eleventh respectively.

WHETHER OR NOT ALUMNI WOULD RECOMMEND TRAINING TAKEN TO OTHERS
Alumni respondents were asked if they would reconmend the training program they completed to other students. In view of the low average ratings of program helpfulness in preparing them for employment, it was anticipated that the percentage who would recommend the training to others would be lower than it was. Ninety-three percent of the respondents would recommend their training program to others (see Table 26). Recommenders ranged from a high of 97 percent of the Health Occupations alumni to a lo:! of 89 percent of the Personal and Public Service alumni. When 46 percent of the respondents

## ALUMNI RATINGS OF TRAINING CONTRIBUTION TO EMPLOYMENT

 BY PROGRAM AREAS| Aspect of Employment | $\begin{gathered} \text { AGRI } \\ \text { BUS } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BUS } \\ \text { OCC } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { HLTH } \\ \text { OCC } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { IND } \\ \text { OCC } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { P\&P } \\ \text { SERV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { SREC } \\ \text { PROG } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { STATE } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Knowing how to use tools and equipment on the job | 2.84 | 2.97 | 3.10 | 2.97 | 2.70 | 2.42 | 2.94 |
| Using time and energy | 2.69 | 2.82 | 3.10 | 2.76 | 2.97 | 2.79 | 2.81 |
| Getting along with other workers | 2.87 | 2.74 | 3.17 | 2.81 | 3.03 | 3.14 | 2.81 |
| Applying for a job | 2.38 | 2.95 | 2.89 | 2.28 | 2.79 | 3.06 | 2.73 |
| Interviewing for a job | 2.35 | 2.95 | 2.80 | 2.22 | 2.76 | 3.02 | 2.70 |
| Knowing what to do in this kind of job | 2.50 | 2.65 | 3.36 | 2.71 | 2.78 | 2.51 | 2.68 |
| Finding needed information | 2.63 | 2.66 | 2.96 | 2.63 | 2.72 | 2.61 | 2.66 |
| Getting along with the customer, patient, etc. | 2.43 | 2.64 | 3.48 | 2.32 | 3.07 | 2.97 | 2.61 |
| Handling new or unpleasant situations | 2.48 | 2.43 | 3.14 | 2.38 | 2.62 | 2.57 | 2.46 |
| Being able to talk to the boss about job problems | 2.43 | 2.32 | 2.57 | 2.39 | 2.59 | 2.80 | 2.38 |
| Understanding union membership | 1.55 | 1.52 | 1.86 | 1.58 | 1.87 | 1.95 | 1.58 |
| Number responding | 179 | 2263 | 131 | 1279 | 219 | 145 | 4216 |

indicated no one influenced their decision to enroll in the program they took and many respondents indicated they weren't aware that they had enrolled in a job preparation program, one must question why such a large percentage of alumni would recommend the program to other students. It may be that the respondents did not have attractive alternatives open to them and their enrollment may have represented selection of the least unattractive curriculum. Or, respondents may have felt that while the instructional program was not as
helpful as it cculd have been, it was more useful than watered down general algebra or the atomic weight of carbon.

TABLE 26
WHETHER OR NOT RESPONDENTS WOULD RECOMMEND OCCUPATIONAL
TRAINING TO OTHERS BY PROGRAM AREA

| Recommendation | AGRI <br> BUS <br> \% | $\begin{gathered} \text { BUS } \\ \text { OCC } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { HLTH } \\ \text { OCC } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { IND } \\ \text { OCC } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { P\&P } \\ \text { SERV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { SPEC } \\ \text { PROG } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { STATE } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Would recommend the program | 92.0 | 93.0 | 97.0 | 94.0 | 89.0 | 93.0 | 93.0 |
| Would not recommend the program | 08.0 | 07.0 | 03.0 | 06.0 | 11.0 | 07.0 | 07.0 |
| Number responding | 190 | 2513 | 158 | 1371 | 249 | 152 | 4633 |

ALUMNI RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT
Alumni were asked to indicate what would improve the occupational training they had received in high school. The most frequently made recommendation was that more individual help be given students in learning about what kinds of jobs they might get, what courses to take in high school, what kind of posthigh school training they might need ( 36.8 percent checked this item). (See Table 27.) Another 25.8 percent felt placement service--more help with knowing where and how to get a job after high school, was needed in the school. It would appear that many former students felt their career choices were left to chance. This is particularily discouraging, since it suggests that irreversible educational decisions by high school students are being made on the basis of relative ignorance. Other recommendations made by at least 20 percent of the respondents to this item included: training needs to be more like the real job ( 23.8 percent), training should be "cluster" oriented ( 22.3 percent), and more emphasis should be placed on related job skills ( 20.6 percent). Note that while 9.6 percent of the respondents felt teachers should know more about the
jubs they're teaching 19.0 percent of the Agri-Business respondents checked this improvement. Only 2.3 percent of the overall respondents to this item feit that occupational training should be narrow in scope and prepare students for one specific job.

## ALUMNI SUITABILITY FOR EMPLOYMENT

Employer/supervisors of respondents employed at the time of the survey were asked to rate the suitability of the occupational program completions for the jobs they held. One indication of the success of programs of occupational preparation is the degree of suitability of former students for employment. While the percentage of alumni who found training reiated employment is small, there are in addition to technical skills related skills and knowledge that are needed by all workers. Programs of occupational preparation are responsible for developing attitudes, basic knowledge, and habits appropriate for the world of work as well as technical skills.

Employer/supervisors found 73.5 percent of the employed respondents to be highly suited for the job they held at the time of the survey (Table 28 , rows one and two combined). Only 3.9 percent were rated as not suited for the job they held (rows four and five combined).

A determination of the degree of correlation between employed respondents' satisfaction with the job held and employer/supervisors' assessment of their suitability for the job was made. The hypotheses was made that respondents who were satisfied with their job would also be rated as suitable for that job. There was a high positive correlation between alumni response to the item measuring job satisfaction and employer/supervisors' ratings of suitability (.9998--correlation matrix).

## RESPONDENTS' RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING RECEIVED IN HIGH SCHOOL BY PROGRAM AREAS (Multiple responses)

|  | ÄGRI | BUS | HLTH | IND | P\&P | SPEC |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | BUS | OCC | OCC | OCC | SERV | PROG |
| Recommendations | STATE |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\%$ | $\%$ | $\%$ | $\%$ | $\%$ |

More individual help should be given students in learning what kind of jobs they might get, what courses to take in high school, what kind of schooling they might need after high school.
$\begin{array}{lllllll}33.0 & 37.4 & 33.8 & 36.7 & 34.5 & 38.8 & 36.8\end{array}$
More help with knowing where and how to get a job after high school.

Training needs to be more like the real job.

Training should prepare you for several jobs
$\begin{array}{lllllll}23.0 & 24.1 & 13.8 & 19.2 & 22.9 & 27.5 & 22.3\end{array}$
Training should include things like how to: get along with. co-: workers, the boss, the customer; get into the union; take license exams; file income tax; apply for workman's compensation; dress for the job.

Greater variety of classroom activities (field trips, etc.)

Offer a greater selection of training programs.

No improvements needed

| 21.5 | 23.5 | 21.3 | 16.0 | 15.9 | 18.8 | 20.6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

$\begin{array}{lllllll}22.0 & 16.5 & 17.5 & 14.9 & 15.3 & 21.9 & 16.4\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllll}21.5 & 19.0 & 13.1 & 13.3 & 19.0 & 19.4 & 17.2\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllll}07.5 & 10.8 & 27.5 & 09.7 & 08.1 & 08.1 & 10.7\end{array}$
Teachers should know more about
the jobs they're teaching.
Other
$\begin{array}{lllllll}19.0 & 08.8 & 10.6 & 09.3 & 12.8 & 07.5 & 09.6\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllll}03.0 & 04.3 & 04.4 & 05.5 & 04.3 & 05.6 & 04.7\end{array}$
Training should prepare you
for one specific job rather than for several jobs.
$\begin{array}{lllllll}04.0 & 01.7 & 02.5 & 02.8 & 01.6 & 05.3 & 02.3\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllll}200 & 2638 & 160 & 1467 & 258 & 160 & 4883\end{array}$

## SUITABILITY FOR EMPLOYMENT ACCORDING TO EMPLOYER/SUPERVISORS BY PROGRAM AREA

| Suitability | AGRI <br> BUS <br> \% | $\begin{gathered} \text { BUS } \\ \text { OCC } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | HLTH OCC $\qquad$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { IND } \\ \text { OCC } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { P\&P } \\ \text { SERV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | SPEC <br> PROG <br> \% | $\begin{gathered} \text { STATE } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Exceptionally able | 33.3 | 33.8 | 28.8 | 29.4 | 33.7 | 20.7 | 31.9 |
| Well | 41.0 | 41.0 | 42.4 | 42.3 | 40.8 | 45.1 | 41.6 |
| Acceptable | 20.5 | 22.4 | 27.1 | 22.6 | 21.4 | 28.0 | 22.7 |
| Poorly | 03.8 | 02.7 | 01.7 | 05.0 | 03.1 | 04.9 | 03.5 |
| Not at all | 01.3 | 00.1 | 00.0 | 00.7 | 01.0 | 01.2 | 00.4 |
| Number Responding | 78 | 1441 | 59 | 738 | 98 | 82 | 2496 |

## EMPLOYER/SUPERVISOR ASSESSMENTS OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

Employer/supervisors of respondents employed at the time of the survey were asked how well prepared the former occupational students were for the jobs for which hired. Fifteen aspects of employment were rated on a four point scale: $1=$ Not at all; $2=$ Poorly; 3 = Somewhat; and 4 = Well. Ratings reported in Table 29 were averaged by program areas and by the total for all program areas. Overall employer/supervisor ratings were above 3.3 in all listed aspects of employment. Alumni ability to work with others was rated highest ( 3.83 on a four point scale) with job knowledge being rated lowest at 3.38. Only two ratings within program areas fell below the desirable level (3.0) but were still within the acceptable range (2.5). Employed Personal and Public Service respondents were rated 2.93 and employed Industrial Occupations alumni were rated 2.73 in accepting advice and supervision. Employer/supervisors seem to be pleased with the preparation of former occupational students in the selected aspects of employment rated.

Seven aspects of employment were analyzed to determine the amount of correlation existing between employer/supervisor appraisals of readiness for employnent and alumni appraisals of the contribution their occupational program made to their employment. There was a high positive correlation between the two raters concerning knowing how to use job tools and equipment (.9808). Employer/supervisors and alumni did not perceive the ability to talk to the boss in the same way (correlation matrix of .0245). (See Appendix Table C-5). Employer/supervisors rated alumni ability to talk to the boss about job problems at 3.54 while alumni rated the same ability at 2.38.

Overall employer/supervisor ratings by regions were also computed and are reported in Appendix Table C-6. The percentage of employer/supervisors who indicated specific employment aspects did not apply for the job held are reported in the same table. In 99.1 percent of the jobs held, the ability to accept advice and supervision was rated as applicable. Regular attendance was applicable to 99.0 percent of the jobs; cooperativeness and ability to get along with others was applicable in 98.6 percent of the jobs; dependability in 98.9 percent; work quantity in 98.0 percent; work quality in 97.9 percent; initiative in 97.8 percent; ability to talk to the boss in 96.9 percent; and adaptability to new situations in 96.2 percent of the jobs.

## IMPORTANT ENTRY SKILLS IDENTIFIED BY EMPLOYERS

Employer/supervisors were asked to check three entry personal qualities and/or job skills they considered most important for employment in the jobs held by the emplo\%ed former occupational students. The ability to get along with others--other workers, customers, patients, etc., was named by 53.6 percent of the employer/supervisors responding to this item (see Table 30). Accuracy was indicated as important by 51.2 percent of the employer/supervisors.

TABLE 29
EMPLOYER/SUPERVISOR RATINGS* OF EMPLOYEE PREPARATION FOR EMPLOYMENT BY PROGRAM AREA

| Aspects of Employment | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AGRI } \\ & \text { BUS } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BUS } \\ & \text { OCC } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{HITH} \\ & \mathrm{OCC} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IND } \\ & \text { OCC } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { P\&P } \\ & \text { SERV } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SPEC } \\ & \text { PROG } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | STATE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cooperativeness, ability to work with others | 3.90 | 3.84 | 3.81 | 3.81 | 3.83 | 3.73 | 3.83 |
| Attendance, reporting for work regularly | 3.81 | 3.82 | 3.83 | 3.76 | 3.80 | 3.71 | 3.30 |
| Accepting advice and supervision | 3.73 | 3.77 | 3.78 | 2.73 | 2.93 | 3.71 | 3.76 |
| Serving the public, patient, etc. | 3.74 | 3.04 | 3.75 | 3.86 | 3.77 | 3.60 | 3.68 |
| Safety habits, minimizing chance for accidents | 3.61 | 3.74 | 3.64 | 3.63 | 3.78 | 3.49 | 3.68 |
| Appearance, presenting a business image | 3.62 | 3.70 | 3.71 | 3.58 | 3.70 | 3.50 | 3.66 |
| Quality of work, ability to meet quality demands | 3.78 | 3.68 | 3.61 | 3.60 | 3.65 | 3.52 | 3.65 |
| Quantity of work, output of satisfactory amount | 3.70 | 3.68 | 3.70 | 3.59 | 3.67 | 3.44 | 3.65 |
| Dependability, thorough completion of a job | 3.74 | 3.63 | 3.63 | 3.52 | 3.65 | 3.48 | 3.60 |
| Adaptable to new situations | 3.77 | 3.60 | 3.55 | 3.07 | 3.56 | 3.51 | 3.57 |
| Use of tools and equipment | 3.60 | 3.57 | 3.37 | 3.56 | 3.45 | 3.49 | 3.56 |
| Being able to talk to the boss about job problems | 3.60 | 3.54 | 3.47 | 3.53 | 3.54 | 3.58 | 3.54 |
| Selection and care of space, materials, and supplies | 3.60 | 3.60 | 3.49 | 3.43 | 3.64 | 3.29 | 3.54 |
| Initiative, doing jobs that need doing | 3.51 | 3.50 | 3.57 | 3.40 | 3.51 | 3.24 | 3.47 |
| Job know-how, application of technical knowledge and skill | 3.51 | 3.39 | 3.44 | 3.33 | 3.31 | 3.29 | 3.38 |

[^7]Competency in using job tools, machines and materials was only identified as important in 21.6 percent of the positions. These findings are consistent with the findings of other studies indicating that personal qualities dominate the entry level scene. In many jobs, skills can be learned quickly on the job. In other jobs, no particular skills are necessary except the ability to follow directions. There are some entry level jobs, however, in which specific skills are important and employer/supervisors prefer these skills be obtained before employment.

Important entry level personai qualities and job skills were also broken down to see if differences exist between geographic regions in the state. These findings are reported in Appendix Table c-7.

## MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS

Alumni responses to two of the survey questions were analyzed using multiple linear regression techniques. This analysis was done to determine if:

1. respondents who were in training related jobs at the time of the survey rated the helpfulness of their training program differently than respondents who were not in training related employment;
2. there was a significant difference between the ratings of alumni from different program areas on the helpfulness of the training program,
3. the recommendations for program improvement made by respondents who were in training related jobs differed significantly from the recommendations for program improvement made by respondents who were not in training related employment; and
4. there was a significant difference between the recommendations made by alumni from different program areas.

Each alumni's response to everyone of the eleven possible choices on the two items was regressed to determine the effect of job relatedness and program

## IMPORTANT ENTRY LEVEL SKILLS IDENTIFIED BY EMPLOYER/SUPERVISORS BY PROGRAM AREA*

| Entry level skill | AGRI <br> BUS <br> \% | $\begin{gathered} \text { BUS } \\ \text { OCC } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | HLTH OCC $\qquad$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { IND } \\ \text { OCC } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { P\&P } \\ \text { SERV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | SPEC PROG $\qquad$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { STATE } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ability to get along with others--other workers, customers, patients, etc. <br> $48.1 \quad 56.3 \quad 72.3 \quad 46.7 \quad 56.7 \quad 54.2$ <br> 53.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Accuracy, quality and thoroughness | 37.0 | 59.1 | 40.0 | 41.7 | 42.3 | 34.9 | 51.2 |
| Positive attitude toward work | 39.5 | 39.2 | 40.0 | 43.6 | 43.3 | 50.6 | 41.3 |
| Dependability | 51.6 | 34.8 | 32.3 | 38.0 | 46.2 | 41.0 | 36.7 |
| Judgment--ability to make decisions, ability to plan and organize | 27.2 | 26.2 | 33.8 | 25.2 | 21.2 | 24.1 | 25.5 |
| Attendance and punctuality | 25.9 | 22.7 | 20.0 | 28.7 | 26.0 | 26.5 | 25.0 |
| Competency in using job tools, machines, and materials | 39.5 | 17.9 | 10.8 | 28.8 | 12.5 | 20.5 | 21.6 |
| Initiative | 14.8 | 17.4 | 09.' | 23.2 | 20.2 | 22.9 | 19.0 |
| Appearance and grooming | 11.1 | 14.9 | 09.2 | 09.0 | 20.2 | 09.6 | 12.9 |
| Work quantity | 16.0 | 10.1 | 06.2 | 13.8 | 13.5 | 09.6 | 11.4 |
| Other | 00.0 | 01.1 | 00.0 | 01.6 | 01.0 | 00.0 | 01.1 |

[^8]area upon the resnonse. In all, a total of 22 regressions were run with the general form: Response $=f($ Program Area, Job Relatedness). The sample consisted of only those respondents who reported having a job at the time of the survey. The sample size was 3603 .

Overall, the predictive value of these equations was low. The coefficient of determination was below 10 percent in all cases. However, we were interested in determining the effect of related employment and program area on the responses of employed survey participants.

In the assessment of the hielpfulness of occupational training in preparing respondents for employment, six of the regressions were statistically significant (see Appendix Table C-8). Job relatedness was more important than program area in three of the responses: knowing how to use tools and equipment on the job, knowing what one does on this kind of job, and being able to talk to the boss about job problems. In the case of knowing how to talk to the boss, the relationship is negative meaning the less related the job to the training taken the more helpful the program area was in teaching the student how to talk to the boss. In seven of the eleven aspects of employment, the program area is more important in explaining participants' responses (see partial correlation coefficients in $A_{1}^{\prime}$ rendix Table ( -8 ) but in only five aspects are the regression coefficients statistically significant.

On the item soliciting recommendations for program improvement, training related employment was more important than program area in only one choice-training needs to be more like the real job. This can be seen from the relative values of the two partial correlation coefficients in Appendix Table C-9. This was the only regression on this item in which the regression coefficient was statistically significant. The program area was significant in explaining responses in five of the eleven recommendations for improvement.

## CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This study focused on six principle dimensions in evaluating the effectiveness of programs of occupational preparation in Illinois: the basis on which occupational decisions were made; the post-high school status of occupational program completers; employment experience of program completers; alumni assessments of program helpfulness and recommendations for program improvement; employer/supervisor appraisals of employee preparation for employment; and entry level personal qualities and job skills considered important for employment.

In order to avoid broad generalization about occupational training based on the total for all programs, findings were also reported in this document by program areas. Since the literature review showed that emphasis has been placed on the importance of occupational students finding employment related to training, an attempt was made to determine the effect of this variable on program effectiveness and recommendations for program improvement.

## BASIS UPON WHICH OCCUPATIONAL DECISIONS WERE MADE

Survey findings show that educational decisions made by high school students in selecting occupational preparation programs tend to be left to chance. It is discouraging that only 20 percent of the respondents named school personnel as influencers in their decision to enroll in occupational training. While there is much verbal support for exploration of the world of work, occupational orientation, and pre-employment experience, evidence shows that these concepts have not yet had much influence upon secondary level students.

Many respondents were unaware of the nature of the occupational courses in which they had enrolled. They did not know the courses were employment preparation courses and many did not look for a job in the area of their preparation after leaving high school. Provisions must be made for establishing an organized system of providing occupational information and orientation so youth will have a sound basis upon which to make meaningful decisions concerning their occupational future.
?OST HIGH SCHOOL EXPERIENCE OF RESPONDENTS
One indication of occupational program effectiveness in the effect of the program upon unemployment rates. It is encouraging that only 6.4 percent of the survey respondents were unemployed but actively seeking work at the time of the survey. Of concern, is the 11.6 percent of the Cooperative Work Experience alumni who were in this category. Former students who participated in programs of cooperative education have had actual work experience which should have given them an advantage in obtaining future employment.

Three of every ten survey respondents was found to be continuing their education at the time of the survey. More alumni of Health Occupations programs were "in school" than were alumni of other program areas. Occupational training tended to be more of a terminal experience than a stepping stone to further education for alumni of Personal and Public Service and Cooperative Work Experience programs. A majority of those who were continuing their education were full-time students and were also in the labor force.

Occupational students need more than limited specific skills training if they plan on going on to postsecondary education, whether at the community college or four-year college level. Youth need realistic exposure to the world of work so that they know what kinds of iobs they might obtain at each spin-off point, what types of skills are required and what kind of further schooling
they might need. In a rapidly changing world of work, occupational education is never terminal and far more flexible options for high school graduates to continue on to postsecondary education or to enter the world of work must be provided.

## EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCE OF RESPONDENTS

A sizeable percentage of the respondents found a job within one month after leaving high school. Alumni of Personal and Public Service programs did not find employment as rapidly as respondents from other programs areas. It took three out of every ten respondents anywhere from one to more than six months to find initial employment after leaving high school. Active high school placement services could have benefited many of these respondents. Forty-five percent of the Personal and Public Service respondents were in this category.

Roughly sixty percent of the respondents who had never been employed since leaving high school were in continuing education except for Special Programs and Personal and Public Service alumni. A higher than average percentage of alumni in these two program areas were either unable to obtain employment or did not want a job.

At the time of the survey, Health Occupations programs had the highest percentage of respondents in training related employment. Only 17 percent of the Industrial Occupations and 20 percent of the Agri-Business alumni were found in training related employment at the time of the survey. These two program areas also had higher than average proportions of respondents who indicated they couldn't find training related employment.

While the overall percentage of respondents who were found in training related employment at the time of the survey was low, employed respondents were generally well satisfied with their jobs. Satisfied employees tend to be
thought of by their employers as well suited for their jobs. This type of employee-employer satisfaction tends to enhance the job changing profile of workers. The highest proportion of highly satisfied respondents was from the Health Occupations program area. Industrial Occupations alumni were not as highly satisfied with their jobs as alumni from other program areas. Approximately 13 percent of the Indistrial Occupations alumni were dissatisfied with their employment situation.

Survey findings support earlier findings by the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education that substantial training related employment rate differentials exist between various occupational program areas. The training related employment rates found in this study are much lower than those reported by Illinois LEA's on the VE-22 Series. Apparently, the LEA's used a more liberal definition of training related employment than is supported by the U.S. Office of Education.

The emphasis given training related employment as an evaluative criteria should be carefully reconsidered. There is much verbal support for the establishment of broad occupational preparation at the secondary level rather than narrow preparation for entry into a specific occupation. Programs whose objectives are to provide students with a set of skills (both general as well as specific) useful in a wide varisty of options so that they may select from many attractive career alternatives tend to have reduced training related placement rates. Reliance upon related placement as a major evaluative criteria many cut down future fiscal resources for those programs that develop multiple job skills and basic knowledge.

Other criteria which may be more useful than related employment for determining curricular modifications might include job satisfaction, alumni assessments of program effectiveness and recommendations for program
improvement, and employer appraisals of employment preparation and identification of important entry level skills.

## ALUMNI ASSESSMENTS OF EMPLOYMENT PREPARATION

Occupational program alumni generally felt that occupational education could be improved. Training programs were most helpful in preparing former students for use of job tools and equipment. Areas where job preparation was least effective were: getting along with the public served; handling new or unpleasant situations; being able to talk to the boss about job problems; and understanding union membership.

While the majority of respondents would recommend that other students select occupational training programs of interest to them, they felt more emphasis should be placed upon occupational information, orientation and exploration of the world of work. It is apparent that programs of occupational preparation have not been effective in developing in students adequate and realistic knowledge about available jobs and career decision making and planning skills. Respondents also expressed a need for high school personnel to provide placement services with a higher than average percentage of Personal and Public Service alumni expressing this need.

Respondents generally felt training could be more realistic--more like the real job. A larger proportion of Business, Marketing and Management alumni made this recommendation than alumni of other program areas.

Findings tend to support the view that cluster oriented employment preparation is to be preferred to specific job training. Low proportions of program completers were found in training related jobs yet high proportions were well satisfied with their jobs. Roughly one-fourth of the respondents felt training should prepare you for several jobs rather than for one specific job. Many respondents also felt that more emphasis should be placed upon
common job skills and related basic knowledge needed by all workers.

EMPLOYER/SUPERVISOR APPRAISALS OF EMPLOYMENT PREPARATION
Einployer/supervisor assessments of alumni readiness for employment indicate satisfaction with occupational training program contributions to alumni employability. Thirteen of fifteen aspects of employment were rated from 3.5 to 3.8 on a 4.0 scale. Employed Industrial Occupations and Personal and Public Serivce clumni were rated low in being able to accept advice and supervision, while other program alummi were rated high in this employment aspect.

It was of interest to note that while emphasis is placed upon skill training at the secondary level, employer/supervisors found training programs to be least effective in this area. The large proportion of respondents who were found in non-training related employment could explain the lower rating in this employment aspect. However, since employees were considered "somewhat prepared" even for non-training related employment, Illinois occupational programs must provide basic enough preparation for the type of entry level positions program alumni obtain.. Competency in using job tools, machines and materials was only identified as an important entry level skill in 21.6 percent of the positions held by employed respondents.

IMPORTANT ENTRY LEVEL PERSONAL QUALITIES AND JOB SKILLS
Personal qualities dominated entry level competences identified by employer/supervisors of respondents employed at the time of the survey. Workers who can get along with other workers, customers, patients, etc., and who are thorough, accurate and produce quality work are desired. Over one-half of the employer/supervisors identified these competences as the most important entry level qualities needed for entry into the positions held by employed alumni survey respondents. The third most frequently mentioned quality
needed for entry level employment was a positive attitude toward work. The extent to which these nonskill factors are included in occupational instruction should affect the employment success of occupational program alumni. Programs designed in full cognizance of entry requirements, given that other program aspects are comparable, should prove to be effective in preparing secondary students for entry into the world of work.

THE IMPORTANCE OF RELATEDNESS AND PR M AREA
With the exception of Health Occur ans alumni, there were very low proportions of survey respondents who were found in jobs related to their training at the time of the survey. Regression analysis showed that training related employment was important in explaining respondent assessments of program effectiveness in only three areas: knowing how to use tools and equipment on the job; knowing what one does on the job; and knowing how to talk to the boss about job problems. In the latter case (being able to talk to the boss), a negative relationship was revealed between this item and the relatedness of the job to training. When making recommendations for program improvement, related employment was significant for only one suggestion-training needs to be more like the real job.

The program area in which alumni were trained was more important in explaining responses in seven of the eleven employment aspects rated for program effectiveness. The program area was significant in explaining responses in five of the eleven recommendations fo: improvement.

The relatedness of the job to the training taken appears to have little significance in influencing alumni assessments of training contributions to employability and their recommendations for program improvement. However, the program areas in which alumni were trained are of some importance in these two questionnaire items.
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# JOBS HELD BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYED AT THE TIME OF THE SURVEY BY D.O.T. CLASSIFICATION, STATE AND REGIONAL TOTALS <br> WITH RELATED INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM 

EXPLANATION OF THE D.O.T. CODE

The D.o.T. coding system explained in Dictionary of Occupational Titles defines 21,741 separate occupations for which there are 35,550 titles. These occupations have been classified and identified by 6-digit numbers. The structure consists of two arrangements of jobs--The Occupational Group Arrangement and the Worker Traits Arrangement. Jobs having the same basic occupational or worker traits characteristics are grouped so that various relationships among occupations can be discerned.
ōccupational Group Ārrangement!
201!368
iWorker Trait Arrangement

## OCCUPATIONAL GROUP ARRANGEMENT

All occupations are grouped into nine broad categories according to work field, purpose, material, product, subject matter, service, generic term, and/or industry. These nine categories are identified by the number 0-9 reflected in the first digit of the code number, as follows:

The nine occupational categories are divided into 84 broad subject matter divisions, reflected in the first and second digits of the code.

In turn, the 2-digit divisions are subdivided into 603 specific subject matter 3-digit groups.

Example: 201. XXX
$2 \quad \begin{aligned} & \text { Occupational } \\ & \text { Category }\end{aligned}$ Category

20
Division
201.

Group

Clerical and sales occupations
This category includes occupations conecraed with preparing, transeriblug, transferring. systematizing, and preserving uritien communications and records; collecting accounts; distributing information; and influencing cus. tomers in lavor of a commodicy or service. Includes occupations closely identifed with sales transactlons even though they do not involve actual participation.

STENOGRAPHY, TYPING, FILiNG, AND RELATED OCCUPATION:
This division includes occupatlons concerned with making, classifying, and filing records, Including written communications.

## Secretarles

This group Includes oceupations concerned with earrylng out minor administrative and general office duties In addition to taklatg and transcribnedictation Occupationsconcerned primarly wilh taking and transcriblng dicta. tlon are Included in Groin 202.

## WORKER TRAIT CHARACTERISTICS

The last three digits (to the ris $t$ of the decimal) of the six digit D.O.T. Code identify worker functions in relation to Data, People, and Things. The relationships expressed in the three hierarchies are ordered from the most complex significant relationship of the occupation to the least complex relationship. The least complex signigicant relationship (as illustrated in Table A-1) would be XXX.888. The most complex job possible would correspond to a D.O.T. code of XXX.000. A job with a D.O.T. code of XXX. 808 represents a worker function with high complexity in one dimension only (with relationship in this example to People).

## RELATIONSHIPS WITHIN DATA, PEOPLE, THINGS HIERARCHIES

 FROM THE DICTIONARY OF OCCUPATIONAL TITLES\author{
DATA (4th digit) <br> 0 Synthesizing <br> 1 Coordinating <br> 2 Analyzing <br> 3 Compiling <br> 4 Computing <br> 5 Copying <br> 6 Comparing <br> $\left.\begin{array}{l}7 \\ 8\end{array}\right\}$ No Significant relationship

}
PEOPLE (5th digit)
0 Mentoring
1 Negotiating
2 Instructing
3 Supervising
4 Diverting
5 Persuading
6 Speaking-Signaling
7 Serving
8 No significant relationship

THINGS (6th digit)
0 Setting-up
1 Precision working
2 Operating-Controlling
3 Oriving-Operating
4 Manipulating
5 Tendifig
6 Feeding-Offbeating
7 Handling
8 No significant relationship

DATA: Information, knowledge, and conceptions, related to data, people, or things obtained by observation, investigation, 'nterpretation, visualization, mental creation; incapable of being touched; written data take the form of numbers, words, symbols; other data are ideas, concepts, oral verbalization.

0 Synthesizing: Integrating analyses of data to discover facts and/or develop knowledge concepts or interpretations.

1 Coordinating: Determining time, place, and sequence of operations or action to be taken on the basis of analysis of data; executing determinations and/or reporting on events.

2 Analyzing: Examining and evaluating data. Presenting alternative a actions in relation to the evaluation is frequently involved.

3 Compiling: Gathering, collating, or classifying information about data people, or things. Reporting and/or carrying out a prescribed action in relation to the information is frequently involved.

4 Computing: Performing arithmetic operations and reporting on and/or carrying out a prescribed action in relation to them. Does not include

5 Copying: Transcribing, entering, or posting data.
6 Comparing: Judging the readily observable functional, structural, or compositional characteristics (whether similar to or divergent from obvious standards) of data, people, or things.

PEOPLE: Human beings; also animals dealt with on an individual basis as if they were human.

0 Mentoring: Dealing with individuals in terms of their total personality in order to advise, counsel, and/or guide them with regard to problems that may be resolved by legal, scientific, clinical, spiritual, and/or other professional principles.

1 Negotiating: Exchanging ideas, information, and opinions with others to formulate policies and programs and/or arrive jointly at decisions, conclusions, or solutions.

2 Instructing: Teaching subject matter to uthers, or training others (including animals) through explanation, demonstration, and supervised practice; or making recommendations on the basis of technical disciplines.

3 Supervising: Determining or interpreting work procedures for a group of workers, assigning specific duties to them, maintaining harmonious relations among them, and promoting efficiency.

4 Diverting: Amusing others.
5 Persuading: Influencing others in favor of a product, service, or point of view.

6 Speaking-Signaling: Talking with and/or signaling people to convey or exchange information. Includes giving assignments and/or directions to helpers or assistants.

7 Serving: Attending to the needs or requests of people or animals or the expressed or implicit wishes of people. Immediate response is involved.

THINGS: Inanimate objects as distinguished from human beings; substances or materials; machines, tools, equipment; products. A thing is tangible and has shape, form, and other physical characteristics.

0 Setting Up: Adjusting machines or equipment by replacing or altering tools, jigs, fixtures, and attachments to prepare them to perform their functions, change their performance, or restore their proper functioning if they break down. Workers who set up one or a number of machines for other workers or who set up and personally operate a variety of machines are included here.

1 Precision Working: Using body members and/or tools or work aids to work, move, guide, or place objects or materials in situations where ultimate responsibility for the attainment of standards occurs and selectio: of appropriate tools, objects, or materiais, and the adjustment of the tool to the task require exercise of considerable judgment.

2 Operating-Controlling: Starting, stopping, controlling, and adjusting the progress of machines or equipment designed to fabricate and/or process objects or materials. Operating machines involves setting up
the machine and adjusting the machine or material as the work progresses. Controlling equipment involves observing gages, dials, etc.. and turning valves and other devices to control such factors as temperature, pressure, flow of liquids, speed of pumps, aind reactions of materials. Setup involves several variables and adjustment is more frequent than in tending.

3 Driving-Operating: Starting, stopping, and controlling the actions of machines or equipment for which a course must be steered, or which must be guided, in order to fabricate, process, and/or move things or people. Involves such activities as observing gages and dials; estimating distances and determining speed and direction of other objects; turning cranks and wheels; pushing clutches or brakes; and pushing or pulling gear lifts or levers. Includes such machines as cranes, conveyor systems. tractors, finace charging machines, paving machines, and hoisting machines. Excludes manually powared machines, such as handtrucks and dollies, and power assisted machines, such as electric wheelbarrows and handtrucks.

4 Manipulating: leing body members, tools, or special devices to work, move or guide, or place objects or materials. Involves some latitude for judgment with regard to precision attained and selecting appropriate tooi. object, or material, although this is readily manifest.

5 Tending: Starting, stopping, and observing the functioning of maciines and equipment. Involves adjusting materials or controls of the machine. such as changing guides, $21 j u s t i n g$ timers and temperature gages, turning valves to aliow flow of marerials, and flipping switches in response to lights. Little judgment is involved in making these adjustments.

6 Feeding-0ffbearing: Inserting, throwing, dumping, or placing materials in or renoving them from machines or equipmen'c which are automatic or tended or operated by other workers.

7 Handling: Using body members, handtools, arid/or special devices to work. move, or carry objects or materials. Involves little or no latitude for juidgment with regard to attainment of standards or in selecting appropriate tool, object, or material.

Note: Included in the concept of Feeding-Offbearing, Tending, OperatingControlling, and Setiting Up, is the situation in which the worker is actuaily part of the setup of the machine, either as the holder and guide of the material or holder and guider of the tool.
reLated instruitional prngrams: *Table a2 lists the jabs held by respondents employed at the time of the syryey by D.O.T. classification. In the last column the reiated instructional programs have been identisied. This matching of iob by D.O.T. classification to instructional programs was taken from the document Vocational Education and Occupations a U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Helfare, Office of Education publication. Other publications utilized in this máching included Vocational and Technical Education: Descriptions, Definitions and D.E. Coding an Illinojs Division of Vocational and Technical Education document and Occupational Tidining Information System: Cycle Tw. Report, by Paul V. Praden and associates, iklahoma State University.

A-5

## TABLE A 2

n and group headings to indicate that only the occupations not classifed in a more specific group are inciuded.

| $\qquad$ Clusters of Occupations and D.O.T. Code | STATE |  | REGION |  |  |  |  |  |  | TRAINING PROGRAM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\frac{115}{8 / 2}$ | Cook Co. | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | Related Instructional Program Name and O.E. Code |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PROFESSIONAL, TECHNICAL, AND } \\ & \text { MANAGERIAL OCCUPATIONS } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 001.281 Draftsman, Architectural | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 003.281 Draftsman, Electrical | 1 | * | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 005.281 Draftsman, Civil | 3 | 0.1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | -17.1300 Drafting |
| 007.281 Draftsman, Mechanical | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 017.281 Draftsman, n.e.c.** ${ }^{\text {Total }}$ | 20 | 0.6 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | L |
|  | 26 | 0.7 | 10 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 |  |
| 003.181 Technician, Electrical or Electronic | 5 | 0.1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | $\left[\begin{array}{l}16.0107 \text { Electrical Technology } \\ -16.0108 \text { Electronic Technology } \\ 16.0112 \text { Instrumentation Tech. }\end{array}\right.$ |
| 005.181 Technician, Civil Engineering | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |
| 018.188 Surveyor | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | F16.0106 Civil Technology |
| 018.587 Rodman | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | -16.0106 Civil Technology |
| 018.687 Chainman | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | [ |
| 011.281 Laboratery Assistant, Metallurgical | 1 | * | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -16.0114 Metallurgical Technology |
| 022.281 Laboratory Technician, |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chemical | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16.0105 Chemical Technology |
| 022.384 Chemist Helper | 1 | * | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16.0105 Chemical Technology |
| 029.381 Lavoratory Assistant or Tester (industry) | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -16 0699 Miscellaneous Technical Education, Other |
| Total | 13 | 0.4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |  |


| J0BS | STATE | REGION |  |  |  |  |  |  | TRAINING PROGRAM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clusters of Occupations and D.O.T. Code | $\frac{\text { Totals }}{\mathrm{f}}$ | Cook Co. | I | II | II I | IV | V | VI | Related Instructional Program Name and D.E. Code |
| 092.228 Teaching Aide-primary 099.228 Non-School Instructors, Tutors, Aides | $\begin{array}{cc} \hline 1 & * \\ 5 & 0.1 \\ 6 & 0.2 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 2 \\ & 2 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 0 2 2 | 0 0 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 1 \\ & 2 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 0 0 0 |  |
| 120.108 Minister <br>  | $\begin{array}{ll} 1 & \star \\ 1 & \star \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 0 0 | 0 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 0 0 | 1 1 |  |
| 132.038 Editor 132.268 Reporter | $\begin{array}{ll} 1 & \star \\ 2 & 0.1 \\ 3 & 0.1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & 1 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & 1 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 0 0 0 | 1 0 1 |  |
| 141.081 Advertising, Art Layout Man 142.081 Floral Designer 143.062 Photographer, Newspaper 149.281 Architectural Modeler Total | $\begin{array}{cc} 3 & 0.1 \\ 5 & 0.1 \\ 1 & 0.0 \\ 1 & 0.0 \\ 10 & 0.3 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 1 2 0 1 4 | 1 0 0 0 1 | 0 1 1 0 2 | 0 1 0 0 1 | 0 1 0 0 1 | 1 0 0 0 1 | 0 0 0 0 0 | [04.0100 Advertising Services 17.0700 Conmercial Art Occupations -04.0500 Floristry -17.0900 Commercial Photography Occupations -16.0103 Architectural Technology (Building Construction) |
| 153.348 Professional Athlete <br> 153.874 Exercisor, Horse <br> 159.148 Announcer, Radio-TV <br> 159.228 Bridge Instructor | $\begin{array}{ll} 1 & 0.0 \\ 1 & 0.0 \\ 2 & 0.1 \\ 1 & 0.0 \\ & \\ 5 & 0.1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 0 0 0 0 | 1 1 0 0 2 | 0 0 1 1 2 2 | 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 1 0 1 | 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 0 | $\cdots$ |





|  | JOBS |  | TE | REGION |  |  |  |  |  |  | TRAINING PROGRAM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Clusters of Occupations and D.O.T. Code |  | $\frac{\alpha \cos }{\alpha}$ | Cook Co. | I | II | II I | IV | V | VI | Related Instructional Program Name and O.E. Code |
| $207.782$ | Duplicating Machine Operator II <br> Mimeograph Operator <br> Automatic Typewriter Operator | 4 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} 14.0301 \text { Duplicating Machine } \\ \text { Operator } \end{array}\right.$ |
| 207.885 | Duplicating Machine Operator IV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $L$ |
|  | Stencil Cutter Operator | 1 | ${ }^{*}$ | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 208.588 | Transcribing Machine Operator Photocomposing Machine, Perforator Operator; Typesetter Perforator Operator | 11 | 0.3 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14.0901 C.lerk-Typists <br> -14.0399 Filing, Office Machines and General Office Occupations |
| 208.885 | Collator Operator | 1 | * | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 209.388 | Clerk-Typist; Mortgage Clerk Statement Clerk; Tax Clerk |  | 8.5 | 103 | 75 | 25 | 26 | 31 | 32 | 13 |  |
| 209.488 | Invoice Clerk; Circulation Clerk | 4 | 0.1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 209.688 | Proofreader; Order Caller | 2 | 0.1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 209.588 | Price Clerk; Marker; Remittance Clerk | 7 | 0.2 | 2 | $!$ | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | -04.0800 General Merchandise <br> -14.0502 Quality Control Clerks |
|  | Total | 735 | 20.4 | 254 | 166 | 76 | 49 | 82 | 68 | 40 | - 4.0502 Quality Control Clerks |
| 210.368 | Account Information Clerk | 2 | 0.1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | [14.0102 Bookkeeper |
| 210.388 | Bookkeeper | 61 | 1.7 | 15 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 12 | 9 | [ |



| JOBS | STATE |  | REGION |  |  |  |  |  |  | TRAINING PROGRAM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clusters of Occupations and D.O.T. Code |  |  | Cook Co. | I | II | III | IV | $V$ | VI | Related Instructional Program Name and O.E. Code |
| 221.388 Order Clerk; Production Clerk | 5 | 0.1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -14.0501 Planning and Production |
| 222.138 Rate Clerk; Shipping Clerk | 4 | 0.1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | [14.0503 Shipping and Receiving |
| 222.368 Expeditor | 2 | 0.1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - Clerks |
| 222.387 Control Clerk; Complaint Clerk |  |  | 18 | 12 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 4 |  |
| 222.587 Distributing Clerk; Route Return Man |  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 0 | 0 | 1 |  |
| 222.687 Receiving Checker; Shipping Checker | 2 | 0.1 0.1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 0 | 0 0 | 0 | 1 |  |
| 223.387 Materials Checker; Stock Clerk | 45 | 1.3 | 12 | 15 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | [14.0504 Stock and Inventory Clerks |
| 223.388 Inventory Clerk | 6 | 0.2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | - |
| 223.587 Laboratory Helper (clerical) | 1 | * | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 223.487 Mail Order Filler | 2 | 0.1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | -14.0200 Apparel and Accessories |
| 223.687 Checker (Bakery Products) | 1 | * | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -04.0600 Food Distribution |
| 223.887 Central Supply Worker | 2 | 0.1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -07.0905 Central Supply Technician |
| 224.487 Weigher | 3 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | [14.0599 Materials Support |
| 229.138 Yard Foreman, (construction) | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | [ Occupations; Other |
| Total | 126 | 3.5 | 41 | 34 | 12 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 11 |  |
| 230.878 Messenger; Office Boy | 5 | 0.1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -14.0405 Messengers and Office Boys and Girls |
| 231.388 Parcel Post Clerk | 2 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | [14.0403 Mail and Postal Clerks |
| 231.588 Mail Clerk | 14 | 0.4 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 |  |
| 231.687 Express Messenger; Shipper | 8 | 0.2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 232.368 Post Office Clerk (Government Services) | 10 | 0.3 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 233.388 Mail Carrier | 1 | * | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | L |


| A-15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JOBS | STATE |  | REGION |  |  |  |  |  |  | TRAINING PROGRAM |
| Clusters of Occupations and D.O.T. Code |  |  | Cook Co. | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | Related Instructional Program Name and O.E. Code |
| 234.582 Addressing Machine Operator 235.138 Telephone Operator; Chief |  |  | 0 2 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 1 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 | -14.0404 Mail Preparing and Mail <br> 14.0401 Handling Machine Operators <br> Communications Systems |
| 235.862 Telephone Operator; Switchboard Operator |  |  | 2 13 | 15 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 |  | $\left[\begin{array}{c}14.0401 \text { Communications Systems } \\ \text { Clerks and Operators }\end{array}\right.$ |
| 237.168 Travel Counselor | 2 | 0.1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | -04.1900 Recreation and Tourism |
| 237.358 Receptionists |  | 1.7 | 20 | 11 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 11 | 0 | -14.0406 Receptionists and Information Clerks |
| 239.368 Counter Clerk <br> 239.588 Meter Reader | $1$ |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | -14.0499 Information Communications Occupations; Other |
| Total | 146 | 4.1 | 55 | 31 | 17 | 11 | 12 | 16 | 4 |  |
| 240.368 Bill Collector; Tracer | 1 | * | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -04.0800 General Merchandise |
| 243.368 Service Clerk | 5 | 0.1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 14.9900 Office Occupations; Other |
| 240.388 Collection Clerk | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 14.9900 Office Occupations, Other |
| 240.468 Lay-away Clerk | 4 | 0.1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 240.887 Collection (Telephone and Telegraph) | 1 | * | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 241.163 Claim:Adjuster | 1 | * | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 04.1300 Insurance |
| 242.368 Hotel Clerk | 2 | 0.1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14.9900 Office Occupations; Other <br> -04.1100 Hotel \& Lodging |
| 249.268 Claims Examiner | 2 | 0.1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | , | 0 | 0 | -04.1300 Insurance |
| 249.368 Credit Clerk; Reservation Clerk; Library Assistant; Claims Clerk | 34 | 0.9 | 6 | 14 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 14.0499 Information Communications Occupations; Other -14.9900 Office Occupations; Other 14.0602 Interviewers and Test Technicians |


\# All Sales Occupations, D.O.T. Codes 250. to 299. are totaled together; See page 14.






| JOBS <br> Clusters of Occupations and D.O.T. Code | STATE |  | REGION |  |  |  |  |  |  | TRAINING PROGRAM |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\frac{\text { Totals }}{\text { f }}$ |  | Cook Co. | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | Related Instructional Program Name and O.E. Code |  |
| 382.884 Janitor <br> 389.781 Termite Exterminator | 23 |  | 4 0 | 7 0 | 3 | 3 1 | 2 0 | 3 0 | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & -17.11 \\ & -01.0201 \end{aligned}$ | Custodial Services <br> Agricultural Chemicals |
| Total | 30 | 0.8 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 |  |  |
| TOTAL: SERVICE OCCUPATIONS | 505 | 14.0 | 101 | 92 | 92 | 60 | 62 | 59 | 39 |  |  |
| FARMING, FISHERY, FORESTRY \& RELATED OCCUPATIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 401.137 Detasseling Crew Supervisor | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | $L^{01.0102}$ | Plant Science |
| 465.887 Laborer, Orchard Sprayer | 1 | * | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| 406.884 Laborer, Nursery (agriculture) | 2 | 0.1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 01.0505 | Nursery Operation and |
| 406.887 Nursery Worker; Groundsman | 3 | 0.1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | Management |
| 407.181 Landscape Gardener | 4 | 0.1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -01.0504 | Landscape |
| 407.884 Groundskeeper | 18 | 0.5 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  | - |
| 407.887 Laborer, Landscape | 2 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | -01.0602 | Recreation |
| 409.883 Farm Equipment Operator | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | -01.0301 | Agricultural Power |
| 424.883 Heavy Equipment Operator; Sprayer | 2 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | -01.0301 | and Machinery |
| Total | 35 | 1.0 | 5 | 12 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 |  |  |
| 411.181 Farmer, Dairy | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | [01.0101 | Animal Science |
| 411.884 Farm Hand, Dairy | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| 412.884 Choreman, Dairy | 2 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  |
| 413.884 Ranchman; Farm Hand Livestock | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |  |
| 419.884 Animal Caretaker, Gamekeeper | 2 | 0.1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | -01.99 | Agriculture; Other |
| Total | 7 | 0.2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |  |  |


| JOBS | STATE |  | REGION |  |  |  |  |  |  | TRAINING PROGRAM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clusters of Occupations and D.O.T. Code |  |  | Cook Co. | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | Related Instructional Program Name and O.E. Code |
| 421.181 Farmer, General 421.883 Farm Hand, General | $\begin{aligned} & 16 \\ & 43 \\ & 59 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.4 \\ 1.2 \\ 1.8 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 0 0 | 0 1 1 | $\begin{array}{r}4 \\ 10 \\ 14 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6 \\ 15 \\ 21 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 5 5 | $\begin{array}{r}5 \\ 9 \\ 14 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 1 <br> 3 <br> 4 | [01.0100 Agricultural Production |
| 441.887 Forest Fire Fighter Total | 1 | * | 0 | 0 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | -01.0601 Forests |
| TOTAL: $\begin{aligned} & \text { FARMING, FISHERY, FORESTRY, } \\ & \text { \& RELATED OCCUPATIONS }\end{aligned}$ | 102 | 2.8 | 5 | 14 | 16 | 27 | 12 | 19 | 9 |  |
| PROCESSING OCCUPATIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 500.884 Plater (electronics) <br> 504.782 Metal Spraying Machine Operator | 1 | * | 0 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | $\left[^{17.2399 \text { Metalworking; Other }}\right.$ |
| 500.886 Laborer, Electroplating | 1 | * | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 502.884 Blast Furnace Caster; Mold Setter | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | -17.2301 Foundry |
| 502.887 Blast Furnace Helper | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 503.886 Pickler, Helper | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |
| 504.885 Heat Treater Helper | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | -17.2400 Metallurgy |
| 509.885 Separator Operator; Scrap Handler | 2 | 0.1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -17.2400 Metallurgy |
| steel) <br> General (iron and Total | 4 13 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1 \\ & 0.4 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 3 3 | 1 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 4 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 510.885 Mixer (iron and steel) | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 512.782 Furnace Operator | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | [17.2301 Foundry |
| 512.883 Furnace Charger | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | [ 7.2301 Foundry |


| JOBS | STATE | REGION |  |  |  |  |  |  | TRAINING PROGRAM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clusters of Occupations and D.O.T. Code | $\frac{\text { Totals }}{\mathrm{f}}$ | Cook Co. | I | II | III | IV | $V$ | VI | Related Instructional Program Name and O.E. Code |
| 542.782 Fireman (petroleum refinery) <br> 542.884 Furnace Loader <br> 549.887 Laborer, Petroleum Refinery <br> Total | $\begin{array}{rr} 1 & \star \\ 1 & \star \\ 6 & 0.2 \\ 8 & 0.2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | 0 0 5 | 0 0 0 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 550.885 Chemical Mixer, Blender <br> 553.885 Drter Operator <br> 556.780 Mold Setter <br> 556.782 Molding Compressor Machine Operator <br> 556.886 Mold Stripper <br> 557.782 Extruder Operator <br> 558.886 Furnace Helper (chemical) <br> 559.884 Tank Cleaner (chemical) <br> 559.887 Laborer, Chemical Processing <br> Total | 2 0.1 <br> 2 0.1 <br> 1 $*$ <br> 4 0.1 <br> 1 $*$ <br> 1 $*$ <br> 1 $*$ <br> 1 $*$ <br> 1 $*$ <br> 14 0.4 | 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 2 | 0 0 0 4 0 0 0 1 1 6 | 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\left[\begin{array}{l} 17.2700 \text { Plastics Occupations } \\ - \end{array}\right.$ |
| 570.885 Concrete Mixer Operator; Mixer Operator (lime, brick) <br> 573.886 Hacker, (brick and tile) <br> 574.782 Set-up Man, Coating Equipment <br> 575.782 Brick Making Machine Operator <br> 575.887 Laborer (concrete production) <br> 579.131 Foreman (concrete block manufacturing) <br> 579.687 Glass Inspector <br> 579.782 Mixer (concrete production) <br> 579.885 Insulation Machine Operator; Laborer, Concrete Mixing Plant | 3 0.1 <br> 1 $*$ <br> 1 $*$ <br> 1 $*$ <br> 1 $*$ <br> 1 $*$ <br> 1 $*$ <br> 2 0.1 <br> 3 0.1 | 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 | 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 | 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 | 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 | 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 | 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 |  |



| JOBS | STATE |  | REGION |  |  |  |  |  |  | TRAINING PROGRAM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clusters of Occupations and D.O.T. Code |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cook } \\ \text { Co. } \end{gathered}$ | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | Related Instructional Program Name and O.E. Code |
| 605.782 Router Operator | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 17.2303 Machine Tool Operator |
| 605.885 Milling Machine Operator | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 606.380 Drill Press Set-up Operator | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 606.782 Boring Machine Operator; <br> Drill Press Operator | 3 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 607.782 Cut-off Saw Operator; | 3 | 0.1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - |
| 615.782 Punch Press Operator |  |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ] | 0 |  |
| 615.885 Shear Operator | 1 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | E |
| Total | 57 | 1.6 | 10 | 15 | 17 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 2 |  |
| 614.782 Extruder Operator; Wire Drawer | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | -17.2399 Metalworking; Other |
| 616.380 Machine Operator; Set-up Man | 53 | 1.5 | 14 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 17.2304 Metal Trades, Combined |
| 616.381 Spring Inspector | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | [17.2305 Sheet Metal [17.2400 Metallurgy |
| 616.685 Load Tester | 1 | * | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | [ 17.2400 Metallurgy |
| 616.782 Kick Press Operator | 1 | * | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17.2304 Metal Trades, Combined |
| 616.885 Bench Worker | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -17.2399 Metalworking; Other |
| 617.885 Punch Press Operator II | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 619.885 Machine Operator II; Brake Operator | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 617.780 Set-up Man, Kick Press | 2 | 0.1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | - |
| $619.88 \mathrm{Se}^{\text {S }}$-up Man (iron and steel) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 619.886 Machine Feeder | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | L |
| 619.887 Machine Helper | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |
| Total | 64 | 1.8 | 15 | 11 | 14 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 1 |  |




| JOBS | STATE <br> Totals <br> \% | REGION |  |  |  |  |  |  | TRAINING PROGRAM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clusters of Occupations and D.O.T. Code |  | Cook Co. | I | II | III | IV | $V$ | VI | Related Instructional Program Name and O.E. Code |
| 651.782 Cylinder Pressman; Offset <br> Pressman; Web Press Man <br> 651.886 Press Man Helper <br> 652.885 Marking-Machine Operator <br> Total | $\begin{array}{rr} 21 & 0.6 \\ 1 & \star \\ 1 & \star \\ 27 & 0.8 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 7 1 0 9 | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 3 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 7 0 0 7 | 0 0 0 1 | 2 0 0 2 | 0 0 1 1 | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | [17.1902 Printing Press Uccupations |
| 660.280 Cabinetmaker <br> 661.281 Patternmaker, Wood (foundry) <br> 669.886 Planer Chainman (planning mill) <br> Total | $\begin{array}{rr} 7 & 0.2 \\ 1 & \star \\ 1 & \star \\ 9 & 0.3 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \\ & 3 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | 1 0 1 2 | 0 0 0 0 | 1 0 0 1 | 0 0 0 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | -17.3601 Millwork and Cabinetmaking <br> -17.3699 Woodworking; Other |
| 680.885 Card Stripper (textile) <br> 680.886 Machine Feeder (raw stock, textiles) <br> 689.384 Cloth Tester <br> 689.885 Back Tender (textile) <br> 689.886 Utility Man (textile) <br> Total | 1 $\star$ <br> 1 $\star$ <br> 1 $\star$ <br> 1 $\star$ <br> 1 $\star$ <br> 5 0.1 | 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 1 0 1 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 0 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 0 0 0 1 1 2 | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 690.782 Stitcher, Machine <br> 690.885 Cutting Machine Tender <br> 692.782 Assembiy Machine Operator <br> 692.885 Assembly Machine Tender 699.885 Cutter, Machine (any industry) <br> Total | $\begin{array}{ll} 1 & \star \\ 1 & \star \\ 1 & \star \\ 1 & \star \\ 1 & \star \\ 5 & 0.1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 1 0 0 1 2 | 0 0 1 0 0 1 | 0 0 0 0 0 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| TOTAL: MACHINE TRADES OCCUPATIONS | 8.7 | 83 | 72 | 57 | 21 | 31 | 32 | 18 |  |




| JOBS | STATE | REGION |  |  |  |  |  |  | TRAINING PROGRAM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clusters of Occupations and D.O.T. Code | $\frac{\text { Totals }}{\mathrm{f}}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { cook } \\ \text { co } \end{gathered}$ | 1 | II | III | IV | $\checkmark$ | vi | Related Instructional Program Name and O.E. Code |
| 731.884 Toy Assembler 731.887 Assembler, Finisher Toys |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Games | 1 * | 0 | 0 | 1 | $0$ | $0$ | $0$ | 0 |  |
| 739.381 Display Assembler | 1 * | 0 | ${ }_{0}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 739.687 Broomcorn Grader |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | $0$ | $0$ |  |
| 739.887 Assembier Small (any industry) | $11 \quad 0.3$ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  |
| Total | $16 \quad 0.4$ | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  |
| 0.887 Painter, Brush; Hand (any |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| . 887 Painter, industry) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 741.884 Painter, Spray (any industry) | 0.1 |  | $\dagger$ | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| 741.887 Painter Helper Spray |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |  |
| Total | $16 \quad 0.4$ | 4 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |  |
| 750.384 Tire Inspector |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 750.687 Tube Inspector-Finisher |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 750.781 Tire Repairer 750.834 Tire vulvanzer | 3 0.1 <br> 1  | 0 | 1 | i | 0 | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 750.887 Tire Mounter |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |
| 752.781 Hose Maker, Belt Builder | $3 \begin{array}{ll}3 & 0.1\end{array}$ | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Total | 110.3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  |
| 762.884 Assembler (shaped wood art.) 769.887 Woodworking, Shop Hand |  | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{0}{1}$ | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | [ ${ }^{17.3601}$ Millwork and cabi |
|  | 20.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |





| JOBS |  |  | REGION |  |  |  |  |  |  | TRAINING PROGRAM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clusters of Occupations and D.O.T. Code |  |  | Cook Co. | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | Related Instructional Program Name and O.E. Code |
| 824.281 Electrician (any industry) | 12 | 0.3 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | [17.1002 Electricity |
| 829.887 Electrician Helper | 2 | 0.1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | [17.1002 Electricity |
| 829.884 Elevator Repairman Helper | 1 | * | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | [17.1099 Construction and |
| 829.281 Electrical Repairman | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | [ Maintenance Trades;Other |
| 825.884 Elevator Construction Helper | 2 | 0.1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Maintenance Trades,0ther |
| 827.281 Electrical Appliance Service- |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 827.884 Air Conditioning Installer (domestic) |  | 0.1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -17.0201 Electrical Appliances |
| 828.281 Electronics Mechanic | 3 | 0.1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | [17.1400 Electrical Occupations |
| 829.381 Cable Splicer; Equipment Installer |  | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 16.0108 Electronic Technology <br> [17.1401 Industrial Electrician <br> 17.1402 Lineman |
| Total | 43 | 1.3 | 13 | 12 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 2 |  |
| 840.781 Painter (construction) | 6 | 0.2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 |  |
| 840.884 Painter, Rough (construction) | 1 | , | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 840.887 Painter, Helper | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 844.884 Cement Mason (construction) | 1 | * | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | [17.1099 Construction and |
| 844.887 Cement Mason Helper | 2 | 0.1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | [ Maintenance Trades; Other |
| 845.781 Painter, Aircraft, Automobile | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -17.0301 Automotive Services |
| 841.884 Billposter (business service) | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |
| Total | 13 | 0.4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 850.883 Power Shovel Operator | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | -17.1003 Heavy Equipment Construction |
| 850.887 Laborer, Road | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 851.884 Pipe Layer (construction) | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -17.1007 Plumbing and Pipefitting |




| JOBS | STATE |  | REGION |  |  |  |  |  |  | TRAINING PROGRAM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clusters of Occupations and D.O.T. Code |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cook } \\ \text { Co. } \end{gathered}$ | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | Related Instructional Program Name and O.E. Code |
| 910.383 Locomotive Engineer, Fireman | 2 | 0.1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 910.388 Yard Clerk | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 910.687 Track Repairman | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |
| 910.782 Car Inspector | 1 | * | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 910.883 Laborer, Car Barn; Yard Engineer | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 910.884 Brakeman, Yard | 2 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 910.887 Baggageman | 1 | * | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 911.887 Wharfman | 2 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | -17.0801 Seamanship |
| 912.368 Transportation Agent (air transportation) | 2 | 0.1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\left[\begin{array}{l}\text { 17.0403 } \\ 04.1900\end{array}\right.$ |
| 913.168 Dispatcher (motor transportation | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 913.463 Bus Driver | 2 | 0.1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | L |
| 915.137 Car-Wash Supervisor | 2 | 0.1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 915.867 Automobile Service Station Attendant | 30 | 0.8 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 5 | $\left[\begin{array}{l}04.1600 \\ 17.0300 \\ \text { Automotive Services }\end{array}\right.$ |
| 915.878 Parking Lot Attendant | 5 | 0.1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | L04.0300 Automotive |
| 915.884 Tire Repairman; Garageman | 4 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | [17.0300 Automotive Services |
| 915.887 Lubrication Man Porter; Used Car Lot | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 919.368 Ticket Agent | 2 | 0.1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 04.0300 Automotive <br> -04.1900 Transportation <br> 14.0505 Traffic, Rate, and Transportation Clerks |
| 919.883 Deliveryman | 2 | 0.1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | -04.0800 General Merchandise |
| 919.887 Automobile Washer; Cleaner | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |
| Total | 63 | 1.9 | 14 | 13 | 9 | 5 | 4 | 10 | 8 |  |


|  | JOBS | STATE |  | REGION |  |  |  |  |  |  | TRAINING PROGRAM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Clusters of Dccupations and D.O.T. Code | $\frac{\text { Totals }}{\mathrm{f}}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cook } \\ \text { Co. } \end{gathered}$ | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | Related Instructional Program Name and O.E. Code |
| 920.132 | Packaging Foreman | 1 | * | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 920.885 | Packager, Machine | 8 | 0.2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 920.886 | Packaging Laborer iany industry) | 7 | 0.2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |
| 920.887 | Packager, Hand | 16 | 0.4 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 |  |
| 921.883 | Conveyor Operator <br> Electric Crane Operator <br> Elevator Operator, Freight | 5 | 0.1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 922.687 | Yardman, Used Building Materials | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 922.883 | Industrial Truck Operator Fork-Lift Operator | 12 | 0.3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |
| 922.887 | Loader; Car Filler; Lumber Yard Man; Returned Goods Sorter; Laborer, Stores (any industry) | 17 | 0.5 $*$ | 4 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | -04.2000 Retail Trade; Other |
| 929.137 | General Handling Foreman | 1 | * | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -04.0900 Hardware, Building Materials, Farm and Garden Equipment and Supplies |
| 929.138 929.782 | Warehouse Foreman | 5 | 0.1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |
| 929.782 | Conveyor Line Operator, Automatic | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 929.884 | Packer (ordnance) | 1 | * | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 929.885 | Baling Machine Operator | 1 | * | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 929.887 | Tying Machine Operator; Box Banding Machine Operator Compress Operator (agriculture) | 21 | 0.6 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |  |
|  | Total | 97 | 2.9 | 22 | 34 | 14 | 5 | 9 | 10 | 3 |  |




## PROCEDURES FOR ASSIGNING THE RELATEDNESS CODE

1. Utilizing information provided by the employed respondent in questions 11--Job title, 13--Type of business and 14--Job duties, assign the D.O.T. Code number that identifies the respondent's job.
2. The attached instrument matches jobs by D.O.T. Code to related instructional programs by O.E. Code. Locate the D.O.T. Code number assigned to the respondent's job on the relatedness instrument. Compare the related O.E. Code number(s) to the O.E. Code number of the respondent's occupational training program which is on the identification label on page one of the survey instrument.
3. If all six digits of the related O.E. Code and the respondent's O.E. Code match exactly, assign the number 3 to indicate a "closely related" occupation.
4. If the first four digits of the related O.E. Code (the shaded area) and the respondent's O.E. Code match exactly but the fifth and sixth digits do not, assign the number 2 to indicate a "related" occupation.
5. If there is not an exact match between the first four digits of the two O.E. Code numbers, assign the number 1 to indicate a "non-related" occupation.
6. In cases where respondents have broad O.E. Codes that do not have related occupations specified, e.g., $18.9900,01.0000,04.0000,07.0000,09.0000$, 14.0000 , or 17.0000 , refer to question 18 to see if the respondent checked a reason for employment in a job not related to their occupational training. If the respondent checked a reason for non-training-related employment, assign the number 1 to indicate a "non-related" occupation.

If the respondent did not check a reason in question 18, the relatedness of the program taken to employment is "not measurable". Assign the number 0 when relatedness cannot be determined.

SAMPLE
D.O.T.
O.E.
D.0.T.
0.E.
D.0.T.
O.E.

| 001.281 | 00 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 002.280-16.0101 |  |
| 002.281 | -16.01101 |
|  | 17.1300 |
| 003.168 | 16.01107 |
|  | 16. 11108 |
|  | 16.0112 |
| 03 | 16.0107 |


| 017.281 - | \%W9300 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 019.181 & - \\ 019.281 & - \end{array}$ | 16.0104 |
|  | 10.509 |
|  | \$5.913 |
|  | \$16.0499 |
|  | 17.1500 |
| 019.288 - | \$16.0106 |
|  | \%\%\%10 |
|  | \%6.0499 |


| 078.281 - \%/..8201 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  | O7. 5204 |
| 078.368 | - 0\%. 0102 |
|  | 07 O403 |
|  | 07. 0404 |
|  | 07\% 0501 |
|  | O\%. 0901 |
|  | 07/10902 |
| 078.381 | - O1. 0202 |
|  | 01. 0 :03 |

If the six digits of the respondent's $0 . E$. Code match the corresponding six digits of the instructional program related to the D.O.T. Code of the respondent's job, assign the number 3 for a "closely related" occupation.


If the first four digits of the two codes match exactly, assign the number 2 for a "related" occupation.



| D.O.T. O.E. |
| :---: |
|  |
| 078.368-64802 |
| 0, 203 |
| b7)604 |
| 0, 9 O501 |
| 034001 |
| 07602 |
| 078.381- Brifen |
| 13, 3803 |
| OF\% 03 |
|  |
| 079.398-67.0101 |
| 67.0903 |
| 07.6.904 |
| 079.378-07.0101 |
| 07. 6302 |
| O7, 0305 |
| 07.5806 |
| 07\% 9602 |
|  |
| 132.088-049100 |
| 141.031-Stum00 |
| 141.051-17.0100 |
| 141.081-04s+100 |
| 17.0700 |
| 141.168-04.0100 |
| 142.031-64*5100 |
| 142.051-17.0701 |
| 17\%902 |
| 142.061-\%. 6701 |
| 142.081-64.0500 |
| 13.6701 |
| 17.1703 |
| 183.062-64.,500 |
| 143.858-64.1500 |
| 04.1800 |
| 144.081 - 17.6.00 |



| D.O.T. O.E. | D.0.T. O.E. | D.O.T. O.E. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 202.368-14.9703 | $\begin{array}{r} 208.885-14 ., 0399 \\ 159702 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 213.138-\operatorname{tg} 000 \\ & 213.382-\operatorname{sen} 01 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | \% ${ }^{2+1} 02$ |
|  | 209.138-148999 | 213.582 - 5\% 02 |
|  | 14\%02 | 213.588 - 8 - 6.402 |
|  | 209.368-14.0399 | $213.782-8 \leqslant 02$ |
|  | 209.388-14.0702 | $213.885-14 \times 8.02$ |
|  | 209.388-140909 | 214.488-11.0104 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 204.268=06.000 \\ & 204.288=14.0402 \\ & 14.0702 \end{aligned}$ | 14.6901 |  |
|  | 209.488-145099 | 215.388-14.9104 |
|  | 209 584.0702 | 285.488-14.0104 |
|  | $209.584-146899$ |  |
|  | 180702 | 216.388-340104 |
| $205.138=18.0803$ | 209.587-14.0399 | 216.488-84.0700 |
|  | $140702$ | Yis104 |
| 205.168-14,0603 | 209.588-64.0800 | 216.588 - \$1.5104 |
|  | 14.0399 |  |
| 205.288-14.603 | 18.8502 | 217.388-14.6104 |
|  | 209-687 146901 | 217.885-14.0104 |
| 205.388-14.603 | 209.687 - 14.0399 |  |
|  | 209.688 - | $219.138-$ Kr.0199 |
| $206.388=14.0302$ | HRE02 | 219.368-0¢\%000 |
|  | $210.368-16.9102$ | 219.388-69.5900 |
| $206.588-14.0302$ | $210.388-1460102$ | 1\%0303 |
|  | $210.488-14.0102$ | 17.1999 |
|  | 210.588 - 14.0102 | 219.485 - \$4:5199 |
| 207.138-14.0201 |  | $219.487 \text { - \4:0303 }$ |
| $14,0702$ | $211.136-14 \% 0103$ | 219.488-8*1500 |
| $207.582-14.0301$ | $211.368-14.0103$ | $14 \% 003$ |
| 14.8702 | 211.468-04*0500 | 14**602 |
| $207.782-14.0301$ | 04t100 | $219.585-19.0803$ |
| 14.0702 | 04. 1100 | $219.588-14.1303$ |
| $207.884-14.0302$ | 04.1800 | 219.688-14.0303 |
| 14,0702 | 04.1900 |  |
| $207.885-14.0301$ | 217.488 4.0103 |  |
|  | 211.488-14.0103 | 221.168 - 14.5601 |
| $208.738-14,0399$14.0702 |  | $221.388-1, \mathbf{D}^{2} 01$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 212.138 \text { - Y } 805 \\ & 212.358 \text { - } 0005 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 22i.588-158501 |
| 208.588-14,0399 |  | 222.138-120503 |
| 14.0702 |  | 222.368 - 14.5503 |
| $208.782=\begin{array}{r}14.0399 \\ 14.0702\end{array}$ |  | 222.387 - 15.8503 |
|  |  | 222.488 - Y\$\$503 |
| 14.0702 |  | $222.587 \text { - } 4.0503$ |
|  |  | 222.588 - t 4.5505 |
|  |  | 222.687 - 110001 |
|  |  | 3, 8 e503 |


| D.O.T. | O.E. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 223.138 | - 14.0504 |
| 223.388 | - 14.0504 |
| 223.487 | - 04.0600 |
|  | 14.0504 |
| 223.587 | - 14.0504 |
| 223.588 | - 14.0504 |
| 223.687 | - 04.0200 |
|  | 14.0504 |
| 223.887 | - 07.0905 |
| 224.487 | - 14.0599 |
| 229.138 | - 14.0599 |
| 229.188 | - 14.0599 |
| 229.368 | - 14.0599 |
| 229.387 | - 14,0599 |
| 229.388 | - 14.0599 |
| 229.488 | - 14.0599 |
| 229.587 | - 14.0599 |
| 229.588 | - 14.0502 |
|  | 14.0599 |
| 229.688 | - 14.0599 |
| 229.884 | - 14.0502 |
| 229.887 | - 14.0599 |
| 230.138 | - 14.0405 |
| 230.368 | - 14.0405 |
| 230.868 | - 14.0405 |
| 230.878 | - 14.0405 |

$231.138-14.0403$
231.388 - 14.0403
$231.588=14.0403$
$231.687-14.0403$
231.688 - 14.0403
232.138 - 14.0403
232.368 - 14.0803
$233.138=14.0403$
$233.388=14.0 .403$

| $234.582=14.0404$ |
| :--- |
| $234.885=14.0404$ |
| $235.138=14.0401$ |
| $235.228=14.0401$ |
| $235.388=14.0401$ |
| $235.585=14.0401$ |
| $235.588=14.0401$ |
| $235.862=14.0401$ |


| D.O.T. | O.E. |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 236.382=14.0401 \\ & 236.588=14.0401 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |
| 237.168-04.1800 |  |
|  | 14,0303 |
|  | 14.0703 |
| 237.368 | - 14,0406 |
|  | 04.1900 |
| 239.138-14.0499 |  |
| 239.228-14.0499 |  |
| $\begin{array}{r} 239.368-04.1300 \\ 14.0499 \end{array}$ |  |
|  |  |
| 239.382-14.0499 |  |
| 239.388-14.0499 |  |
| 239.587 - 14.0499 |  |
| 239.588 - 14.0499 |  |
| $239.687=14.0499$ |  |
| 240.138-14.9900 |  |
| 240.368 - 04.0800 |  |
|  | 14.9900 |
| 240.388-14.9900 |  |
| 240.468 - 14.9900 |  |
| $240.884=14.9900$ |  |
| 240.887 - 14,9900 |  |
| 241.168-04.1300 |  |
| 241.368-04.0800 |  |
|  | 14.9900 |
| 241.387-14.9900 |  |
| 242.368-04.1100 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 243.368=14.9900 \\ & 243.468=04,0800 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |
| 249.138-14.0499 |  |
| 24.138 14.9900 |  |
| 249.168-04.1300 |  |
|  | 14.0499 |
| 249.288 - 16.0108 |  |
| 249.368-04.0100 |  |
| 04.0400 |  |
| 04.0800 |  |
| 04.0900 |  |
| 04.9900 |  |
| 14.9900 |  |
| 14.0499 |  |
|  | 14.0602 |



| $250.258-04,1300$ |
| ---: |
| $250.358-04.1700$ |


| 251.258-04.0400 |
| :---: |
| 252.158-04.1200 |
| 252.258 - 04.0100 |
| 04.0400 |
| $252.358=04.0100$ |
| 04.0400 |
| 04.1200 |
| $\begin{array}{r} 253.358=04.0100 \\ 04.9900 \end{array}$ |
|  |  |
|  |
| 255.258-04.1900 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 256.258=04.1000 \\ & 256.358=04.0700 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |
|  |
| $\begin{array}{r} 258.258=04.0100 \\ 258.358=04.0100 \\ 04.1200 \end{array}$ |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 261.158=04.0600 \\ & 251.258=04.0600 \\ & 261.358=01.0402 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |
|  |  |



| D.O.T. O.E. | D.O.T. O.E. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 281.158-04.1200 | $\begin{array}{r} 293.358=04.1800 \\ 04.2000 \end{array}$ |
| 281.358-04.0200 |  |
| 04.0700 |  |
| 04.1200 | 294.258-04.0800 |
| 281.458-04. 12: |  |
| 282.258-04.1200 | $\begin{aligned} & 296.358=0, .10200 \\ & 296.368=04,0500 \\ & 296.388=04.0800 \end{aligned}$ |
| $282.358=04.0200$ |  |
| 04.1200 |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 297.258 \text { - } 09.0203 \\ & 297.458-08.0800 \end{aligned}$ |
| 283.458-04.4600 |  |
| 284.258-04.1200 | $\begin{aligned} & 298.081=04,0100 \\ & 298.381=\$ 4.0100 \\ & 298.884= \\ & 2.0702 \end{aligned}$ |
| 284.358-04.1200 |  |
| 04.1600 |  |
| 285.358-6axtm00 |  |
|  | $299.138-2100$ |
| 286.358-04.1800 |  |
| 287.358-04.4800 | 29.800 0 fition |
| 287.358-04, 3800 | $\begin{aligned} & 299.258=09.0203 \\ & 299.358=04.0800 \end{aligned}$ |
| 289.158-34.1200 | 299.381 - $\begin{array}{r}\text { O4.2000 } \\ \mathbf{1 7} .1099\end{array}$ |
| 289.358 - 04.0300 |  |
| 28.350-8,0500 | 299.387 - 04.6200 |
| 04.1200 | 299.468-69\%500 |
| 0.1800 |  |
| 64,2000 | $299.478=07.0601$ |
| 0.3100 | 299.488-04.1000 |
| 289.458-64.6800 | $\begin{aligned} & 299.587=04.0600 \\ & 299.687=08.1000 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |
| 290.358-04\%3900 | 299.884-07.0601 |
| 290.468-040600 | $\begin{array}{r} 299.887=04.0100 \\ 04.0200 \end{array}$ |
| 64\%800 |  |
| 0\%,1500 | $.887-09.0205$ |
| 290.478-04.0800 |  |
| 290.877-04.0800 |  |
|  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 291.158 \text { - OH.0600 } \\ & 291.858 \text { - 0. } 80600 \end{aligned}$ | 302.887-09,0202 |
|  |  |
| 292.138-84.0600 | 303.138 - 09.0205 |
| 292.358-04.7600 |  |
| 64.500 | 305.281-09.0203 |
| 292.468-0470700 |  |
| 292.483-0.0700 | 306.878-09, 0205 |
| 292.887 - 04.0600 |  |
|  | 307.878 - 09.0201 |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} 309.878-09,0201 \\ 09,0202 \end{array}$ |


| D.O.T. O.E. | B.O.T. O.E. |
| :---: | :---: |
| $310.137-01.0700$ | $\begin{array}{r} 319.138-0_{2} 0203 \\ 5=00 \end{array}$ |
| 310.138-04.0700 |  |
| 09.3203 | $319.468-11.2904$ |
| 310.868-04.0700 | $\begin{aligned} & 319.874=09.0203 \\ & 319.878-17.2904 \\ & 319.884-14.2902 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |
| 311.138-69\%003 |  |
| 17.2904 |  |
| 311.878-09.0203 | $\begin{aligned} & 320.137-04.300 \\ & 320.138=09.0205 \end{aligned}$ |
| 17.2904 |  |
| $313.131-17.2902$ | 321.138-09.0205 |
| 313.138-09.8等03 |  |
| 17\% 찬01 | 323.887 - 09.0205 |
| 313.168 - 17.4902 |  |
| 313.381-091923 | $\begin{aligned} & 324.738-04.1100 \\ & 324.878-04.7100 \end{aligned}$ |
| 17.2901 |  |
| 17.4302 |  |
| 313.781-03. $\mathrm{m}^{\text {a }} 03$ | $\begin{aligned} & 329.138 \text { - 04.,1100 } \\ & 329.478 \text { - 04, } 1100 \\ & 329.878 \text { - 04. } 1100 \\ & 329.999-04.1100 \end{aligned}$ |
| 17.2901 |  |
| 11.4902 |  |
| $313.884-098003$ |  |
| VR901 | 330.371 - 11.2601 |
| 314.381 - 0. 0203 |  |
| 1\%\%02 | $331.878-17.2602$ |
| 314.781 - 89 \% ${ }^{\text {co3 }}$ |  |
| W*x 02 | $\begin{aligned} & 332.138-17.2602 \\ & 332.271=17.2602 \\ & 332.381=17.2602 \end{aligned}$ |
| 314.878-095803 |  |
| 13602. |  |
| 315.381-0. ${ }^{\text {c/e03 }}$ | 333.271 - ${ }^{\text {me }} \times 02$ |
| 17\% 2 | $\begin{aligned} & 334.868-1.699 \\ & 334.878-\$ 2699 \end{aligned}$ |
| 316.781-09.9203 |  |
| 13,2003 |  |
| 316.878-09\%003 | 335.878 - W\%2699 |
|  | 338.381-07.0909 |
| 316.884-69\%903 |  |
| 1.4.03 | 339.371 - W7.2601 |
| 317.884-09.0203 | $339.381-07 . \begin{array}{r} 1 / 2699 \\ 5909 \end{array}$ |
| 11.8502 |  |
|  | $339.878=17.2699$ |
| 17\% 4 | 340.368-04.1800 |
| $\begin{array}{r} 314.138-9.9803 \\ 11.2499 \end{array}$ | 341.368 - 04.1800 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 346.381-09.0202 \\ & 346.878-09.0202 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 350.138 \text { - } 1.2904 \\ & 350.878 \text { - } 17.2904 \end{aligned}$ |



| D.O.T. O.E. | D.O.T. O.E. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 364.381 - 174399 | 381.137 - I3ta00 |
| $364.781=17.1899$ | 381.887-17.100 |
| $364.884=17.1699$ |  |
| 364.887 - 17.1099 | 382.884 - JV6 00 |
| 365.381 - 17.3402 | 389.138-61501 |
| 365.884-17.3402 | 389.887 - 14**00 |
| 259.138-04.1500 |  |
| 369.387-17.1601 |  |
| 369.468 - 04.1500 |  |
| 369.587 - 17.1601 |  |
| $369.687=17.1600$ |  |
| 369.782 - 17.1601 |  |
| 17.1699 |  |
| 369.877 - 17.1600 |  |
| $369.884=17.1601$ |  |
| 17.160? |  |
| 11.1699 |  |
| 369.885 - This |  |
| W.1602 |  |
| \$1.159 |  |
| $369.886-151002$ |  |
| 369.887 - 1FIT02 |  |
| 373.118-17.2801 |  |
| 373.168 - 17.280] |  |
| $373.884=1712801$ |  |
| $375.118=17.2802$ |  |
| $375.138=17.2802$ |  |
| 375.168 - 17.2802 |  |
| 375.228 - 17.2802 |  |
| 375.268 - 17.2802 |  |
| $375.388=17.2802$ |  |
| $375.588=17.2802$ |  |
| 375.868 - 17.2802 |  |
| 376.268 - 17.2802 |  |
| $376.868=17.2802$ |  |
| 377.868 - 17.2802 |  |
| $379.168=01.0602$ |  |
| 379.268 - 172602 |  |
| 379.368 - W 202 |  |
|  |  |
| 379.387-1込 |  |
| $379.887-8.3$ |  |


| D.O.T. O.E. | D.O.T. O.E. |
| :---: | :---: |
| $401.137 \quad 01.0102$ | $\begin{aligned} & 411.181=01.0101 \\ & 411.884=01.0101 \end{aligned}$ |
| 401.138-01.0102 |  |
| 401.181-01.0102 | $412.137-01.0401$ |
|  |  |
| 402.181-01.0102 | 412.168-01.0401 |
| 402.883-01.0102 | $412.387=01.0299$ |
|  | $412.687=01.0299$ |
| 403.137-01.0102 | $\begin{aligned} & 412.884=01.0299 \\ & 412.887=01.0299 \end{aligned}$ |
| 403.181-07.0102 |  |
| $403.687-07.0401$ |  |
| 403.883-01.0102 | $\begin{aligned} & 413.684=01.0401 \\ & 413.687=01.0402 \end{aligned}$ |
| 403.886-01.0102 |  |
| 404.131-01.0102 | $\begin{aligned} & 419.131=01.0101 \\ & 419.181=01.0101 \\ & 419.884=01.9900 \end{aligned}$ |
| $404.137=01.0102$ |  |
| 404.181-01.0102 |  |
| 01.0401 |  |
| 404.883-01.0102 | $\begin{aligned} & 421.181-01.0100 \\ & 421.384=01.0200 \\ & 421.883-01.0100 \\ & 421.884-01.0100 \end{aligned}$ |
| 404.884-01.0299 |  |
| $404.885=01.0301$ |  |
| 404.887-01.0102 |  |
| 405.181-07.0102 | $\begin{aligned} & 422.127=01.0304 \\ & 422.181=01.0304 \\ & 422.884=01.0304 \\ & 422.887=01.0304 \end{aligned}$ |
| 405.885 = 01.0102 |  |
| $405.887-01.0102$ |  |
|  |  |
| 406.168-07.0505 | $\begin{aligned} & 424.132-01.0301 \\ & 424.883-01.0301 \\ & 424.886=01.0301 \end{aligned}$ |
| 406.181-01.0102 |  |
| 406.884-01.0505 |  |
| 406.887-01.0505 |  |
| 407.137-01.0505 | $429.131-01.0100$ |
| $407.138=01.0505$ | 429.228-01.0299 |
| 407.181-01.0504 | $\begin{aligned} & 429.885=01.0702 \\ & 429.887=01.9900 \end{aligned}$ |
| 407.868-07.0602 |  |
| $407.884-01.0504$ |  |
| 407.887 - 01.0602 | 431.782-17.0800 |
|  | $431.883-17.0800$ |
| 409.137-01.0102 | $\begin{aligned} & 431.884=17.0800 \\ & 431.887=17.0800 \end{aligned}$ |
| 409.168-01.0104 |  |
| 409.181-01.0104 |  |
| 01.0500 | 432.884-17,0800 |
| 01.0301 |  |
| 409.884-01.0501 | 433.884-17.0800 |


|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 436.181=01.0607 \\ & 436.884=01.0607 \\ & 436.887=01.0607 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 9.687=17.0800 \\ & 9.884-17.0800 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| 441 137-01.0601 |  |
| 11.168 = 01.0601 |  |
| 441.384 - 01.0601 |  |
| 441.687 |  |
| $1.887-01.0601$ |  |
| 441.137-01.0706 |  |
| $442.168-01.0706$ |  |
|  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 449.168=01.0703 \\ & 449.287=01.0703 \\ & 449.887=01.0703 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| $1.781-01.0604$ |  |
|  |  |
| - |  |
| 465. 137 - 01. |  |
| , 01.0201 |  |
| 56.781-01.0201 |  |
|  |  |
| 5.88 |  |
| 466.887-0.0.0401 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 467.138-01.0299 \\ & 467.384-01.0299 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 469.158-01.0200 \\ & 469.168-01.0202 \\ & 469.381-01.0401 \\ & 469.387-01.0402 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |



|  | D.O.T. O.E. |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 609.381=17.2399 \\ & 609.782=17.2303 \end{aligned}$ |
| D.O.T. O.E. |  |
|  | 17.2400 |
|  | 609.885-17.2302 |
| 600.131-17.2302 |  |
| 600.280-17.2302 | $\begin{aligned} & 610.381=17.2399 \\ & 610.782=17.2399 \\ & 610.884=17.2399 \end{aligned}$ |
| 600.281-17.2302 |  |
| $600.380=17.2302$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 600.381=17.0401 \\ & 600.884=17.2302 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 611.782=17.2399 \\ & 611.885=17.2399 \end{aligned}$ |
| 601.130-17.2307 611.885-17.2399 |  |
| 601.280-17.2307 | 612.131-17.2399 |
| 17.2308 |  |
| $601.281-17.2307$ | 612.381-17.2399 |
| 601 3817.2308 | $\begin{aligned} & 612.782=17.2399 \\ & 612.887=17.2399 \end{aligned}$ |
| 601.381-17.2307 |  |
| 601.782-17.2307 |  |
| $601.885-17.2307$ | $\begin{aligned} & 613.380=17.2399 \\ & 613.381=17.2399 \\ & 613.687=17.2399 \\ & 613.782=17.2399 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |
| $602.380=17.2303$ |  |
| $602.782-17.2303$ $602.885-17.2303$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 614.782=17.2399 \\ & 614.884=17.2400 \end{aligned}$ |
| $603.280=17.2303$ |  |
| 603.380-17.2303 |  |
| 603.782 - 17.2303 | $\begin{aligned} & 615.782=17.2303 \\ & 615.885=17.2303 \end{aligned}$ |
| 603.885-17.2303 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 604.130=17.2303 \\ & 604.280=17.2303 \\ & 604.380=17.2303 \\ & 604.782=17.2303 \\ & 604.885=17.2303 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 616.380=17.2304 \\ 17.2305 \end{array}$ |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 616.381-17,2400 \\ & 616.780=17,2305 \\ & 616.782-17,2303 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |
| $605.280-17.2303$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 605.280=17.2303 \\ & 605.380=17.2303 \end{aligned}$ | $17.2304$ |
| 605.782 - 17.2303 | 616.885-11.2304 |
| $605.885=17.2303$ | $616.280-17.2304$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 606.280=17.2303 \\ & 606.380=17.2303 \\ & 606.782=17.2303 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 617.380-17.2305 \\ & 617.780-17.2304 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |
|  | 617.780-17.2399 |
| 607.782-17.2303 | 617.782-17.2304 |
|  | $617.885-17.2304$ |
| $609.280=17.2399$ | 17.2805 |
| 609.380-17.2303 | 17,2399 |


| D.O.T. O.E. | D.O.T. O.E. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 609.381-17.2399 | $\begin{aligned} & 619.280-172004 \\ & 619.281-18204 \\ & 619.380-17203 \end{aligned}$ |
| 609.782 - 17.2303 |  |
| 17.2400 |  |
| 609.885-17.2302 | $619.380-17.2003$ |
|  | 17.2305 |
| 610.381-17.2399 | $619.381=17.2400$ |
| 610.782-17.2399 | 619.384-17.2400 |
| 610.884-17.2399 | $\begin{aligned} & 619.387-17.2400 \\ & 619.782-17.4304 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |
| $611.782-17.2299$ 17.2305 <br> $611.885-172399$ $\$ 7.2399$ |  |
|  |  |  |
| 612.131-17.2399 | $\begin{aligned} & 619.884-17.2304 \\ & 619.885-\$ 17.2304 \end{aligned}$ |
| 612.281 - 17.2399 |  |
| $612.381-17.2399$ | 620.281 - O\%.0301 |
| 612.782-17.2399 | 04.0800 |
| 612.887-17.2399 | 1\%.0300 |
|  |  |
| 613.380-17.2399 | 150302 |
| 613.381-17.2399 | 11.0303 |
| $613.687=17.2399$ | 11.6402 |
| 613.782-17.2399 | $\begin{aligned} & 17.1003 \\ & 1.9100 \end{aligned}$ |
| 614.782-17.2399 | 620.381 - J. 93.02 |
| $614.884=17.2400$ | 620.884-71.001 |
|  | 1\%0500 |
| 615.782-17.2303 | \%\% 0302 |
| 615.885-17.2303 | $\text { \$i. } 1503$ |
|  |  |
| $\begin{array}{r} 616.380=17.2304 \\ 17.2305 \end{array}$ | $621.228-\sqrt{6} \%$ |
|  |  |
| 616.381-17.2400 ${ }^{\text {2 }}$ |  |
| $616.780-17.2305$ | 621.381-\$1\%0401 |
| $616.782-17.2303$ | 621.781 -\$\% ${ }^{\text {W01 }}$ |
| 17.2304 | 621.884 - \% 17 0401 |
| 616.885-17.2304 | 623.131 - 7.3 .2200 |
| 117.2305 |  |
| 616.280-17,2304 | $\begin{aligned} & 623.281 \text { - } \begin{array}{l} \text { R200 } \\ 623.381 \\ \text { - } \end{array}=1400 \end{aligned}$ |
| 616.280 - 17.2304 |  |
| $617.380-17.2305$ | $\begin{aligned} & 623.884-\Downarrow 5 \\ & 623.887-\text { \% } \end{aligned}$ |
| $617.780-17.2304$ |  |
| 17.2399 |  |
| 617.782-17.2304 |  |
| 17.2305 |  |
| 617.885-17.2304 |  |
| 17.2805 |  |
| 17,2399 |  |


| D.0.T. | $0 . E$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 625.281-17.1200 |  |
|  |  |
|  | 17,3100 |
|  |  |
| 629.281-1 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 630.281-17.1003 \\ & 630.381-17.1003 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 633.131-17.0600 \\ & 633.281-17.0600 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |
| 637.281 - 17.0100 |  |
|  |  |
| 17.0202 |  |
|  |  |
| 637.884-11.0202 |  |
| $638.281-$16.0111 <br> 16.0113 <br> 17.1099 |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 650.582-17.1901 \\ & 650.782-17.1901 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 651.130-13.1902 \\ & 651.280=1.1902 \\ & 651.381= \\ & 651.782=192902 \\ & 651.885= \\ & 651.886=1.1902 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 653.131=11.1906 \\ & 653.687-17.1906 \\ & 653.780=1.1906 \\ & 653.782=1.1906 \\ & 653.885-17.1906 \\ & 653.886-11.1906 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 654.688-17.1901 \\ & 654.782-171901 \\ & 654.887-17.1901 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 659.130-17,1900 \\ & 659.380-11.1903 \\ & 659.781=1.1999 \\ & 659.782=1.1999 \\ & 659.885-1.1906 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |



| D.O.T. O.E. |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 681.885 \\ & 681.886 \\ & 681.887 \end{aligned} \text { WH? } \begin{aligned} & 3399 \\ & \$ 3599 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 682.137 \\ & 682.687 \\ & 682.885 \\ & 682.887 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| $683.380-11.3899$ |  |
| 683.384 | 17.3399 |
| $683.487-17.3399$ |  |
|  |  |
| 683.687 - 17.3899 |  |
| 683.780 | 17.3399 |
| $683.781-173899$$683.782=17399$ |  |
|  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 683.885 \\ & 683.887 \text { - } \$ 3.3399 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |
| 684.137 - 117:3399 |  |
| 684.384 -. 17.7899 |  |
|  |  |
| 684.684 - 13.33999 |  |
|  |  |
| 684.782 - 11.3399 |  |
|  |  |
| 685.137 - 77.3399 |  |
| 685.380 - 17.33399 |  |
|  |  |
| 685.780 - 14, 3399 |  |
| 685.781685.885 |  |
|  |  |
| 685.886 - 117.3399 |  |
| 689.280 - 17.3399 |  |
| 689.384 - 16.0699 |  |
| $689.387-37.3399$ |  |
| 689.687 | 17.3399 |
| $689.780-17.3$ |  |
| $689.782-17.3400$ |  |
|  |  |
| 689.885-17.3399 |  |
|  | 17.3400 |


| D.O.T. | O.E. |
| :--- | :---: |
| $690.782-17.3401$ |  |
| 690.885 | $=17.2700$ |
|  | 17.3401 |
| 691.282 | -17.2700 |
| $693.281-17.0401$ |  |
| $693.381-17.2309$ |  |
| $699.782-17.3401$ |  |


|  | D.O.T. O.E. | D.O.T. O.E. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | $\begin{aligned} & 714.281-17.2101 \\ & 714.381-182101 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 729.384-\$ 3.403 \\ & 729.684-\$ 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| D.O.T. O.E. | 715.281 - 717.402 | 737.387-171.2400 |
| 704.381-11.2399 | $715.381-\geqslant 7.2102$ | 739,381-16.0111 |
| 704.884-11.2399 | 716.884-717.1502 | \$17.3899 |
|  | 716.884 -. | 13.3500 |
|  | 719.281-17.1501 | $\begin{gathered} 739.781-W 3601 \\ 730 \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  | $739.884-17.3699$ |
|  | $720.281-917.1803$ | $753.381-317.3401$ |
|  | $721.131-317.8403$ | 753.884 -13.3401 |
|  | 721.281-317.0401 | 754.381-717.2700 |
|  | $721.381-874403$ | 754.381-3743899 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 709.387-1.2400 \\ & 709.687-\text { Y. } 2400 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 721.884-\$34.403 | 754.884-317.2700 |
|  | $721.887-71141403$ | 760.884-217.2601 |
| $710.128-68.0113$$710.281-3502$ | $722.281-17.1501$ |  |
|  | 722.381-1121501 | 761.281-317.3699 |
| $710.361-\frac{17.1502}{12001}$ | 723.381-86.017 | 13.3699 |
|  | 23.381 \#7.0201 | 761.884-31.3601 |
|  | 723.887-717.0101 | 13:3699 |
| 710.781 - \$1.2201 | $723.884-317.0201$ | 762.687-37.3501 |
| $711.138-312201$$711.381-1301$ | 724.281-37.1403 | 762.884-312.301 |
|  | $724.381-\%{ }^{21403}$ |  |
| $711.384-12.2101$ | 724.384 \$7\%1502 | 763.884-717.3501 |
|  |  | 764.131-314.3699 |
| 711.587 - 3122101 <br> 711.687 - 742101 |  | 764.387-717.3699 |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 711.687 & -\$ 2201 \\ 711.781 & -\$ 201 \\ 711.884 & -\$ 20101 \end{array}$ | 725.484-17.1502 | 764.687-317.3699 |
|  |  | 764.884-17.3699 |
|  | $726.281-36.9108$ | 764.887-317.3699 |
|  | $726.781-31.1500$ | 769.281-317.3501 |
|  |  | 769.687-113 3501 |
| $712.381-01.0103$$712.781-0103$ | 727.687-1752400 | 769.884-313.3501 |
|  |  | 769.887-17.3501 |
| 712.884-0920404 | 728.281 -2is.0107 | 777.381-17.2700 |
| 713.251 - 07.0601 | 729.281-316.0108 |  |
| 713.281 - 07.0601 | 37.101 | 779.884-11.2700 |
|  | 17.1502 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 713.381-328201 \\ & 713.781-31.2101 \end{aligned}$ | 729.381-17.0401 | 780.131-313.3500 |
|  | 17. 401 | 780.137-31.3500 |
| 713.884-67.0601 | 17.1501 | 780.381-09.0204 |
|  | 17. 15002 | 17.3500 |


| D.O.T. | O.E. | D.O.T. | O.E. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 780.587 | - 17.3500 | 788.131 | -17.3401 |
| 780.684 | $=17.3500$ | 788.137 | - 17.3401 |
| 780.687 | - 17.3500 | 788.281 | - 11.8401 |
| 780.884 | - 17.0303 | 788.381 | - 17.3401 |
|  | 17.3500 | 788.384 | -17.3401 |
| 780.887 | - 17.3500 | 788.584 | - 17.3401 |
|  |  | 788.587 | - 17.3401 |
| 781.132 | - 17.3399 | 788.687 | -17.3401 |
| 781.281 | - 17.3399 | 788.884 | - 17, 3401 |
| 781.381 | - 17,0703 | 788.887 | - 11.3401 |
|  | 17.3399 |  |  |
| 781.484 | - 17.3399 | 789.387 | - IT. 3400 |
| 781.684 | - 17.3399 | 789.684 | - 1/.3400 |
| 781.687 | - 17.3339 | 789.687 | - 8) 0702 |
| 781.781 | - 11.3400 |  | \#1.3300 |
| 781.884 | - 17.3399 | 789.781 | - W\%.9400 |
| 781.887 | - 11.3399 | 789.884 | -71.3400 |
|  |  | 789.884 | - 11.1600 |
| $782.781-11.3302$ |  |  | $17.3399$ |
| 782.782-17.3399 |  |  |  |
| 782.884-09.0204 |  |  |  |
| 17.1600 |  |  |  |
| 17.3399 |  |  |  |
| 784.281-17.3399 |  |  |  |
| 784.781: - 17.3399 |  |  |  |
| $785.261-17.3302$ |  |  |  |
| $785.281-17.3302$ |  |  |  |
| 785.361-09.0202 |  |  |  |
| 785.381-09.0202 |  |  |  |
| 17.3301 |  |  |  |
| 77.3302 |  |  |  |
| $786.134-17.3399$ |  |  |  |
| 786.782-17.3399 |  |  |  |
| 786.885-11.3399 |  |  |  |
| 787.138-11.3399 |  |  |  |
| 787.381 - 17.3399 |  |  |  |
| 787.782-09.0204 |  |  |  |
|  | 17.3899 |  |  |
| 787.885 | - 17.3399 |  |  |
| 787.886 | - 17.3899 |  |  |




| D.O.T. | O.E. |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 930.188=16.0116 \\ & 930.280=16.0116 \\ & 930.281=16.0116 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 950.132=17.3000 \\ & 950.168=16.0107 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |
| 950.782 | 17.3000 |
|  | 17.3201 |
|  | 17.3202 |
| 950.885 | 17.0103 |
|  | 17.3202 |
| 951.885-17.3200 |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 953.380-\text { W.3202 } \\ & 953.387-1.404 \\ & 953.782-\$ .3203 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| 954.782-11.3403 |  |
| 955.782-17.3203 |  |
| 957.282-16.0108 |  |
| 969.261-09.0202 |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| 971.281 - W. 1504 |  |
| $971.381-\text { WुT104 }$ |  |
|  |  |
| 971.684-37.1904 |  |
| 971.782 - \$171904 |  |
| 971.884-W.1904 |  |
| 971.885-1.1904 |  |
| 971.887 | - 11.1904 |

D.O.T. O.E.
972.281 - 17.1903
972.381-1.1903
972.382 - 17.1903
972.781 - 17.1903
972.782 - 17.1503
972.887 - 17.1903
973.138-12.1901
973.381 - 17.1901
$974.381 \cdot 17.1903$
976.131 - 17.8901
976.381 - V7,0901
976.387 - 17.0901
976.588 - 17.0501
976.687 - 17.0501
976.782 - 17.0901
976.884-17.0901
$976.885-17.0901$
976.886 - 17.0901
975.887 - 17.0901
977.781-17.0901
977.884-17.1906
979.081 - VIT1903
979.138-17.1900
979.381 - 11.0901

171900 171205
979.382 - 17.0901
979.387 - 17.0901
979.781 - 12.1999
979.782 - 17.1903
979.884 - 17.1903
11. 1905
979.886-17.1904
$979,887-17,1903$

## APPENDIX TABLE C-1

REASONS FOR LEAVING FIRST JOB HELD BY PROGRAM AREA

|  | AGRI <br> BUS <br> $\%$ | BUS <br> OCC <br> $\%$ | HLTH <br> OCC <br> $\%$ | IND <br> OCC <br> $\%$ | P\&PR <br> SERV <br> $\%$ | SPEC <br> PROG | STATE |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Reasons | 25.5 | 31.0 | 21.3 | 31.4 | 22.4 | 34.0 | 30.3 |
| Took a better job | 20.0 | 22.4 | 33.3 | 18.5 | 10.5 | 11.7 | 20.3 |
| Entered school | 23.6 | 11.9 | 10.7 | 13.1 | 10.5 | 06.4 | 12.5 |
| Temporary job ended | 10.0 | 06.1 | 01.3 | 09.5 | 14.0 | 10.6 | 08.0 |
| Laid off | 03.6 | 06.6 | 08.0 | 07.6 | 09.1 | 10.6 | 07.1 |
| Pay too low | 11.8 | 01.6 | 00.0 | 09.3 | 03.5 | 03.5 | 04.9 |
| Military service | 00.0 | 04.4 | 04.0 | 01.7 | 07.0 | 04.3 | 03.4 |
| Moved away | 00.9 | 03.9 | 00.0 | 02.8 | 01.4 | 06.4 | 03.2 |
| Disliked the work | 00.0 | 03.8 | 05.3 | 00.9 | 09.1 | 01.1 | 02.9 |
| Got married | 00.9 | 01.6 | 01.3 | 02.3 | 00.7 | 05.3 | 01.9 |
| Disliked the hours | 01.8 | 01.9 | 02.7 | 00.8 | 05.6 | 01.1 | 01.7 |
| Family reasons | 00.9 | 02.1 | 01.3 | 01.3 | 00.7 | 00.0 | 01.6 |
| Disliked the people | 00.9 | 01.0 | 06.7 | 00.6 | 04.2 | 00.0 | 01.1 |
| Health problem | 00.0 | 01.7 | 01.3 | 00.3 | 01.4 | 00.0 | 01.1 |
| Too far to drive | 110 | 1319 | 75 | 896 | 143 | 94 | 2637 |
| Number responding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## APPEndix table C-2

REASONS FOR LEAVING SECOND JOB HELD BY PROGRAM AREA

| Reasons | AGRI <br> BUS <br> \% | $\begin{gathered} \text { BUS } \\ \text { OCC } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { HLTH } \\ \text { OCC } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { IND } \\ \text { OCC } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { P\&P } \\ \text { SERV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | SPEC PROG $\qquad$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { STATE } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Took a better job | 17.4 | 21:4 | 29.6 | 23.1 | 23.6 | 18.8 | 22.1 |
| Teimporary job ended | 26.1 | 20.5 | 03.7 | 14.4 | 16.4 | 09.4 | 17.6 |
| Entered school | 13.0 | 14.7 | 14.8 | 11.9 | 01.8 | 12.5 | 12.9 |
| Laid off | 15.2 | 08.9 | 00.0 | 18.6 | 07.3 | 21.9 | 12.8 |
| Disliked the work | 02.2 | 06.5 | 07.4 | 08.2 | 16.4 | 03.1 | 07.3 |
| Pay too low | 02.2 | 06.1 | 07.4 | $0 \% .4$ | 09.1 | 03.1 | 06.5 |
| Moved away | 02.2 | 05.4 | 03.7 | 03.0 | 05.5 | 06.3 | 04.3 |
| Military service | 10.9 | 02.2 | 00.0 | 04.2 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 03.1 |
| Disliked the people | 02.2 | 02.8 | 03.7 | 02.7 | 01.8 | 06.3 | 02.8 |
| Too far to drive | 00.0 | 03.5 | 03.7 | 02.0 | 03.6 | 03.1 | 02.8 |
| Disliked the hours | 06.5 | 02.2 | 03.7 | 02.2 | 01.8 | 03.1 | 02.4 |
| Got married | 00.0 | 03.0 | กn. 0 | טi. 0 | 00.0 | 03.1 | 01.3 |
| Health problem | 02.2 | 01.5 | 11.1 | 00.7 | 07.3 | 06.3 | 01.9 |
| Family reasons | 00.0 | 01.5 | 11.1 | 00.5 | 05.5 | 03.1 | 01.5 |
| Number responding | 46 | 541 | 27 | 403 | 55 | 32 | 1104 |

## APPENDIX TABLE C-3

reasons for leaving third job held by program area

|  | AGRI <br> BUS <br> $\%$ | BUS <br> OCC <br> $\%$ | HLTH <br> OCC <br> $\%$ | IND <br> OCC <br> $\%$ | P\&P <br> SERV <br> $\%$ | SPEC <br> PROG <br> $\%$ | STATE <br> $\%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Reasons | 31.8 | 13.5 | 16.7 | 24.2 | 05.9 | 06.3 | 18.1 |
| Took a better job | 09.1 | 14.5 | 00.0 | 19.3 | 17.6 | 18.8 | 15.9 |
| Laid off | 22.7 | 15.5 | 00.0 | 13.7 | 11.8 | 06.3 | 14.3 |
| Temporary job ended | 13.6 | 17.1 | 16.7 | 08.1 | 05.9 | 00.0 | 12.4 |
| Entered school | 00.0 | 08.8 | 00.0 | 10.6 | 05.9 | 18.8 | 09.0 |
| Pay too low | 00.0 | 05.7 | 08.3 | 06.8 | 11.8 | 06.3 | 06.2 |
| Disliked the work | 00.0 | 06.2 | 00.0 | 04.3 | 05.9 | 12.5 | 05.2 |
| Moved away | 00.0 | 04.1 | 25.0 | 03.7 | 00.0 | 12.5 | 04.5 |
| Disliked the hours | 13.6 | 03.1 | 08.3 | 03.1 | 11.8 | 00.0 | 04.0 |
| Disliked the people | 04.5 | 02.1 | 08.3 | 03.1 | 11.8 | 00.0 | 03.1 |
| Too far to drive | 04.5 | 02.1 | 08.3 | 01.9 | 00.0 | 12.5 | 02.6 |
| Military service | 00.0 | 04.1 | 00.0 | 00.6 | 00.0 | 06.3 | 02.4 |
| Uecith rroblem | 00.0 | 02.1 | 08.3 | 00.6 | 11.8 | 00.0 | 01.9 |
| Family reasons | 00.0 | 01.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.5 |
| Got married | 22 | 193 | 12 | 161 | 17 | 16 | 421 |

## APPENDIX TABLE C-4

REASONS FOR LEAVING FOURTH JOB HELD BY PROGRAM AREA

| Reasons | AGRI BUS \% | $\begin{gathered} \text { BUS } \\ \text { OCC } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { HLTH } \\ \text { OCC } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { IND } \\ \text { OCC } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { P\&P } \\ \text { SERV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { SPEC } \\ \text { PROG } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { STATE } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Took a better job | 14.3 | 24.1 | 33.3 | 23.7 | 00.0 | 33.3 | 23.1 |
| Temporary job ended | 28.6 | 22.2 | 00.0 | 13.6 | 20.0 | 16.7 | 17.9 |
| Laid off | 14.3 | 11.1 | 00.0 | 18.6 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 13.4 |
| Entered school | 00.0 | 18.5 | 00.0 | 03.4 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 10.4 |
| Pay too low | 14.3 | 01.9 | 00.0 | 11.9 | 20.0 | 00.0 | 07.5 |
| Moved away | 00.0 | 07.4 | 00.0 | 08.5 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 06.7 |
| Disliked the work | 00.0 | 05.6 | 00.0 | 05.1 | 20.0 | 16.7 | 06.0 |
| Too far to drove | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 08.5 | 20.0 | 00.0 | 04.5 |
| Got married | 00.0 | 01.9 | 00.0 | 01.7 | 00.0 | 16.7 | 02.2 |
| Health problem | 00.0 | 01.9 | 00.0 | 01.7 | 00.0 | 16.7 | 02.2 |
| Disliked the people | 00.0 | 01.9 | 33.3 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 01.5 |
| Disliked the hours | 00.0 | 01.9 | 00.0 | 01.7 | 00.0 | 00.0 | U1. 5 |
| Family reasons | 00.0 | 01.9 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 20.0 | 00.0 | 01.5 |
| Military service | 00.0 | 00.0 | 33.3 | 01.7 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 01.5 |
| ilumber responding | 7 | 54 | 3 | 59 | 5 | 6 | 134 |

## $\therefore$.PDFHDIX TABLE C 3

CORRELATION BETWEEN EMPLOYER/SUPERVISOR APPRAISALS OF
READINESS. FOR EMPLOYMENT AND ALUMNI APPRAISALS OF HELPFULNESS OF EMPLOYMENT PREPARATION

Aspects of employment Correlation Matrix
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Knowing how to use job tools and equipment } & 0.9809\end{array}$
Knowing what one does on the job 0.7528

Getting along with co-workers
0.6914

Selection and care of space, materials and supplies 0.6173
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Quantity of work } & 0.5925\end{array}$
Serving the public, patients, customers, etc.
0.3685

Being able to talk to the boss about job problems
0.0245

EMPLOYER/SUPERVISOR RATINGS* OF EMPLOYEE PREPARATION FOR EMPLOYMENT BY REGIONS


PERSONAL QUALITIES AND JOB SKILLS CONSIDERED MOST IMPORTANT ACCORDING TO EMPLOYER/SUPERVISORS BY REGIONS (Multiple responses)

|  | Regions |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { State } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Personal qualities and job skills | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Cook } \\ \text { Co. } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I } \\ & \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { II } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { III } \\ & \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { IV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & V \\ & \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { VI } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Ability to get along with others--other workers, customers, patients | 48.8 | 56.8 | 51.0 | 57.4 | 57.7 | 50.9 | 58.2 | 53.6 |
| Accuracy, quality, and thoroughness | 55.5 | 53.5 | 53.6 | 43.5 | 46.0 | 47.2 | 45.3 | 51.2 |
| Positive attitude toward work | 43.4 | 42.1 | 39.5 | 39.5 | 39.3 | 41.9 | 38.8 | 41.3 |
| Dependability | 35.6 | 33.8 | 36.2 | 40.4 | 36.2 | 39.2 | 44.7 | 36.7 |
| Judgment--ability to make decisions, ability to plan and organize | 25.0 | 25.6 | 22.4 | 26.0 | 26.4 | 26.0 | 31.8 | 25.5 |
| Attendance and punctuality | 29.4 | 25.9 | 22.7 | 24.7 | 22.4 | 18.1 | 25.3 | 25.0 |
| Competency in using job tools, machines and materials | 21.2 | 24.0 | 21.2 | 21.5 | 20.6 | 2 Cu .4 | 20.0 | 21.6 |
| Initiative | 17.4 | 18.8 | 20.7 | 18.8 | 18.7 | 19.6 | 21.8 | 19.0 |
| Appearance and grooming | 13.1 | 11.3 | 14.0 | 13.5 | 12.3 | 15.8 | 11.2 | 12.9 |
| Work quantity | 11.3 | 10.5 | 11.7 | 13.9 | 11.7 | 11.7 | 09.4 | 11.4 |
| Other | 01.2 | 01.4 | 00.5 | 00.4 | 01.5 | 01.1 | 00.6 | 01.1 |

The percentages will not total 100 percent due to multiple responses to this item. Each employer/supervisor was asked to check 3 personal qualities or job skills that were most important for a person entering the job held by the employee being rated. The table should read--of the employer/supervisors responding to this item, 53.6 percent checked ability to get along with others. . . .as an important entry level skill.

| Dependent Variable | F Ratio | Program Area |  |  | Relatedness |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Regression Coefficient | Standard Error | Partial Correlation Coefficient | Regression Coefficient | Standard Error | Partial Correlation Coefficient |
| Interviewing for a job | 35.05** | -. 1667** | . 0199 | -. 1382 | -. 0307 | . 0324 | . 0158 |
| Applying for a job | 25.79** | -. 1434** | . 0200 | -. 1189 | -. 0253 | . 0325 | -. 0130 |
| Knowing how to use tools and equipment on the job | 22.36** | -.0831** | . 0203 | -. 0672 | .1584** | . 0331 | . 0795 |
| Knowing what one does in this kind of job | 10.38** | -. 0205 | . 0207 | -. 0165 | .1445** | . 0337 | . 0713 |
| Being able to talk to the boss about job problems | 7.31** | . 0351 | . 0197 | . 0297 | -.1004** | . 0320 | -. 0522 |
| Finding needed information | 4.54* | -.0529** | . 0203 | -. 0435 | . 0383 | . 0330 | . 0194 |
| Understanding union membership | 2.94 | -.0584* | . 0245 | -. 0396 | . 0061 | . 0400 | . 0025 |
| Using time and energy | 2.44 | -. 0346 | . 0194 | -. 0298 | . 0333 | . 0315 | . 0177 |
| Handling new or unpleasant situations | . 59 | -. 0203 | . 0195 | -. 0174 | . 0052 | . 0317 | . 0027 |
| Getting along with other workers | . 41 | . 0032 | . 0197 | . 0027 | -. 0278 | . 0320 | -. 0145 |
| Getting along with the customer, patient, etc. | . 12 | -. 0088 | . 0213 | -. 0069 | -. 0108 | . 0346 | -. 0052 |
| $\star$ Significant at the .05 Te $* *$ Significant at the .01 | vel |  |  |  |  |  |  |

APPENDIX TABLE C-9
REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF ALUMINI RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT
BY PROGRAM AREA AND JOB RELATEDNESS

| Dependent Variable | F Ratio | Program Area |  |  | Relatedness |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Regression Coefficient | Standard Error | Partial Correlation Coefficient | Regression Coefficient | Standard Error | Partial Correlation Coefficiont |
| Training needs to be more like the real job | 15.64** | -.0175** | . 0058 | -. 0504 | .0403** | . 0094 | . 0713 |
| Training should include: Getting along with boss; co-workers, customers; income tax; license exams; union; dress; etc. | 15.31** | -.0287** | . 0055 | -. 0874 | . 0092 | . 0089 | . 0173 |
| Greater choice of programs | 6.19** | -.0174** | . 0050 | -. 0577 | -. 0082 | . 0082 | -. 0168 |
| Training should prepare you for several jobs | 4.27* | -.0161** | . 0056 | -. 0485 | -. 0012 | . 0090 | -. 0023 |
| Training should prepare for one job only | 3.59* | .0047* | . 0020 | . 0390 | . 0052 | . 0033 | . 0264 |
| Other | 1.18 | . 0045 | . 0029 | . 0257 | . 0013 | . 0047 | . 0046 |
| Teachers should know more about the jobs they teach | . 81 | -. 0047 | . 0040 | -. 0198 | . 0039 | . 0065 | -. 0099 |
| More help with knowing how and where to get a job after high school | . 58 | -. 0033 | . 0057 | -. 0097 | -. 0090 | . 0092 | -. 0163 |
| More help in learning about jobs, high school courses, post-high school training | . 43 | -. 0022 | . 0065 | -. 0056 | -. 0096 | . 0106 | -. 0150 |

Appendix Table C-9 Con't.

| Dependent Variable | F Ratio | Program Area |  |  | Relatedness |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Regression Coefficient | Standard Error | Partial Correlation Coefficient | Regression Coefficient | Standard Error | Partial Correlation Coefficient |
| No improvements needed | . 31 | -. 0027 | . 0042 | -. 0108 | -. 0036 | . 0068 | -. 0087 |
| Greater variety of class classroom activities | . 22 | -. 0032 | . 0049 | -. 0106 | . 0009 | . 0080 | . 0018 |
| *significant at the . 05 **Significant at the . 01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

APPENDIX D
SURVEY INSTRUMENTS AND COVER LETTERS

## ALUMNI SURVEY COVER LETTER <br> FIRST MAILING

(To be typed on local district letterhead)

Dear Alumnus:
We are evaluating the effectiveness of the occupational training we provided members of the "Class of '71". One purpose of the occupational program you took was to prepare you for work. The student who took the training and his employer are the best persons to tell us if we did what we set out to do.

So future students can be better prepared for employment, will you take a few minutes to fill out the enclosed questionnaire? No individual will be indentified in the results of this study. The answers you give to the questions will be kept in strict confidence. It is important to know how your employer or supervisor feels about the training you took in high school. Giving the name and address of your present employer or supervisor will enable us to contact him/her for this information.

We rave contracted with the Center for Educational Studies at Eastern Illinois University to collect and tabulate the completed questionnaires. Would you complete the questionnaire as soon as possible and mail it in the enclosed stamped envelope? The envelope is addressed to the Career Education Followup Study, Eastern Illinois University. Thank you for your valuable contribution to the improvement of job training for future students.

Sincerely,

ISignature and title of a local school person whom the student will know)

## AlUMNI SURVEY REMINDER NOTICE SECOND MAILING

Dear Alxmnxs:

(To be typed on local district letterhead)

Dear Alumnus:
In case you did not recieve our earlier letter, this second copy of the questionnaire is being sent. You still have an opportunity to let us know how well the occupational training you took in high school prepared you for work.

Many of your 1971 ciassmates have already returned their questionnaires. Won't you hẻlp us improve the occupational training of future students by mailing your completed questionnaire today? We have enclosed, for you convenience, a stamped envelope addressed to the Career Education Followup Study at Eastern Illinois University.

Thank you for your help.

> Sincerely,

Signature and title of a local school person whom the student will know)

# A FOLLOWUP SURVEY OF FORMER occupational students 

## FILL IN YOUR SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER



If your name and address are wrong on the white label above, PRINT corrections below.
Correct Name

———First $\overline{\text { Name }}$ ——
MI
Present Address

directions: where the words this occupational program appear, they mean the occupational program named on the last line of the white láel above.
mhere you are asked to "Check" a box, the check must be in the box if the ansuer is to be counted.

## PART I

## SINCE HIGH SCHOOL

1. Give the month and year you last attended high school.

2. Sex:Male $\square$ Female
3. Check the box before the reason you left high school at that time.
$1 \square$ Graduated
$2 \square$ Went to work
$3 \square$ Didn't like school
$4 \square$ Personal reasons
$5 \square$ Entered another school or training program
4. Check the box before the length of time it took you to find your first job after leaving high school.
$1 \square$ Less than one month
$2 \square$ one to three months
$3 \square$ Three to six months
$4 \square$ Over six months
$5 \square$ No job since leaving high school
5. If you have been out of work at any time since leaving school, how many weeks were you not employed?

Number of weeks
6. Check the box before the number of jobs you have held since Teaving school.
$1 \square$ One job
$2 \square$ Two jobs
$3 \square$ Three jobs
$4 \square$ Four or more jobs
$5 \square$ None
7. If you've changed jobs since leaving high school, circle the number to the rigit of the reason why you

| REASON POR LEAYING | 30bS LEFT |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | First | Second | Third | Fourth |
| Iook a better job | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Temporary job ended | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Laid off | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Disliked the work | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Disliked the people | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Disliked the hours | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Pay too low | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Family reasons | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Got married | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| Military service | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Entered school | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| Moved away | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Heal th problem. | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 |
| Too far to drive | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 |

8. If you have NEVER HAD A JOB SINCE LEAVING HIGH SCHOOL, check the box before the reason why.


I'm in school
I have not been able to get a job
Do not want a job Couldn't get into the union
I'm in the military service Poor health
I can't make enough money to make it worth working
8 Other

## (Specify)

9. Check the box before the one answer that best describes what you are doing now.
$1 \square$ Employed full-time (35 hours or more a week)
$2 \square$ Employed part-time (less than 35 hours per week)
3
$4 \square$ Work part-time and go to school part-time
$5 \square$
Work full-time and go to school part-time
$6 \square$ Full-time student
$7 \square$ Full-time homemaker
$8 \square$ Unemployed but actively suroking a job
$9 \square$ Unemployed; not seeking work
10 $\qquad$ Military service
10. If you work part-time (less than 35 hours a week) check the box in front of the reason why.
$1 \square$ That's all I care to work
2
That's all 1 can get

## DIRECTIONS: IF YOU ANSWERED QUESTION 8, answer questions 19, 20, and 21 oney.

IF YOU HAVE A JOB NOW, answer questions in Part II and Part III. if you have had a job since leaving HIGH SCHOOL, but are NOT EIPLOVED NOW, answer questions in part 111.

## PART II

EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCE

## OIRECTION: IF YOU HAVE A JOB NOW, answer the following.

11. Your job title

Sucin as: Shipping Clerk, Receptionist, Spot Welder, Nurse Alde, Grounds Keeper Waitress, Clerk Typist, Diesel Mechanic)
12. Supervisor's Name:
(PRINT Supervisor's Name)
Susiness or Company name and address:
(Name of Business or Company)
(Number--Street or Rural Route)
(City)
(State)
(Zip Code)
13. Tyile of Business

Such as: electronics, auto repair, department store, shoe factory, grocery store, etc.,)
14. What are your job duties: ("Job duties" are tasks you are required to do in your job, such as: make beds, order supplies, preplare food, read blueprints, layout machine parts, repair equipment.) Please list all your duties.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$


밈ㅁ
(For School use Onley)
15. Check the box before the ONE THING YOU LIKE MOST about your job.
$1 \square$ Good pay
$2 \square$ Some of the things I do on the job (pleasant
$3 \square$ job duties)
$3 \square$ challenging, etc.,
$4 \square$ The hours
$5 \square$ Security of having a job
$6 \square$ Possibilities for advancement
$7 \square$ Meeting people
$8 \square$ Fellow workers
$9 \square$ Employer
$10 \square$ Everything
$11 \square$ Nothing
16. Check the box before the ONE THING YOU DISLIKE MOST about your job.
$1 \square$ Low pay
$2 \square$ Some of the things I do on the job (unpleasant
$3 \square$ Nature of the work (monotonous, routine, not
self-satisfying)
$4 \square$ The hours
$5 \square$ Some of the customers, patients, etc.,
$7 \square$ The boss
$8 \square$ No possibilities for advancement
$9 \square$ Working conditions (too hot, dirty, too cold)
$10 \square$ No disTikes
$1 \square$ Dislike everything
17. How do you feel about this job?
$1 \square$ I like it very much
$2 \square$ I like it
$3 \square$ It's OK
$4 \square$ Not what I'd hoped
$5 \square$ It's awful

Continued, next page
18. If you are NOT WORKING If A JOB FOR WHICH YOU WERE TRAINED IN HIGH SCHOOL, check the box before the reason why.

$\begin{array}{ll}1 & \square \\ 2 & \square \\ 3 & \square \\ 4 & \square \\ 5 & \square \\ 6 & \square \\ 7 & \square\end{array}$Not presently employed
Couldn't find a job for which I was trained
I couldn't earn enough money
Didn't know what the job was really like
I didn't like the jobs for which I was trained
Needed more training and couldn't get it
No chance for promotion Other

Wirite in)

## PART III

## YOUR HIGH SCHOOL OCCUPATIONAL TRAIAING

19. In addition to your own personal interest, who encouraged you most to enroll in this occupational program? (Check the box before only one.)
$1 \square$ Parent(s), guardian, or family member
$2 \square$ Guidance counselor or administrator
$3 \square$ A teacher
$4 \square$ A student who took the program
$5 \square$ A friend
$6 \square$ No one
$7 \square$ Other
20. What would improve the occupational training you received in high school? (Check the box before the one(s) that you suggest.)

Training showld include things like how to: get along with other workers, the boss, the customer; get into the union; take license exams; file income tax; apply for workman's compensation; dress for the job.
$2 \square$ More individual help should be given to students in learning what kinds of jobs they might get, what courses to take in high school, what kind of schooling they might need after high school. More help with knowing where and how to get a job after high school.
 Training should prepare you for several jobs. Training should prepare you for one job rather than for several jobs.
 Offer a greater selection of training programs. Teachers should know more about the jobs they!re teaching.
 Training needs to be more like the real job.
Greater variety of classroom activities (field trips, etc., ).
10 No improvements needed.
$11 \square$
Other (Use back page for other suggestions you have.)
21. Would you recommend this occupational program to others?YesNo

DIRECTION: IF YOU HAVE A JOB NOW OR HAVE HAD A JOB AT ANY TIME since leaving high school, answer questions 22 and 23.
22. In general, how much help was your high school occupational training in: (Circle the number that applies.)

None Little Some Much Apply | Does |
| :---: |
| not |

1. Knowing how to use tools and equipment on the job? ? 2 3 4
2. Knowing what one does in this kind of job?
3. Using time and energy?
4. Finding needed information?
5. Being able to talk to the boss about job problems?
 Getting along with the customer, par tlent, etc.,?
6. Getting along with other workers?
7. Understanding union membership?
8. Handling new or unpleasant situations?
9. Applying for a job?
10. Interviewing for a job?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

23. Check the box before the one thing that was hardest for you to learn when you first began working on the job.


Learning the layout, routine, how machines operate, job terminology, etc., Performing certain job tasks
Speed
Getting along with the public (patients, customers, etc.,) Working with fellow workers Patience, courtesy, initiative, self-contrci Making dectsions
Managing my time efficiently
Nothing
Everything
Other
(Specify)

Please return completed questionnaire to:
Career Education Followup Study
B-6 Student Services Butlding
Eastern Illinois University
Charleston, Illinois 61920

# EMPLOYER/SUPERVISOR SURVEY COVER LETTER FIRST MAILING 

(To be typed on local district letterhead)

Dear Employer or Supervisor:
We are currently evaluating the effectiveness of the occupational training we provide high school youth. One of our occupational training objectives is to equip students with job skills required to enter the world of work. As the employer or supervisor of one of our former students, you can help us determine if we are doing what we have set out to do.

Will you take a few minutes to assess the preparation for employment of the employee named on the enclosed evaluation form? This is designed to give us vital information for determining the effectiveness and identifying strengths and weaknesses of present occupational training programs. No employee, employer, supervisor, or business will be identified in the results of this study. All responses to questions will be kept in strict confidence.

We have contracted with the Center for Educational Studies at Eastern Illinois University to collect and process study data. Would you complete the evaluation form as soon as possible and mail it in the enclosed stamped envelope? The envelope is addressed to the Career Education Followup Study, Eastern Illinois University. Thank you for your valuable contribution to the improvement of job training for future students.

Sincerely,
(Signature and title of a local school administrator)

# EMPLOYER/SUPERVISOR SURVEY REMINDER NOTICE SECOND MAILING 



## (To be typed on local district letterhead)

## Dear Employer or Supervisor:

In case you did not receive our earlier letter, this second copy of the evaluation form is being sent so you will have the opportunity to let us know how you feel about the high school occupational training provided youth.

The early responses to our request for information from the employer/ supervisors of our former students have been rewarding. An analysis of returns seems to indicate that employer/supervisors welcome the opportunity to assist school personnel in providing realistic employment education for students.

Won't you help us improve the occupational training of future students by mailing your completed evaluation form today? We have enclosed, for you convenience, a stamped envelope addressed to the data processing agency at Eastern Illinois University. Again let me assure you that your answers will be kept in strict confidence.

Thank you for your assistance.
Sincerely,
|Signature and title of a local school administrator)

## EVALUATION OF EMPLOYEE'S HIGH SCHOOL PREPARATION FOR EMPLOYMENT

To the Employer or Supervisor of:

## Employee's Name

1. In what capacity are you related to the employee named abovef (check the box.)
$1 \square$ Employar
2Supervisor
3 $\square$ Other
$\qquad$
(Write in)
2. What is the title of the job for which this employee is hired?
(Job titte)
3. In the following aspects of employment, how well prepared was the employee previously named for the job for which hired? (Circle the number below the answer.)
4. Job know-how, application of technical knowledge and skill
5. Use of tools and equipment
6. Selection and care of space, materials, and suopites
7. Quallty of work, ability to meet quality demands
8. Quantity of work, output of satisfactory amount
9. Cooperativeness, abllity to work with others
10. Accepting advice and supervision
11. Dependability, thorough completion of a job Without supervision
12. Initiative, doing jobs that need doing
13. Attendarice, reporting for work regularly
14. Appearance, presenting a business flnage
15. Adaptable to new situations
16. Being able to talk to the boss about job related problems
14, Serving the pubitc, patient, etc.
17. Safety habits, minimizing chance for accidents

| Not at a! 1 | Poorly | Somewhat | Well | Does not apply |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

4. How would you rate the suitability of the employee previously named for the kind of Job held? (Check the box that applies.)
$1 \square$
$2 \square$
$3 \square$
$4 \square$
Exceptionallyable
Well
Acceptable
Poorly
Not at atl
5. Below is a list of personal gualities and job skills. Check the box before the three you consider most important for a person entering the Job held by the previously named employee.
$1 \square$ Ability to get along with others--
$2 \square$ other workers, customers, patients
$3 \square$ Positive attitude toward work
$4 \square$ Appearance and grooning
$5 \square$ Judgment--ability to make decisions,
$6 \square$ ability to pian and organize
$7 \square$ and matericy in using job tools, machines,
$8 \square$ Accuracy, quallty, and thoroughness
$9 \square$ Attendance and punctuality
$10 \square$ Work quantity
$11 \square$ Other

27-29
(Whe in)
Us.g the back of this sheet for other suggest fons concerning high school occupational training.

Return to: Career Education Followup Study
B-6 Student Services Buflding
Eastern Illinols University
Charieston, Illinols 61920

## SAMPLE LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT REPORT

This appendix contains a sample of the report of the findings of the followup survey prepared for each local school district participating in the survey. Information in the report will enable local school district personnel to identify strengths and weaknesses of present programs of occupational preparation and determine implications for instructional modifications and program improvements.

## A ONE YEAR FOLLOWUP SURVEY

| Center for <br> - Scrive 7 Educational <br> - Resparent Studies <br> - Teacharr <br> School of Education e Eabtern Minnois Lnivirsil; |
| :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## FOLLOWUP <br> REPORT

on
"Clase of '7"

## OECUPATIOWAL PROGRAM ALUMNI

 $\epsilon$SAMPLE HIGH SCHOOL
District No. 00
Sample
Illinois 60000

The survey reported herein was conducted by The Center for Educational Studies, School of Education, Eastern Illinois University, Charleston Illinois, in cooperation with The Illinois Division of Vocational and Technical Education and Sample High School, District No. 00, Sample, Illinois, 60000 .

TABLE 2

TABLE 14

TABLE 15

Employer/Supervisors of employed respondents were asked to evaluate Alumni readiness for employment and responded. TABLES 19 and 21 specify employers ratings and recommendations for occupational training.

TABLE 20
Of the "Class of '71" occupational Alumni were employed full-time at the time of the survey; were full-time students; and were unemployed and actively seeking work;

## TABLE 8

Of the Alumni employed at the time of the survey were in jobs "closely related" to their high school occupational training; were in "related" jobs; and were in "non-related" jobs

TABLE 11
Of the Alumni employed at the time of the survey indicated high satisfaction with their job;
indicated their job was OK; and indicated dissatisfaction with the job they held.

Of the Alumni were encouraged to enroll in occupational training by counselors, teachers or administrators;
indicated no one encouraged them to enter occupational training; ànd
were encouraged by their parents or family to enroll.

Af the Alumni would recommend their occupational training progran to Jthers. TABLE 16 specified the recommendations respondencs made for improving high school occupational training. reconendations for occupational training.

Of the Embloyer/Supervisors rated employed Rlumni exceptionally able for the job they held:
were rated well suited for the job held; and were rated acceptable.
table 1

| Program Taken | Number of Questionnaires Sent | Percent <br> Postally <br> Returned | Percent Responding | Percent of <br> Non-Usable <br> Responses | Percent of Usable Reaponses for Questionnaires Assumed Received* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 04.0000 | 26 | 11.54 | 43.48 | 10.00 | 39.13 |
| 07.0900 | 14 | 7.14 | 69.23 | 0.0 | 69.23 |
| 14.0000 | 21 | 9.52 | 78.95 | 0.0 | 78.95 |
| 14.0101 | 10 | 0.0 | 60.00 | 0.0 | 60.00 |
| 14.0702 | 10 | 0.0 | 80.00 | 0.0 | 80.00 |
| 14.0901 | 3 | 0.0 | 33.33 | 0.0 | 33.33 |
| 17.0000 | 37 | 2.70 | 52.78 | 5.26 | 50.00 |
| 17.0300 | 4 | 0.0 | 50.00 | 0.0 | 50.00 |
| 17.1300 | 7 | 0.0 | 57.14 | 0.0 | 57.14 |
| 17.1500 | 13 | 15.38 | 36.36 | 0.0 | 36.36 |
| 17.1900 | 5 | 0.0 | 60.00 | 0.0 | 60.00 |
| 17.2304 | 4 | 0.0 | 25.00 | 0.0 | 25.00 |
| 17.2902 | 3 | 0.0 | 66.67 | 0.0 | 66.67 |
| 18.9902 | 45 | 11.11 | 30.00 | 0.0 | 30.00 |
| Total | 202 | 6.93 | 51.06 | 2.08 | 50.00 |

TABLE 2
STATUS OF RESPONDENTS AT THE TIME OF THE SURVEY BY PROGRAM TAKEN
Status (In Percentages)

| Program Taken | Sample Size |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 04.0000 | 9 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.1 | -11.1 | 11.1 |
| 07.0900 | 9 | 44.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 22.2 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 0.0 |
| 14.0000 | 15 | 80.0 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | ก. 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 13.3 | 0.0 | $\therefore$ ? |
| 14.0101 | 6 | 66.7 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 15.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0. 0 |
| 14.0702 | 0 | 75.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.5 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 12.5 | 0.7 | 5.7 |
| 14.0901 | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | ก. | 0.0 | r. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| 17.0000 | 18 | 61.1 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.6 | 2.0 | 5.6 | 11.1 | 5.6 |
| 17.0300 | 2 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | r.? |
| 17.1300 | 4 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 |
| 17.1500 | 4 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 7.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.9 |
| 17.1900 | 3 | 33.3 | 0.7 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 0.0 | $?$ | 0.0 | $\cdots$ |
| 17.2304 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.9 | 137.0 | ).9 | 0.0 | 9.5 | $0 . ?$ | $\bigcirc$.? |
| 17.2902 | $?$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 50.1 | 0.0 | 50.7 |
| 18.9902 | 12 | 66.7 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 8.3 |
| total | 94 | 56 | 4 | 1 | 1 | - | 3 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 6 |

Question: Check the length of time it took you to find your first job after leaving high school.

TABLE 3

## Length of first jab seapch after leaving high school by program taken

| Program Taken | Sample Size | Percent Who Found Emplayment in |  |  |  | Percent With No Job Since Hieh Schoo? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 Month | 1 to 3 | 3 to 6 | Over 6 |  |
|  |  | or Less | Months | Months | Months |  |
| 04.0000 | 9 | 62.5 | 0.0 | i2.5 | 0.0 | 25.0 |
| 07.0900 | 7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | C. C | 0.0 |
| 14.0000 | 14 | 71.4 | 21.4 | 0.0 | 7.1 | 0.0 |
| 14.0101 | + | $83 . ?$ | ก. 0 | 1 ¢. 7 | $\bigcirc \cdot \mathrm{r}$ | 3.0 |
| 14.0702 | R | 50.0 | $1 ? .5$ | 37.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 14.0901 | 1 | 100.0 | 0.n | 0.0 | 7.0 | 3.0 |
| 17.0000 | $1 \%$ | 75.0 | 12.5 | J. 0 | t. 3 | 6.3 |
| 17.0300 | ? | 50.0 | 0.0 | 9.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 |
| 17.1300 | 3 | 100.0 | 9.0 | 0.0 | C. 0 | 0.0 |
| 17.1500 | 4 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | C.O | n.0 |
| 17.1900 | 3 | 56.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.0 | 33.2 |
| 17.2304 | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | U. 0 | $\bigcirc \cdot C$ | 0.0 |
| 17.2902 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 18.9902 | 11 | 81.8 | $0 . \mathrm{C}$ | 0.0 | 9.1 | 9.1 |
| trtal | 94 | 62 | 8 | 5 | 3 | A |

Question: Check the number of jobs you have held since leaving high school.
TABLE 4
Number of jobs held since leaving high school by program taken

| Program <br> Taken | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sample } \\ & \text { Size } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Percent who Have Held |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | No Job | One Job | Two Jobs | Three Jobs | Four or More Jobs |
| 04.0000 | $\bigcirc$ | 22.2 | 55.6 | 11.1 | 11.1 | C.0 |
| 07.0900 | ? | 0.0 | 88.9 | 11.1 | 1.1 0.0 | c. C |
| 14.0000 | 15 | c.c | 6). 0 | 33.3 | 6.7 | c.c |
| 14.0101 | + | 0.0 | 66.7 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 14.0702 | \% | 0.0 | 37.5 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 12.5 |
| 14.0901 | 1 | $\bigcirc .0$ | 100.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 120 |
| 17.0000 | 17 | ¢. ¢ | 76.5 | $0 . \mathrm{c}$ | c.r | 17.6 |
| 17.0300 | 2 | 50.0 | 3.0 | 50.0 | 0.6 | $\bigcirc$ |
| 17.1300 | 3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6 tr .7 | 33.3 | 0.0 |
| 17.1500 | 4 | 3.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | O.c | r.c |
| 17.1900 | 3 | 33.3 | 65.7 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 |
| 17.2304 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 1.0 | $\cdots$ |
| 17.2902 | 2 | C.ec | 50.0 | 10.0 | 0.6 | -c.e |
| 18.9902 | 113 | 8.3 | 41.7 | 25.0 | 15.7 | 8.3 |
| IC ratal. | 9 | 6 | 53 | 22 | 5 | 6 |


| Prograin Taken | Took a Better Job | Temp. Job Ended | Laid Off | The Work | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\text { jisliked }}{\text { The }} \\ & \text { People } \end{aligned}$ | The Hours | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pay } \\ & \text { too } \\ & \text { Low } \end{aligned}$ | Family Reasons | Got Married | Military Service | Entered School | Moved <br> Away | Health Problem | TOO Far to Drive |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 04.0000 | 05.6 | 00.0 | 01.4 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 01.4 | 01.4 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 |
| 07.0900 | 01.4 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 07.4 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 01.4 | 00.0 | 01.4 | 00.0 |
| 14.0000 | 04.2 | . 00.0 | 01.4 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 01.4 | 01.4 | 04.2 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 02.8 | 00.0 | 01.4 |
| 14.0101 | 00.0 | .01 .4 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 03.0 | 01.4 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 01.4 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 |
| 14.0702 | 05.6 | . 17.4 | 04.2 | 00.0 | 07.0 | 00.0 | 00.13 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 01.4 | 00.0 | 00.0 |
| 14.0901 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | $0 \% 3$ | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 |
| 17.0000 | 02.8 | 01.4 | 01.4 | 00.0 | 01.4 | 01.4 | 01.4 | 01.4 | 01.4 | 00.0 | 04.2 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 |
| 17.0300 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 01.4 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 |
| 17.1300 | 02.8 | 01.4 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 01.4 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 |
| 17.1500 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 02.8 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 |
| 17.1900 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 |
| 17.2304 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 |
| 17.2902 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 01.4 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 07.4 | [C.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 01.4 | 00.0 | 01.4 |
| 18.9902 | 02.8 | 00.0 | 01.4 | 02.8 | 00.0 | 01.4 | 0\%. 8 | 00.0 | 01.4 | 01.4 | 00.0 | 04.2 | 00.0 | 00.0 |
| Total Percent | 25.0 | 05.6 | 11.1 | 04.2 | 01.4 | 04.2 | 06.9 | 04.2 | 08.3 | 02.8 | 12.5 | 09.7 | 01.4 | 02.8 |
| Total Job |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 18 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 9 | 7 | 1 | 2 |

TABLE 6

| Program Taken | Sample <br> Size | Reasons (in percentage) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | In School | Unable to Get a Job | Do Not Want a Job | Couldn't Get Into a Union | In the Military Service | In Poor Health | Can't Make Enough Money | Other Reasons |
| 04.0000 | 2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 |
| 07.0900 | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 14.0000 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
| 14.0101 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 |
| 14.0702 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 14.0901 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.0000 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.0300 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.1300 | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.1500 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.1900 | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.2304 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.2902 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 18.9902 | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| total | 7 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | i | 0 | 1 | 0 |

Question: If you work part-time (less than 35 hours a week) check the box in front of the reason why.
tadle 7

## REASONS FOR PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT BY PROGRAM TAKEN

| Program <br> Taken | Sample Size | That's all I care to work | That's all I can get |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 04.0000 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 07.0900 | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 14.0000 | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 14.0101 | 2 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 14.0702 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 14.0901 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.0000 | 2 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.0300 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.1300 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.1500 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.1900 | 1 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 17.2304 | 0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 17.2902 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 18.9902 | 1 | 6 | 100.0 |
| TOTAL | 8 |  |  |

TABLE 8
RELATEDNESS OF EMPLOYMENT AT THE TIME OF THE SURVEY TO OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING BY PROGRAM TAKEN*

| Program Taken | SampleSize | Percentage Who Were Found In A |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Non-Related Job | Related Job | Closely Related Job |
| 04.0000 | 7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 07.0900 | 5 | 20.0 | 70.0 | 0.0 |
| 14.0000 | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 14.0101 | 6 | 83.3 | 16.7 | 0.0 |
| 14.0702 | 7 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 85.7 |
| 14.0901 | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.0000 | 8 | 87. 5 | 0.0 | 12.5 |
| 17.0300 | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.1300 | 3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.1500 | 3 | 66.7 | 33.3 | 0.0 |
| 17.1900 | ? | 50.0 | 50.3 | 0.0 |
| 17.2304 | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.2902 | $\stackrel{\square}{4}$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 18.9902 | 4 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| total | 49 | 34 | 8 | 7 |

Question: If you are not working in a job for which you were trained in high school, check the reason why.

| Program Taken | Couldn't Find Job for Which Trained | Couldn't Earn Enougn Money | Didn't Know What Job Was Really Like | Didn't Like Jobs for Which Trained | Needed More Training; Couldn't Get it | No Chance for Promotion | Other** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 04.0000 | 25.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 07.0900 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | $\overline{100.0}$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 14.0000 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 14.0101 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 |
| 14.0702 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 |
| 14.0901 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 |
| 17.0000 | 20.0 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 40.0 |
| 17.0300 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.1300 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 66.7 |
| 17.1500 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.1900 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.5 |
| 17.2304 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.9 |
| 17.2902 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 |
| 18.9902 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 33.3 |
|  | 7 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 7 |

**Additional reasons specified by respondents checking the "other" category immediately follow this table
*Reported in Percentages

> REASONS FOR EMPLOYMENT IN JOB NOT RELATED TO HIGH SCHOOL OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING BY PROGRAM TAKEN*

## TABLE 9

50.0


TABLE 9 "Dther" Responses
Other reasons, specified by respondents, for not working in a job for which trained in high school. (Phrasing and spelling used by respondents was not corrected.)
14.0101 "Advanced study in accounting."
14.0702 "in college-only needed job for 2 mos."
"I took this job while it was at hand, I would love another job where shorthand is necessary."
17.0000
17.1300
17.1500
17.1900
18.9902
"part time to earn money."
"I wasn't trained for any job, in the occupational training class that I took"
"laid off"
"Still attending school."
"This is starting from the bottom of machine design and is a great help toward my field. Also I'm a student now."
"Needed a sumner time job to get me through college."
"Attending School"
"Continuing training"
"No insurance"

TABLE 10

## D.O.T. CLASSIFICATION* OF JOBS EMPLOYED RESPONDENT'S HELD AT THE TIME OF THE SURVEY

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Job } \\ \text { D.0.T. } \\ \text { Code } \end{gathered}$ | Number in Job | Percent in Job | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Job } \\ & \text { D.O.T. } \\ & \text { Code } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Jumi:or } \\ & \text { in } \\ & \text { Job } \end{aligned}$ | Percen* ia Job |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 001.281 | 1 | 1.4 | 381.887 | 2 | 2.8 |
| 079.368 | 1 | 1.4 | 401.137 | 1 | 1.4 |
| 142.081 | 1 | 1.4 | 500.884 | 1 | 1.4 |
| 201.368 | 11 | 15.3 | 504.782 | 1 | 1.4 |
| 202.388 | 1 | 1.4 | 600.280 | 1 | 1.4 |
| 203.588 | 4 | 5.6 | 651.782 | 1 | 1.4 |
| 206. 388 | 2 | 2.8 | 724.781 | 1 | 1.4 |
| 209.388 | 6 | 8.3 | 741.884 | 2 | 2.8 |
| 211.368 | 1 | 1.4 | 820.381 | 1 | 1.4 |
| 213.582 | 4 | 5.6 | 822.381 | 1 | 1.4 |
| 215.388 | 1 | 1.4 | 859.884 | 1 | 1.4 |
| 219.388 | 3 | 4.2 | 860.381 | 1 | 1.4 |
| 222.387 | 2 | 2.8 | 851.381 | 1 | 1.4 |
| 237.368 | 1 | 1.4 | 866.381 | 1 | 1.4 |
| 290.468 | 2 | 2.8 | 869.884 | 1 | 1.4 |
| 311.878 | 4 | 5.6 | 915.137 | 1 | 1.4 |
| 355.878 | 5 | 6.9 | 915.867 | 1 | 1.4 |
| 379.368 | 1 | 1.4 | 972.381 | 1 | 1.4 |
| 379.868 | 1 | 1.4 |  |  |  |

*Appendix A contains the Job Titles of each 0.O.T. Code and the instructionai program that the U.S. Office of Education considers appropriate for training personnel for entry level into the specified job.

Question: How do you feel about this job?
table 11
SATISFACTION WITH JOB HELD AT THE TIME OF THE SURVEY BY PROGRAM TAKEN

| Program Taken | Sample Size | I like it very much | I like it | It's OK | Not what I'd hoped | It's Awful |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 04.0000 | 7 | 78.6 | 42.9 | 14.3 | 14.3 | 0.0 |
| 07.0900 | 5 | 60.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 14.0000 | 12 | 41.7 | 50.0 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 14.0101 | 6 | 50.0 | 16.7 | 33.3 | c. 0 | 0.0 |
| 14.0702 | 7 | 71.4 | 0.0 | 29.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 14.0901 | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.0000 | 14 | 42.9 | 42.9 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.0300 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.1300 | 3 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 73.3 | 0.0 |
| 17.1500 | 3 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.1900 | 2 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.2304 | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.2902 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 18.9902 | 8 | 62.5 | 12.5 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| total | 70 | 3 ? | 22 | 14 | 2 | 0 |

Question: Check the box before the ONE THING YOU LIKE MOST about your job.
FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH JOB SATISFACTION

| Program Taken | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sample } \\ & \text { Size } \end{aligned}$ | One Thing Liked Most About Job (In Percentages) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { त } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04.0000 | 5 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 |
| 07.0900 | 4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | $0 \% 0$ | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 |
| 14.0000 | 11 | 9.1 | 9.1 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 54.5 | ?.0 |
| 14.0101 | 6 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 15.7 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 |
| 14.0702 | 6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 |
| 14.0901 | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.0000 | 12 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.0300 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.01 | 00.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.1300 | 3 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 |
| 17.1500 | 2 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.1900 | 2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | $0 . \mathrm{C}$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.01 | 0 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.2304 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.2902 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 18.9902 | 7 | 28.6 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 28.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 28.6 | 0.0 |
|  | 60 | 8 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 27 | 0 |

Question: Check the box before the ONE THING YOU DISLIKE MOST about your job.

| FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH JOB DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | One Thing Disliked Most About Job (In Percentages) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Program Taken | Sample Size | $\begin{aligned} & \text { त̈ } \\ & 3 \\ & 3 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 0 <br> 0 <br> + <br>  <br> 0 <br> $\widetilde{0}$ <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04.0000 | 6 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.066 .7 | 0.0 |
| 07.0900 | 5 | 20.0 | 40.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.00 .0 | 0.0 |
| 14.0000 | 13 | 0.0 | 15.4 | 7.7 | 0.0 ' | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 0.0 | 0.069 .2 | 0.0 |
| 14.0101 | 6 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 16.733 .3 | 0.0 |
| 14.0702 | 6 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.066 .7 | 0.0 |
| 14.0901 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.010 C .0 | 0.0 |
| 17.0000 | 13 | 23.1 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.746 .2 | 0.0 |
| 17.0300 | 1 | 0,0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 0.0 | 0.0 |
| $17.1300$ | 3 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.066 .7 | 0.0 |
| 17.1500 | 3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | $0.0 \quad 0.0$ | 0.0 |
| 17.1900 | 2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0100 .0 | 0.0 |
| 17.2304 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0100 .0 | 0.0 |
| 17.2902 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 .0 | 0.0 |
| 18.990 ? | 8 | 12.5 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.050 .0 | 0.0 |
|  | 68 | 9 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 435 | 0 |

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH JOB DISSATISFACTION

Question: In addition to your own personal interest, who encouraged you most to enroll in this occupational program? (Check only one.)

TABLE 14
SOURCE OF ENCOURAGEMENT TO ENROLL IN OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING BY PROGRAM TAKEN*

| Program Taken | Parent(s) or Other Family | Guidance Counselor or Administrator | Teacher | Alumnus of the Program | Friend | No One | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 04.0000 | 12.5 | 37.5 | 6.0 | 25.0 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 0.0 |
| 07.0900 | 50.0 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 12.5 | 25.0 | 0.0 |
| 14.0000 | 14.3 | 14.3 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 7.1 | 50.0 | 0.0 |
| 14.0101 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 50.0 | 0.0 |
| 14.0702 | 28.6 | 0.0 | 28.6 | 14.3 | 14.3 | 14.3 | 0.0 |
| 14.0901 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.0000 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 6.7 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 26.7 | 0.0 |
| 17.0300 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.1300 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.1500 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 |
| 17.1900 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.2304 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.2902 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 18.9902 | 27.3 | 36.4 | 18.2 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 0.0 |
|  | 17 | 17 | 11 | 7 | 8 | 22 | 0 |


TABLE 15
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WHO WOULD RECOMMEND OCCUPATIONAL TRAIAING TO OTHERS BY PROGRAM TAMCN

| Program Taken | Sample Size | Percent Who <br> Would Recomend | Percent Who Would <br> Not Recommend |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 04.0000 | 9 | 88.9 | 11.1 |
| 07.0900 | 8 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 14.0000 | 15 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 14.0101 | 6 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 14.0702 | 8 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 14.0901 | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.0000 | 1. | 181.3 | 18.8 |
| 17.0300 | 2 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.1300 | 2 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.1500 | 3 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.1900 | 3 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.2304 | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 18.9902 | 12 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  |  | 0.0 |

Question：What would improve the occupational training you received in high school？
RESPONDENT＇S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING BY PROGRAM TAKEN

| Program Taken | Sample Size |  |  |  | $\stackrel{8}{4}$ <br> $\xrightarrow{7}$ <br> 0 <br> $\frac{0}{2}$ <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 告 <br>  |  | Greater choice of programs． |  |  |  |  | $\xrightarrow{*}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 04.0000 | 9 | 11.1 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 22.2 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 0.0 | 22.2 | 0.0 | 22.2 | 0.0 |
| 07.0900 | 9 | 33． 3 | 44.4 | 11．1 | 22.2 | 0.0 | 22.2 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 0.0 |
| 14.0000 | 15 | 26.7 | 26.7 | 6.7 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 26.7 | 13.3 | 26.7 | 0.0 |
| 14.0101 | 6 | 33.3 | 16.7 | 33.3 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 |
| 14.0702 | 8 | 12．5 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 37.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 37.5 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 12.5 |
| 14.0901 | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.0000 | 18 | 11.1 | 33.3 | 16.7 | 33． 3 | 5.6 | 0.0. | 22.7 | 16.7 | 27.8 | 22.2 | 0.0 |
| 17.0300 | 2 | 0.0 | 100．0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | $0 . \cdots$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.1300 | 4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.1500 | 4 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 |
| 17.1900 | 3 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | $\bigcirc .0$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 |
| 17.2304 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17.2902 | 2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 |
| 18.9902 | 12 | 16.7 | 41.7 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 25.0 | 8.3 | 8.3 |
| TOTAL | 94 | 16 | 28 | 13 | 22 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 19 | 15 | 15 | 4 |

Other recommendations, specified by respondents, to improve the occupational training received in high school. (Phrasing and spelling used by respondents was not corrected.)
04.0000 "To me that classroom was a waste of time. It didn't teach me how to do the things that were necessary for my job. The teacher was a bad teacher, all he made us to was work on displays. How many kids in that class worked with displays--hardly any if any. The only thing, I like about it was I could get out of school to go to work."
14.0000 "1. More typing
2. using old machines in 0.0. class of 2 hr .
3. more understanding of vocabulary"
"I had Mrs.
for my teacher and I feel she was a very good teacher. She kept you interested and you learned more that way. I feel she was the one that helped me the most."
14.0702 " I have a comment about Part III, number 20, Item 7, My teacher at , cannot be beat. She is the most wonderful teacher alfve. Everyone dislikes her except a few.Many of my friends that were in my Secr. Practice Class were along with me the ones who dearly love her. She is definately strict, but when credit is due, complements are given. I passed two minutes of my 150 word transcription and it would not have been possible for me to work so high so fast, had it not been for her splendid teaching. I was 2nd best in the class at transcribing. One girl ahead of me passed 3 minutes 6150 words per minute and as I stated above I passed 2 minutes. I don't think there's a teacher in the world that's as good at teaching Sec. Prac. as she is.
17.0000 "They should be able to get you a job that interests you. Employers that might hire you (according to others that did get jobs) just have you do the dirty work, you dont' really get any kind of training that once you are out of school will get you a job. It is all really a mistake, to get in the program. From what I've found kids are mostly in the program to get out of school more, and make money! It wasn't that way in my case, I didn't care about the money. I was really interested in a couple of occupations which might have led to schooling if I found I was really interested in that area of work. I was really disappointed!"
"I sure did like the course I took in drafting \& that is what I want to get into but haven't had any luck yet. I have my application in at If you could be of any help to me getting a job. I sure would appreciate it very much."

TABLE 16 "Other" Responses
17.1500 "I think that more emphasis needs to be put on Technical Schools and much less on college. I have found that many people who have attended college are unorinted for working in many jobs, they have unrealistic approaches to solving tasks and problems. While people who have acquired their training on the job or through technical schools are much better off in their job knowledge and working habits."
17.1900 "Al though I had a 2 hour course I feel that this was still not enough time per day for the student to start \& finish projects With other subjects to study he has a tendency to lose interest or forget the importance of that day's class."
"I'm in school at Lake Land College right now but they didn't have Grafic arts at this school so I switched to an accounting major, but if there is still a chance of getting a break in the photography line of work I would be pleased to here about it."
18.9902 "Learning students to accept responsabilitys and to get what they can out of school will they are there because they can use it when they are on there own."

Question: In general, how much help was your high school occupational training in: (Score indicates average on a four point scale: 1 = None; 2 = Little; 3 = Some; 4 = Much)

TABLE 17
Alumni ratings Of training contribution to employment by program areas

| Aspects of Employment | Program Areas |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AgriBus. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bus. } \\ & \text { Occ. } \end{aligned}$ | H7th. Occ. | Ind. Occ. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { P\&PS } \\ & \text { OCC. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Spec } \\ & \text { Prog. } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| KNOWING HDW TO USF TחרI S AND EOUIPMFNT IN THE JOR | 0.0 | 3.55 | 3.25 | 7.62 | 4.00 | 2.14 | 3.09 |
| KVOWING WHAT TO DO <br> IV THTS KIND OF JחB | 0.0 | 3.03 | 3.50 | ? 6.68 | 4.00 | 2.56 | 2.93 |
| l'stng, tImF $¢$ ENEPGY | 0.0 | 3.36 | 3.38 | 2.73 | 4.00 | 2.67 | 3.11 |
| FINITNG NFFNED INFCRMATIDA | 0.0 | 3.26 | 3.38 | 2.48 | 4.00 | 2.89 | 3.05 |
| RFINR ARLF TH TALK TO THF ROSS ARIIUT JOR PROBLEMS | 0.0 | 7.89 | 3.00 | 2.22 | 4.00 | 3.11 | 2.74 |
| r.ETTING ALONG WITH CHSTRMEP, PATIENT, ETR. | 0.0 | 3.06 | 3.88 | 2.27 | 3.00 | 2.89 | 2.89 |
| GETTING ALONG WITH OTHFR WIRKFRS | 0.0 | 3.43 | 3.13 | 2.77 | 4.00 | 3.30 | 3.21 |
| HNOFESTANIING UNITN MCMRFRSHIP | 0.0 | 1.59 | 1.83 | 1.41 | 0.0 | 2.11 | 1.65 |
| HANDLING NFW OR UNFI. FASANT SITUATIONIS | 0.0 | 3.11 | 3.38 | 2.30 | 1.00 | 2.50 | 2.80 |
| ADPIVINT, FOR A JMB | 0.0 | 3.23 | 3.63 | 2.57 | 4.00 | 3.20 | 3.13 |
| INTEPVIEWING FRP A Jח? | 0.0 | 3.43 | 3.63 | 2.49 | 4.00 | 3.30 | 3.16 |
| AIJMRFP RFSPONDING | 0 | 38 | 8 | 73 | 1 | 10 | 80 |


| ＊23470 | ㅇ․ㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇ00000 <br>  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 6и！ 43 R1a＾］ | m000000000000－ <br>  |
| Gu！ 470 N |  N NiN |
|  | mmм0．0イ000000－1． <br>  |
|  | 00MNGOMyg．coon $\dot{O} \dot{\sim} \dot{\sim} \dot{0} \dot{\sim} \dot{\sim} \dot{0} \dot{0} \dot{\sim} \dot{\sim}^{\circ} \dot{\sim}$ |
|  <br> ＇Ksazun0s＇әЈua！fed | omoooorroo00000 $\dot{\square} \dot{\circ} 0^{\circ} 0^{\circ} \dot{\sim} 0^{\circ} 0^{\circ} 0^{\circ}$ |
|  | 00000000000000 <br>  |
|  <br>  | 0 MOO0000000007 $\dot{\square} \dot{0} 00^{\circ} 00^{\circ} 0^{\circ} 0^{\circ} 0^{\circ}=$ |
| paəds | $00+0$ noocce000． <br>  |
| sxsez qo¢ uiequas Gu！uniofrad | motroorsocooog <br> $\dot{\sim} \dot{\sim} \dot{\sim} \dot{\sim} \operatorname{nin}^{\circ} 0^{\circ} 0^{\circ} 00^{\circ} 0^{\circ}$ |
| － 57 ＇ㅅ6оLои！umaz <br>  <br>  | －minonor000000m <br>  |
|  | NMはめの｜ームーNNNーーの |
| 長 |  <br>  <br>  |

TABLE 18 "Other" Responses
Other tasks, specified by respondents, that were the one thing hardest to learr when first beginning work on the job. (Phrasing and spelling used by respondents was not corrected.)

04,0000 "I had had little experience as a mason before; until I got into the hang of things."
14.0901 "Learning how my department worked along with the others."
17.0000 "Getting adjusted to a job situation after only being a student. No real problem."

Question: In the following aspects of employment, how well prepared was the employee named above for the job for which hired? (Score indicates average on a 4 point scale: $1=$ Not at all; 2=Poorly; $3=$ Somewhat; and 4=Well)

TABLE 19
EMPLOYER/SUPERVISOR RATINGS OF EMPLOYEE READINESS FOR EMPLOYMENT

| Aspects of Employment | Average Rating | Percent Who Indicated Does Not Apply |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job know-how, application of technica? knowledge and skill | 3.40 | 8.1 |
| Use of tools and equipment | 3.62 | 12.7 |
| Selection and care of space, materials, and supplies | 3.59 | 19.0 |
| Quality of work, ability to meet quality demands | 3.68 | 0.0 |
| Quantity of work, output of satisfactory amount | 3.71 | 1.6 |
| Cooperativeness, ability to work with others | 3.83 | 0.0 |
| Accepting advice and supervision | 3.79 | 0.0 |
| Dependability, thorough completion of a job without supervision | 3.56 | 3.2 |
| Initiative, doing jobs that need doing | 3.44 | 1.6 |
| Attendance, reporting for work regularly | 3.79 | 0.0 |
| Appearance, presenting a business image | 3.67 | 6.5 |
| Adaptable to new situations | 3.61 | 1.6 |
| Being able to talk to the boss about job related problems | 3.46 | 0.0 |
| Serving the public, patient, etc. | 3.59 | 27.0 |
| Safety habits, minimizing chance for accidents | 3.65 | 21.0 |

Question: How would you rate the suitability of the employee named above for the kind of job held?

TABLE 20
EMPLOYEE SUITABILITY FOR THE JOB HELD ACCORDING TO EMPLOYER/SUPERYISORS

| Suitability | Percent of <br> Employees |
| :--- | :---: |
| Exceptionally able | 30.6 |
| Well suited for job held | 45.2 |
| Acceptable | 19.4 |
| Poorly suited for job held | 03.2 |
| Not at all suited for job held | 01.6 |

## Additional Employer Comments by Program Number

14.0000 "Most recent high school graduates seem to have difficulty adapting to the idea they must go to work each day even if they don't feel up to par in the morning. As a group, the 18 to 21 year olds have the poorest attendance record and blame it on being sick. This is particularly true of the girls. The longer they are on the same job the better their attendance. Almost every business uses Data Processing to some extent yet new employees entering the work force fail to elen know the basics of this important part of business. The time spent by the student learning shorthand, which is a dying art, could be used to learn basic Data Processing. More Business and Economic courses would be very helpful in understanding the overall function of business."
"Our company has more opportunity for those with typing ability. Our minimum acceptable typing score is 40 wam. We have limited opportunities for clerical without skills. Shorthand is used some, however, the longer percentage of our supervisors use dictaphone."
"High school occupational trainingis great as long as the training keeps up with the changing business world. These young employees are very impressive."
14.0900 "Employee worked 1 month then quit because of personal problems."
17.0000 "----is no longer with us. She never came to work and I had to find someone to replace her."
18.9902 "Bus. appearance really not required but nice to have for all employees."

Question: Below is a list of personal qualities and job skills. Check the box before the three you consider most important for a person entering the jub held by the previously named employee.

TABLE 21
IMPORTANT ENTRY SKILLS IDENTIFIED BY EMPLOYER/SUPERVISORS

Entry Skills | Percent of |
| :---: |
| Times Identified* |

Ability to get along with others--other workers, customers, patients ..... 51.6
Initiative ..... 17.2
Positive attitude toward work ..... 37.5
Appearance and grooming ..... 07.8
Judgment--ability to make decisions, ability to plan and organize ..... 31.3
Competency in using job tools, machines, and materials ..... 15.6
Dependability ..... 35.9
Accuracy, quality, and thoroughness ..... 56.3
Attendance and punctuality ..... 21.9
Work quantity ..... 14.1
Other ..... 03.1

[^9]
[^0]:    lU.S. Office of Health, Education, and Welfare; National Center for Educational Statistics, Standard Terminology for Curriculum and Instruction in Local and State School Systems (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970), p. 62 (X 02 45.20).

    2Ibid., p. 62 (X 02 45.21)

[^1]:    *While all city of Chicago Schools are in one school district, only four of the secondary schools were scheduled for evaluation in FY 1973. Three of the four schools chose to participate in the survey.
    **Some school districts have more than one high school participating in the survey.

[^2]:    Daniel P. Norton,, and Donivaṇ J. Wailey, , The Efficiency and Efficacy of Evaluation Practices of the Illinois Division of Vocational and Technical Education--Final Report (Evanston, Illinois: Educational Testing Service, December 21, 1972), p. 83.

[^3]:    1Milton E. Larson. "Attitude, Money and Program," in Contemporary Concepts in Vocational Education, Gordon $F$. Law, ed., Washington, D.C. American Vocational Association, Inc., 197T, pp. 55-56.

    2J. Chester Swanson, "Criteria for Effective Vocational Education," in Contemporary Concepts in Vocational Education, Gordon F. Law, ed., Washington, D.C., American Vocational Association, Inc., 1971, p. 24.

[^4]:    3John Beaumont, "Philosophical Implications of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968", in Contemporary Conception in Vocational Education, Gordon F. Law, ed., Washington, D.C., Âmerican Vocational Association, Inc., 1971, pp. 12-13.

[^5]:    *Will not total 100 percent due to rounding

[^6]:    $1_{\text {Rupert N. Evans, Garth L. Mangum, and Otto Pragan, Preparation for }}$ Employment: The Background and Potential of the 1968 Vocational Education Amendments (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, The University of Michigan--Wayne State University; Washington, D.C.: National Manpower Policy Task Force, May 1969), p. 55.

[^7]:    *Ratings indicate the average on a four point scale: $1=$ Not at all prepared; 2 = Poorly prepared; $3=$ Somewhat prepared; and $4=$ Well prepared.

[^8]:    *The percentages will not total 100 percent due to multiple responses to this item. Each employer/supervisor was asked to check 3 personal qualities or job skills that were most important for a person entering the job held by the employee being rated. The table should read--of the employer/supervisors responding to this item, 53.6 percent checked ability to get along with others. . . . as an important entry level skill.

[^9]:    *Will not total 100 percent as each respondent could check three. Percent is based upon the number of total respondents who check a particular skill.

