THE EFFECTS OF A JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT PROGRAM ON "AT-RISK" YOUTHS' LEVEL OF SELF ESTEEM, LOCUS OF CONTROL, AND ENDORSEMENT OF IRRATIONAL BELIEFS

A THESIS

Presented to

the Graduate Faculty

University of Wisconsin-La Crosse

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science in Education

College Student Personnel

---

by

Gretchen E. Koehler

July, 1986

WT
20
1984

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

La Crosse, Wisconsin 54601

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Candidate: Gretchen E. Koehler

We recommend acceptance of this thesis in partial fulfullment of this candidats requirements for the degree MASTER OF SCIENCE IN EDUCATION-COLLEGE STUDENT PERSONNEL.

The candidate has completed her oral report.

Thesis Committee Member	7/22/86 Date
Thesis Committee Member	7/22/86 Date
Thesis Committee Member	7/22/86 Date

This thesis is approved for the College of Education.

Dean, Graduate Studies	7/22/86 Date

8701313

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Although it would be virtually impossible to acknowledge everyone who has either inspired me, taught me, helped me, or simply put up with me, while writing this thesis, to not try would be both arrogant, and perhaps even a bit dangerous considering how much time and energy these others have invested in my paper and me.

In the category of those who "inspired" me there is Tim Shepardson and Andy Zeimelis. Both of these men, along with my parents, encouraged me to critically think about social issues facing disadvantaged people of the world.

Those who have "taught" me include everyone I have ever came into contact with, and actually, proabably many whom I have not come into contact with. For this thesis, however, Tom Hood and Kip Zirkel are the two that filled my wee head with such concepts as "locus of control".

Those people that "helped" me are far too many to name individually but include everyone who lent me a book, (you know who you are, and yes, you'll get it back) those who showed me how to use the computer, the software package, and the printer, and those who let me use their office space and such. Such could be anything, right? Also included in this group are my three advisors, Kip, Jennifer, and Bob, who provided me with constructive, albeit contradictory at times, feedback. Working with three people was nowhere near as agonizing as many people had suggested it may be, but I'm sure this pleasant surprise was really a function of these special people.

Now the people that have simply "put up" with me are really the ones who deserve to be thanked the most. These people not only insipired me, taught me, helped me, and put up with me, but these are the people that actually held my hand and heart, ever so delicately, each day of this journey. This is the group of people that you'll find Jan, John, Jon, Brian, Maureen, Sarah, and of course, my bicycle.

For organizational purposes only, I have tried to place a number of people in distinct little catergories. The truth of the matter is that most of these people were in all of these categories, to some extent, some more so than others. The point is, without all of their support, and affection, this journey would have been much longer and not nearly so bearable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem	3
	Importance of the Study	4
	Related Literature	5
	Conclusion	11
	Definition of Terms	11
II.	METHOD	13
	Sample and Setting	13
	Research Design	14
	Instrumentation	18
	Procedure	22
	Data Analysis	24
	Delimitation	24
	Limitations	25
III.	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	26
	Results	26
	Conclusions	29
	Recommendations	31
IV.	SUMMARY	32
	REFERENCES	35
	APPENDICES	39

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	"Analyses of Variance for Pretest/Posttest Scores on the JF, SES, LOC, and IBT"	27
2.	"Pearson Correlations Between Final Evaluations and Posttest Scores	29

ABSTRACT

Gretchen E. Koehler: The Effects of a Job Training Partnership Act Program on "At-Risk" Youths' Level of Self Esteem, Locus of Control and Endorsement of Irrational Beliefs.

Fourteen youth from the ages of 16 to 21 years old who were enrolled in a JTPA troubled youth program, administered by Western Wisconsin Coulle Region Community Action Program in La Crosse, WI, were assessed on the Janis Field Feelings of Inadequacy Scale, the Self Esteem Scale, an Abbreviated 11-item Rotter I-E Scale, and the Irrational Beliefs Test, once prior to starting an 8 week work experience, and once again after completing the treatment. The work experience included an 8 hour job seeking skills workshop which emphasized resume' preparation, interviewing skills, and job search strategies.

Results obtained through a series of four, one-way analyses of variance indicated that there were no significant differences between any of the pre and posttest scores. In addition, participants' final evaluation of the program, using Pearson's correlation coefficients, were not significantly correlated with any of the posttest measures except the Irrational Beliefs Test.

Recommendations for future research based on this study included increasing the sample size, incorporating a control group into the design of the study, and utilizing instruments that have been designed for this population.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The issue of preparing our youth for productive employment has always been, and will continue to be, a major concern to our society. Unfortunately, youth unemployment continues to rise. In 1984, nearly 40% of the unemployed in our country, almost 3.5 million people, were under the age of 25. Nearly 1.5 million 10-to-24 year olds who were looking for work reported that they had no work experience; 1.5 million 10-to-24 year olds were not in the labor force, but said they would like to have worked. Teenagers constituted nearly 20% of the unemployed yet received less than three percent of all new jobs (The Roosevelt Centennial Youth Project, 1984).

Maria Jahoda, who has been studying the effects of unemployment for fifty years, made the following remarks on youth unemployment:

> The psychological situation of those sixteen to eighteen or nineteen year old people to whom the ordinary transitition to adulthood is thus denied presents perhaps the socially most dangerous aspect of the current depression. This is the age group on whose skills, motivation to work and general outlook on the world in which they live the future of the country will depend in the next decades. Many of them are without hope, without plans and without ambition and are gradually abandoning the habits and aspirations that family and school has tried to instill in them (Jahoda in Oddy, 1984, p. 378).

Although exact figures on the proportion of youth that are represented by "at-risk" groups are not readily available, all sources indicate that this group constitutes a large number. Furthermore, as we

approach the 1990's, the number of these youth will continue to rise (Consortium on Education for Employment, 1981).

For this study, "at-risk" refers to those youth who for one reason or another seem to be unable to succeed in the present system of education and employment. They are youth from poor families; youth who have poor academic records or drop out of the educational system altogether; those who are handicapped either mentally or physically, and those who are members of minority groups who experience discrimination. To compound matters, these youth often lack prior work experience, have a criminal record, lack proficiency in the English language, and have dependent children of their own. These youth exist in every community throughout the nation, although they tend to concentrate in our major cities (The Roosevelt Centennial Youth Project, 1984).

While national employment projections are difficult to make, one likely scenario suggests that greater competition for jobs combined with these youths' occupational deficiencies and other barriers to employment will continue to limit the absorption of these youth into the labor market. In other words, these at-risk youth are not likely to achieve a stable, rewarding, productive vocational future. Adult unemployment statistics show that employment problems continue to be concentrated among the groups that are being defined here as at-risk (The Carnegie Foundation, 1979).

Several hypotheses have been advanced to explain the youth employment crisis: a shifting world economy; changes in the labor market; an inadequate supply of jobs; a growing alienation among youth; and the failure of our educational system to keep pace with changing

needs (The Carnegie Foundation, 1979).

The federal government has responded, in part, with employment and training programs. The Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) of 1982, administered by the Department of Labor succeeded the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA). JTPA began operating on October 1, 1983 after a one year transition period. JTPA was developed to provide job training and other employment services, such as placement, to unskilled and economically disadvantaged individuals who need training to obtain employment.

JTPA is divided into five titles. Title I established the state and local service delivery system and addressess overall program and administrative issues. Title II provides training for economically disadvantaged adults and youth. This title is further divided into II-A for year-round services and II-B for a special summer youth program. Title III provides a program for dislocated workers, i.e., those who have lost their jobs because of plant closings or major work force reduction and are unlikely to return to their previous industry or occupation. Title IV is for federally administered activities, such as Job Corps and programs for Native Americans. Finally, Title V contains miscellaneous provisions related to other federal programs including state unemployment service agencies (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1985).

Statement of the Problem

Lefkowitz (1982) noted after interviewing 300 people including participating youth, program staff, and educators, in 17 different cities, over a three month period, that "few, if any of the hundreds of

youth training programs in the United Statest are prepared to respond to the underlying problems that prevent young people . . . from becoming and staying employed" (p.12). Even studies initiated by the federal Office of Youth Programs during the Carter Administration show that after youth complete a program, it is likely that these "at-risk" youth will return to the same grim existence they have always known (Lefkowitz, 1982).

One of the most serious flaws in current federal youth training policy is its failure to make anything other than cosmetic changes in the lives of these distressed youth. Emotional and attitudinal phenomena are not dealt with enough to make any significant or long term changes.

The major research questions for this study were: What effect did the 8 week work experience, and the job seeking skills workshop, have on the participants' level of self esteem, locus of control and endorsement of irrational beliefs; and would there be a connection between the differences realized from pretest to posttest scores and how favorably the participant would evaluate the troubled youth program?

Importance of the Study

According to Montross and Shrinkman (1981) career development is a lifelong developmental process which incorporates one's background, education, work and other experiences that influence his/her decisions regarding career and lifestyle.

One major difficulty faced by many of our youth, particulary at-risk youth, is that they lack the experience of work. Not only are they denied general information about occupations, but they also often lack

very basic work values and attitudes which are necessary to obtain and maintain permanent employment (Oinonen, 1984).

Super (1953) has outlined a career development theory in which a major component is the individual's self concept. Super views the process of career development and implementing one's self concepts in a series of life stages. Development through these life stages can be partly guided by the development of the self concept.

One aspect of self concept is one's self evaluation which has profound effects on other thinking processes, emotions, desires, values, and goals. Branden (1969) sees self esteem as the single most significant key to understanding behavior.

In short, self esteem is relevant to an effective employment and training program. Thus, adequate evaluations of such programs should pay attention to cognitive and attitudinal processes.

The results of this research may prove useful in the overall evaluation of this particular JTPA program, as well as for other employment and training programs. Those people who create employment and training program objectives, and the means by which these objectives are to be attained, may also find this information helpful. In addition, this research may provide insight for college student personnel workers involved with cooperative work experience programs.

Related literature

This study investigates the effects of a JTPA program on participants' level of self esteem, locus of control, and endorsement of irrational beliefs. This review of related literature will focus on the relationship between (1) self esteem; (2) locus of control; and (3)

endorsement of irrational beliefs, and well as (4) career/vocational development theory and (5) career guidance programs for troubled youth.

Self Esteem

The popularity of the psychological concept of self esteem is well known. Researchers exploring such diverse research topics as conformity, interpersonal attraction, cognitive dissonance, causal attribution, as well as many other topics, have all viewed self esteem as a central variable (Wells and Marwell, 1976). As Crandall suggested, self esteem "has been related to almost everything at one time or another" (1973, p. 45).

While most people agree that the concept of self esteem reflects some "sense of self", attempts to come up with a more rigorous definition have, so far, not gained a consensus of support within psychology. Wells and Marwell (1976, p.5) say that "self esteem is a deceptively slippery concept about which there is a good deal of confusion and disagreement". In addition, they note that one of the most frequently noted properties of the self esteem literature has been its rather indeterminant character. Reflecting this ambiguity, the concept of self esteem often appears under various other names such as self acceptance, self evaluation, self worth, or self regard.

Several researchers have tried to distinguish conceptually between self esteem, and self acceptance or self regard (Crandall, 1973), but as Wells and Marwell (1976) point out, when differences or similarities are found, it is usually difficult to determine whether they are describing similar or completely different phenomena.

The instruments used in this study were selected based on

Crandall's (1973) evaluation of the best currently available scales designed to measure self esteem. The Janis Field Feelings of Inadequacy Scale was originally designed to measure feelings of inadequacy relating to persuasibility, but is viewed as a very good measure of self esteem in other social contexts.

The other instrument utilized is this study is Rosenberg's Self Esteem Scale. This scale is a direct measure of global self worth or self acceptance.

Internal-External Locus of Control

Self esteem has been associated with other constructs. These constructs are not intended to be identical with self esteem, but rather are significantly related. One such construct is that of Rotter's internal-external locus of control. This refers to:

> The extent to which persons perceive contingency relationships between their actions and their outcomes. People who believe they have control over their destinies are called "Internals"; that is, they believe that at least some control resides withinin themselves. "Externals", on the other, hand, believe that their outcomes are determined by agents or factors extrinsic to themselves, for example, by fate, luck, chance, powerful others, or the unpredictable (MacDonald, 1973, p.169).

Fish and Karabenick (1971) did a study in which 285 males were administered both the Rotter I-E Scale and the Janis Field Feelings of Inadequacy Scale. The results supported the assumption that people with high self esteem have a greater potential for self reinforcement (internal locus of control). It should be noted, however, that prior to the Fish and Karabenick (1971) study, Platt, Eisenman and Darbes (1970) conducted a similar study in which they correlated the Ziller, et al,

Self Esteem Scale with Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale and found no significant correlations.

Interpreting these results, as well as others, (Crandall, 1973) it seems possible that although self esteem is conceptually related to locus of control, specific questionnaries may not reveal their similarities.

Irrational Beliefs

Another construct which has been found to be associated with self esteem is the structure of the individual's irrational belief system. The founder of rational-emotive therapy (RET), Albert Ellis, theorized that the primary determinant of emotional disturbance is an irrational belief system, which is comprised of any number of clearly articulated illogical beliefs.

Ellis (1962) has clearly explicated the relationship between an individual's belief system to his/her mental health. The belief system, conceptualized as a higher-order organization of various beliefs/attitudes which serves to enhance the individual's self esteem.

Like self esteem, irrational beliefs have been correlated with a variety of psychological distresses including depression (La Pointe and Crandell, 1980), anxiety (Himle, Thyer, and Papsdorf, 1982), and fear of public speaking (Lohr and Rea, 1981).

Daly and Burton (1983) found a significant negative correlation betweeen self esteem as measured by the Janis Field Feelings of Inadequacy Scale and irrational beliefs as measured by the Irrational Beliefs Test developed by Jones (1969). This finding suggests that self esteem is an underlying variable in Ellis' rational-emotive theory of

irrational beliefs. Specifically, there were four beliefs found to be useful in predicting low self esteem: demand for approval, high self expectations, anxious overconcern, and problem avoidance. The authors further contend that it is possible that these irrational beliefs are symptomatic of low self esteem and may be dispelled as the individual's feeling of personal worth is enhanced.

Whiteman and Shorkey (1978) found a significant correlation between self esteem as measured by Rosenberg's Self Esteem Scale and observed scores on the Rational Behavior Inventory. This study was designed to validate the RBI.

Theories of Career Development

Several theories of career development view one's self concept as laying the ground work for career development. In fact, one proposition of Super (1953) in his theory of vocational development is that vocational development can be enhanced by helping individuals mature in their abilities and interests and by helping them test reality and develop their self concept.

Another proposition of Super's is that the process of vocational development is largely that of development and implementing a self concept. That is:

> It is the compromise process in which the self concept is a product of the interaction of inherited aptitudes, neural and endocrine make-up, opportunity to play various roles, and evaluation of the extent to which the results of role playing meet with the approval of superiors and fellows (1953, p. 189-190).

Barrett and Tinsely (1977) found that individuals with poorly crystalized views of themselves or poorly organized self concepts have

more difficulty selecting vocational areas than those with better-organized and more positive self concepts, thus adding emphasis to the key role of self concept in career planning.

Tolbert (1980) views his theory of career development as a compendium of several different theories, and yet, sees the self concept as the major motivating force in career development.

The proposition that an individual's vocational development can be "guided" has been supported (Baker and Popowicz, 1983), but most of the research has not utilized special population groups, such as delinquent youth, as samples.

Evidence exists to support the proposition that there is a relationship between an individual's self concept and vocational development (Holland, 1981; Korman, 1966) and that an individual's self concept can be modified through career guidance (Bank, 1969). Here again, however, most of the studies did not use special population groups as samples.

Career Guidance for Troubled Youth

The only study the author found which used delinquent youth as subjects in a study to determine the effects of a career guidance program on career maturity and self concept was completed by Pavlak and Kammer (1985). In this study, the effectiveness of a career guidance program was evaluated using a 2 X 2 pretest-posttest control group design using race (black or white) and group (treatment or no treatment) as independent variables. The dependent variable measurement instruments were the Career Maturity Inventory Attitude Scale (Crites, 1978) and the Tennesse Self Concept Scale (Fitts, 1965). The results

from the multivariate analysis of variance on the posttest career maturity and self concept scores indicated no signficant differences between the career maturity levels of the subjects in the treatment and control groups or between the self concept levels of the treatment and control group.

Interestingly in regard to the present study, Pavlak and Kammer (1985) suggest that a guidance program which would incorporate a work experience program in addition to the classroom-type instructions on values, interests, skills and job seeking skills may be more effective with delinquent youth.

CONCLUSION

At-risk youth are a particularly vulnerable population whose career development needs have not been fully researched. There is clearly a strong link between an individual's self concept and his/her vocational career development. Research has also indicated that the concept of locus of control and irrational beliefs are closely related to self esteem. Research which investigates the effects of a career development program, particularly one which has a work experience component, has on at-risk youth's self concept, locus of control, and endorsement of irrational beliefs, however, is virtually nonexistent. This study is directed to this end.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, specific terms were defined as follows:

At-risk: those youth who met two of the following four

criteria: (1) high school drop out; (2) low academic achievement record; (3) potential to drop out of high school; and (4) juvenille offender status (See Appendix A).

In-school youth: those youth who were enrolled and meeting academic and attendance requirements in a high school, a GED program, or an adult basic education program.

Income eligible: meeting or falling below 70% of the lower living standard income level (See Appendix B).

Job seeking skills workshop: an eight hour workshop offered over a three day period which taught interviewing skills, resume' preparation, and job search strategies (See Chapter 2 for a full description).

Locus of control: a construct reflecting a generalized belief that a person'sdestiny is controlled primarily by internal versus external forces (Rotter, 1966).

Out-of school youth: those youth who were not enrolled in any educational institution at the time of enrollment into the troubled youth program.

Self esteem: the evaluation one makes and holds with regard to the self.

Troubled youth: synonomous with "at-risk" (See above).

Work experience: federally subsidized employment at a non-profit work site for eight weeks.

Youth: participants between the ages of 16 to 21.

Chapter II

METHOD

Sample and Setting

Western Wisconsin Coulee Region Community Action Program (CAP) is a private, non-profit corporation that was organized in 1966 with the mission of responding to the needs of low income persons in such a manner as to promote self-sufficiency. The main office is located in Westby, WI (Vernon County, population 25,872), and has sattelite offices serving Crawford County (population 16,695), La Crosse County (population 96,117), and Monroe County (population 36,351).

The sample used in this study consisted of 14 income-eligible youth who were enrolled in a La Crosse County Job Training Partnership Act-funded program at CAP. Participants were recruited through newspaper advertisements and referrals from group homes, social workers, probation officers, and high school guidance counselors.

Of the 14 participants, 8 (57%) were female, and 6 (42%) were male. Ten (71%) were receiving some kind of public financial assistance; 8 (57%) classified themselves as handicapped; 7 (50%) were high school drop outs; 13 (93%) were white; 1 (7%) was non-white; 11 (79%) were in-school; and 3 (21%) were out of school.

In terms of age, 4 (29%) were 16 years old; 5 (36%) were 17 years old; 2 (14%) were 18 years old; 1 (7%) was 19 years old; 1 (7%) was 20 years old; and 1 (7%) was 21 years old.

Research Design

Research Variables

The independent variable for this study was an 8 week work experience coupled with a job seeking skills workshop (JSSW).

The dependent variables for this study were the participants' (1) level of self esteem as measured by the Janis Field Feelings of Inadequacy Scale (JF) (Eagly, 1967) and the Self Esteem Scale (SES) (Rosenberg, 1965); (2) locus of control as measured by an Abbreviated 11-item Rotter I-E Scale (LOC) (Valecha, 1972); (3) endorsement of irrational beliefs as measured by the Irrational Beliefs Test (Jones, 1968); and (4) overall evaluation of the troubled youth program as measured by their responses to a questionnaire developed by the researcher.

Design

This study is a one-group pretest-posttest experimental design identifying the differences in participants' level of self esteem, locus of control and endorsement of irrational beliefs before and after completing an 8 week work experience and job seeking skills workshop.

Participants began the 8 week work experience between February 7, 1986 and May 5, 1986 and all participants had completed the 8 week work experience or dropped out of the program by June 25, 1986.

The specific location where the participant completed his/her work experience depended on their career interests, as well as the availability of their preferred worksite. Worksites included the La Crosse County Printing Office; the La Crosse County Treasurer's Office;

Lutheran Hospital; the Navy Recruiting Office; The Womens, Infants and Childrens Program Office; the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse, the Boy Scouts, Emmerson Elementary School, the Salvation Army, The Town of Campbell, and the YM/WCA.

Participants completed all assessment instruments for the initial observation approximately one week prior to beginning their work experience and for the second time within one week of completing their work experience. All participants completed the initial assessments in the researcher's office. The post treatment assessment instruments were all completed at the participant's residence and then collected by the researcher.

The Job Seeking Skills Workshop (JSSW) was conducted over a three day period (March 20, 23, and 25, 1986) for a total of 8 hours.

Threats to Internal Validity

The following threats to internal validity for this study were possible: history, maturation, and testing effects. Other threats to internal validity that were not applicable to this study include mortality, instrumentation, statistical regression, selection-maturation interaction, and differential selection of subjects.

History is defined as any event which is not included in the experimented treatment which may affect scores on the dependent variable (Gay, 1981). In this experiment, history becomes a rival explanation of change simply due to the length of time between the pre and post test measurements. Of the 14 participants used in this study, 7 (50%) resided in residential group homes. According to Assistant Director of the Coulee Youth Center, the atmosphere group home workers try to create

is one which strives to enhance the youth's level of self esteem and endorsement of personal responsibility: Thus, differences observed between pre and post assessments on self esteem and locus of control may be attributable to the participants living structure as opposed to the troubled youth employment and training program.

Another possible threat to the internal validity of this study is maturation. Maturation, as defined by Campbell and Stanley (1971), refer to any biological or psychological changes that may occur within the subject over a period of research. In other words, any difference observed may simply be a result of the participant's internal state independent of specific external events.

A third threat to the internal validity of this study is the effect of testing. The possibility exists that simply taking a pretest may have effected performance on the posttest regardless of whether or not the independent variable was administered. Considering the length of time between the pre and post test measures, however, it is likely that the testing effect was not a threat to validity.

Threats to External Validity

Threats to external validity are those phenomena that may occur which would make generalizations to nonexperimental populations questionable (Gay, 1981).

The following threats to external validity will be addressed: pretest treatment interaction, selection-treatment interaction, specificity of variable, and contamination and experimenter bias.

According to Gay :

Pretest-treatment interaction occurs when subjects

> respond or react differently to a treatment because they have been pretested. A pretest may sensitize or alert subjects to the nature of the treatment. The treatment effect may be different than it would have been had subjects not been pretested (1981, p. 216).

This study involved measuring participants attitudes, which are especially susceptible to this pretest-treatment interaction, but the amount of time elapsed between pretest and posttest measures dilutes the potency of this threat to external validity.

Since the participants used in this study were not randomly selected from a population, the possibility exists that the experimental group is different, perhaps in some important way, from the larger population, and hence, the ability to generalize to other populations is threatened. This threat is termed selection-treatment interaction (Gay, 1981, Chapter 10).

Another threat to external validity in this study was the specificity of variables. This term refers to the fact that every research study uses a specific type of subjects, measuring instruments, at a specific time, with specific circumstances which per se limit generalizability.

The final threat to external validity in this study was contamination and experimenter bias. Because the researcher spent a good deal of time with the participants on an individual basis, the possibility exists that the researcher may have not been consistent in the quantity or quality of time spent with each individual. This inconsistency may, in turn, have influenced the participants' post assessments.

Instrumentation

Five assessment instruments were used in this study (Appendices C-G).

Janis Field Feelings of Inadequacy Scale

The Janis-Field Feelings of Inadequacy Scale (JF) developed by Eagly (1967) is a revision of a scale that was orignially designed to measure feelings of inadequacy in persuasibility research (Crandall, 1973).

The revised version that was used for this study contains 20 items, answered on a five-point Likert scale and is balanced for response bias. The form is self-administered and takes approximately 10 minutes to complete. The range of raw scores for this instrument is from 20 to 100, although the range of scores using means, which were used for this study, range from 1 to 5 with the lower scores reflecting higher levels of self esteem.

Reliability ratings using the split-half method revealed reliabilities of .72 (Eagly, 1967) and .88 (Eagly, 1969) using two samples. A correlation of .54 was obtained between the positive and negative halves (Eagly, 1967).

Self esteem as measured by the JF refers to the global, subjective evaluation an individual makes and usually holds with regard to his/herself. It expresses an attitude of approval or disapproval and indicates to what extent the individual perceives him/herself to be capable, significant, successful and worthy. Low self esteem is characterized by negative self evaluation, and is accompanied by feeling of incompetence, insignificance, and inadequacy (Daly and Burton, 1983).

In terms of convergent validity, the orignal Janis-Field version

correlated .67 with CPI (California Psychological Inventory) self esteem scale, and .60 with self rating of esteem, and was correlated negatively with test anxiety (Crandall, 1973). No convergent validity data are available for the revised form.

For discriminant validity, low correlations with self ratings of dominance and openmindedness were found (Crandall, 1973). Studies investigating the predictive validity for this scale have been ambigious, however, correlations of .24 and .27 with peer ratings of self esteem and dominance were found by Hamilton (1971).

Self Esteem Scale

The second self esteem scale used in this study was the Self Esteem Scale (SES) (Rosenber, 1965). This scale was orginally developed to be used with high school students although it has since been used with adult samples (Crandall, 1973). According to Crandall (1973) this scale probably measures the self acceptance aspect of self esteem best since all of the items revolve around liking and or approving of the self.

This scale contains 10 items which are answered on a four point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree, although they are scored only as agreement or disagreement. One point is given for each high self esteem response and no points are given for low self esteem responses. Using this scoring method, a range betwen one and 10 is yielded. The higher scores represent higher levels of self esteem.

For reliability, Tippett and Silber (1965) found a test-retest correlation of .85 over a period of two weeks. Tippett and Silber (1965) also report correlation from .56 to .83 with several measures and clinical assessments for convergent validity. Rosenberg (1965) reports

considerable construct validity for this measure.

Abbreviated 11-Item Rotter I-E Scale

The third instrument used in this study was the Abbreviated 11-Item Rotter I-E Scale (LOC) (Valecha, 1972). This scale consists of 11 items from Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale (Rotter, 1966) that were regarded as being more general, adult-oriented, and work related (Crandall, 1973). According to Rotter (1966), the construct of locus of control reflects a person's perception of contingency relationships between one's own behavior and the events which follow that behavior. This instrument was designed to measure a person's locus of control based on this definition of locus of control.

Each item on the instrument requires a forced choice between an internal and external statement. After selecting the statement that is closer to the individual's own opinion, the respondent then marks whether that choice is either "much closer" or "slightly closer" to their own opinion. This format allows for the measurement of intensity of the feelings. The range of possible scores using this format is from 11 to 44. Lower scores reflect more of an internal locus of control.

No reliability data has been reported on this abbreviated scale. The minimal amount of validity data that has been reported has been based soley on males.

Irrational Beliefs Test

The fourth instrument used in this study is the Irrational Beliefs Test (IBT) (Jones, 1969). Jones extracted 10 factors which he found,

through factor analysis, that assess the degree to which an individual endorses each of Ellis' (1969) "core irrational beliefs".

The scale consists of 100 items with 10 items chosen to represent each of the following irrational beliefs: Demand for Approval, High Self Expectations, Blame Proneness, Frustration Reactivity, Emotional Irresponsibility, Anxious Overconcern, Problem Avoidance, Dependency, Helplessness, and Perfectionism.

Each item is phrased in a generalized belief statment format with a 5 point Likert scale used to denote the individual's degree of agreement. Scores range from 0-500 and are reported in stanines. Data regarding reliability and validity were not available.

Program Evaluation

The final instrument used in this study was an overall evaluation of the (JTPA) troubled youth program that was developed by the researcher. This evaluation consisted of 14 items of which 11 were phrased in a generalized belief format. Participants rated their level of agreement for each of the 11 statements on a 5 point Likert Scale. Items 6 through 11, which assessed participant's perception of helpfullness of the job seeking skills workshop (JSSW), was not included in the total or mean scores of these evaluation as not all participants attended the JSSW. The range of means for this instrument, based on the seven remaining items, was between 1.00 to 5.00. Lower scores reflect greater agreement with the items.

The final three items on the evaluation were open-ended questions regarding the most helpful and least helpful parts of the program, as well as opportunities for additional comments about the program.

Procedure

To be participants in this JTPA funded troubled youth program, individuals needed to be both income eligible (Appendix B), and considered "at-risk" (Appendix A). In addition, preference for entering this program was given to women, minorities, persons with handicaps, high school dropouts and those receiving public assistance, and or Aid to Famililies with Dependent Children (AFDC). Participants for this study were recruited through newspaper advertisements and referrals from group homes, social workers, probation officers, and high school counselors.

Once a youth had met both criteria for eligibility, the researcher interviewed the participant to detemine his/her career interests and abilities, and then contacted an appropriate non-profit worksite supervisor to arrange for the work experience.

Worksite supervisors were told that CAP would pay for the youths' wages ($3.35 per hour), but the youth were really employees and should be treated as such. Constructive feedback given to the youth regarding job performance was highly encouraged.

Those youth who were in-school were allowed to work no more than 10 hours a week. Those who were considered out of school were allowed to work no more than 24 hours per week. In addition, those out of school youth were required to attend some form of classroom training that would be arranged with the researcher and paid for by JTPA funds. The entire work experience for both groups, in school and out of school, could last no longer than 8 weeks.

Approximately a week and a half before the JSSW was held,

participants and participating employers received a letter notifiying them of the workshop (Appendices I and J). In addition to the letter, participating youth received a personal data sheet (Appendix K) that was to be filled out by the time of the first session.

The first session of the JSSW began with participants receiving a folder of handouts (Appendix L). Following the distribution of the JSSW folders, participants were lectured by the researcher on application blanks, letters of application, and resume' writing. Participants then created their own resume' and watched a film entitled "Your Image: Make It Work For You" (Barr Films, 1983). This film made clear how one's image is a combined total of one's appearance and behaviors, and how an individual can create and maintain the image he/she wants to have.

The second session of the workshop was completely devoted to interviewing skills. Participants were lectured on the importance of grooming skills, potential interview questions they could be asked, and question that they, in turn, could ask an employer. Mock interviews were then conducted. The second session concluded with a film titled, "Job Interview: Whom Would You Hire: A Small Business" (Churchill Films, 1980). The film showed actual interviews of four potential employees and stimulated discussion among film watchers as to whom they would hire.

The third and final session of the JSSW addressed different job search strategies and concluded with a video tape title "Kirby Stanek's Job Seeking Tips". This video included tips on the entire job search process.

With approximately one week left in each participant's work

experience, participants were asked to complete the Janis Field Feelings of Inadequacy Scale, the Self Esteem Scale, the Abbreviated 11-item Rotter I-E Scale and the Irrational Beliefs Test and a final program evaluation (Appendix G). A brief letter of introduction accompannied the final evaluation form (Appendix H).

Within one week of completing their work experience all participants returned the post assessment either in person, or they used the self addressed, stamped envelope that was enclosed with the assessment materials.

Data Analysis

Responses to all pre and post assessments were tabulated. Mean scores were used for the Janis Field Feelings of Inadequacy Scale, the Self Esteem Scale, and the final evaluation. Mean stanine scores were used for the Irrational Beliefs Test, and total raw scores were used for the Abbreviated 11-item Rotter I-E Scale.

A one-way, analysis of variance was used to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference between pre and post test scores on the Janis Field Feelings of Inadequacy Scale, the Self Esteem Scale, and Abbreviated 11-item Rotter I-E Scale, and the Irrational Beliefs Test. Analysis using multiple t-tests was not utilized due to the increased likihood of committing a Type I error.

Pearson correlation coefficients were also calculated between all dependent variables and the final evaluation.

Delimitations

The following delimitations were designed into the study:

1. The subjects consisted only of those youth who met both the income eligibility and "at-risk" criteria checklist. As such, generalization to youth served by different eligibility standards may not be valid.

2. Participants chose to be in this troubled youth program. It is possible that these subjects do not represent "at-risk" groups in the population.

Limitations

1. The assessment instruments used in this study were not specifically developed for "at-risk" youth, and therefore, may not be valid for this sample.

2. The extremely low number of subjects used in this study reduces the generalizability of the results.

3. Not all participants completed the entire 8 week work experience. It is possible that those youth who did not complete the full 8 week work experience may have had different post assessment scores had they completed the work experience.

Chapter III

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter contains the results of all pre and posttest measurements, discussions of the results, and recommendation for future employment and training programs for troubled youth.

Results

The primary purpose of this study was to determine whether there was a significant difference between participants' pretest scores on the Janis Field Feelings of Inadequacy Scale, the Self Esteem Scale, the Abbreviated 11-item Rotter I-E Scale, and the Irrational Beliefs Test, and their posttest scores on the same tests after completing an 8 week work experience program and job seeking skills workshop. Second, this study sought to determine whether there was a significant correlation between the participant's final evaluation of the troubled youth program and the difference between their pre and posttest scores on the Janis Field Feelings of Inadequacy Scale, the Self Esteem Scale, the Abbreviated 11-item Rotter I-E Scale, and the Irrational Beliefs Test.

In order to determine what, if any, significant differences occurred between pre and posttest scores on the dependent variables, a series of one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) was administered. A total of four separate ANOVA's were completed. Due to one profile not being included because it was completed in an invalid manner, only 13 of the 14 participant's sets of scores were used in all analyses.

The first ANOVA examined whether there was any significant difference between the means of the pre JF scores and the post JF scores. Results of the first ANOVA are shown in Table 1. The F-value shows that there was not a significant difference (at the .05 level) between the group means on the pre and posttest scores.

TABLE 1

ANALYSES OF VARIANCE FOR PRETEST/POSTTEST SCORES ON THE JF, SES, LOC, and IBT

MEASUREMENT	SS	df	MS	F	p
JF	268	12	268	2.12	.17
SES	1632	12	1632	.27	.61
LOC	12628	12	12628	.38	.55
IBT	809	12	809	.58	.46

The second ANOVA examined whether there was any significant difference between the means of the pre SES scores and the post SES scores. Results of the second anova are also shown in Table 1. The F-value shows that there was not a significant difference (at the .05 level) between the group means on the pre and post test scores.

The third ANOVA examined whether there was any significant difference between the means of the pre LOC scores and the post LOC

scores. (See Table 1). The F-value shows that there was not a significant difference (at the .05 level) between the group means on the pre and posttest scores.

The fourth, and final ANOVA examined whether there was any significant difference between the means of the pre IBT scores and the post IBT scores. (See Table 1). The F-value shows that there was not a significant difference (at the .05 level) between the group means on the pre and posttest scores.

Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated between the participants' final evaluation of the troubled youth program and posttest scores on the JF, SES, LOC, and IBT. Results of the Pearson correlations are shown in Table 2. The p-values indicate that the only variable which was significantly correlated, at the .05 level, with how the participants evaluated the program was the IBT. The r-value between the IBT and the final evaluation was .54 (with a p-value of .03); as the participants' endorsement of irrational beliefs decreased, there was a corresponding increase in how favorably the participants evaluated the program.

TABLE 2

PEARSON CORRELATIONS BETWEEN
FINAL EVALUATION AND POSTTEST SCORES

TEST	FINAL PROGRAM EVALUATION	
	r	p
JF	.25	.20
SES	.47	.05
LOC	.40	.30
IBT	.54*	.03*

*significant at the .05 level

Discussion

Conclusions

The results of this study indicate that there were no significant differences between participant's pretest scores on any of the dependent variables and their posttest scores on those same measurements. There were individual participants that showed positive gains in the post measurement scores, but there were also those that showed decreases in their post measurement scores, resulting in the differences being cancelled out.

Because these youth were considered "at-risk", it should be noted that employment/training is only one of many issues facing these youth that may have had an effect on their levels of self esteem, locus of control and endorsement of irrational beliefs. In addition, at least

two other possible explanations may account for the lack of significant findings in this study. The first explanation is that eight weeks may simply be too short of a time period for changes in self esteem, locus of control, and endorsement of irrational beliefs to be evidenced. Secondly, and perhaps more fundamentally, the troubled youth program at CAP was not specifically designed to address the phenomena being assessed in this study.

On the whole, increases or decreases in participants' scores on the dependent variables could not be predicted from the participants' final evaluation of the troubled youth program. One ironical exception to this general finding was that the participants' scores on the pre IBT, which were higher than the post IBT scores, (although not significantly) or more "irrational", were correlated most highly with a positive final program evaluation. It is diffiuclt to discover a valid explanation for this finding.

One final finding was that participants who completed the full 8 week work experience and attended the job seeking skills workshop evaluated the program more favorably than did those participants that did not complete both the work experience and the job seeking skills workshop. The numbers of participants, however, that did not attend the job seeking skills workshop was only four; and the number that did not complete the work experience was only two, so it would be difficult to place undue emphasis on this result.

Recommendations

Participants were asked to identify changes that they would make in the troubled youth program. Participant responses were:

-Be able to work more hours
-Distribute the hours worked over more days
-Give every participant equal amounts of attention
-Don't force participants to attend school

From data collected and analyzed, the researcher's recommendations are:

1. Future research assessing "at-risk" youth should use measurements designed for this population.

2. Future research using a large sample is strongly recommended.

3. Future research in this area should incorporate a control group into the design of the study to help control for external threats to validity.

Chapter IV

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to determine whether an 8 week work experience program and job seeking skills workshop had a significant effect of participants' level of self esteem, locus of control, and endorsement of irrational beliefs. In addition, this study sought to determine whether there was a correlation between how favorably the participants evaluated the program on the whole, and posttest scores on the Janis Field Feelings of Inadequacy Scale, the Self Esteem Scale, an Abbreviated 11-item Rotter I-E Scale, and the Irrational Beliefs Test.

The sample consisted of 14 "at-risk" youth who were enrolled in a JTPA funded, troubled youth program administered by Western Wisconsin Coulee Region Community Action Program. All subjects completed pretests on the following measures: the Janis Field Feelings of Inadequacy Scale, the Self Esteem Scale, an Abbreviated 11-item I-E Scale, and the Irrational Beliefs Test. Within one week of completing these initial assessments, subjects began an 8 week work experience program which included a 3 day, 8-hour, job seeking skills workshop. Within one week of completing the work experience, all subjects completed posttests on the same instruments as well as a final troubled youth program evaluation.

Results using a one-way analysis of variance indicated that there were no significant differences between pre and posttest scores on any of the dependent variables. Correlation analysis revealed only one

significant correlation which was between the participants' final evaluation of the troubled youth program and posttest scores on the Irrational Beliefs Test.

The author's major recommendations were for more research to be done using a larger sample size as well as a no-treatment control group to control for threats to external validity. Another recommendation was made for future research assessing "at-risk" youth to use instruments that have been designed specifically for that population.

On a more subjective level, the author recommends that the criteria for being considered "at-risk" be expanded. Ideally, this expansion would include those youth who suffer from a variety of other distresses other than just failing or faltering academics and juvenile offender status.

In addition, the author, based on her review of the literature and personal experience, recommends that future employment and training programs for "at-risk" youth continue to be funded; the large number of youth who are truely "at-risk" is far too great to ignore. Certainly without the continued funding of these programs, our "at-risk" youth are destined to become "at-risk" adults. Future programs, however, may wish to increase the amount of staff time involved in working with these youth and increase the length of the entire program as well. Most research seems to bear out the fact that the longer the programs are, the more likely the youth will experience significant and long term benefits.

Finally, because these "at-risk" youth often face many other serious problems besides employment and training, a more comprehensive

program which would involve, but not be limited to, basic and remedial education, psychological and social counseling, family intervention, basic life skills development, attitudinal preparation for employment, and counseling and support once a job is found, is highly recommended.

REFERENCES

Amster, J. & Lazarus, P. (1982). Locus of control of disadvantaged high school dropouts: Preliminary data. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 55, 1332-1334.

Baker, S. B. & Popowicz, C. L. (1983). Meta-analysis as a strategy for evaluating effects of career education interventions. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 3, 178-186.

Bank, I. M. (1960). Children explore careerland through vocational role models. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 17, 184-189.

Barr Films. (1983). Your image: Make it work for you. Pasadena, CA.

Barrett, T, & Tinsley, H. (1977). Measuring vocational self-concept crystallization. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 11, 305-313.

Branden, N. (1969). The psychology of self esteem. Los Angeles, CA: Nash Publishing Corporation.

Campbell, D. T. & Stanley, J. C. (1963). Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

The Carnegie Foundation (1979). Giving youth a better chance: Options for education, work and service. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Cellini, J. & Kantorowski, L. (1984). Locus of control and career decidedness: Some metholodological notes. Psychological Reports, 55, 614.

Chassin, L. & Stager, S. (1984). Determinants of self esteem among incarcerated delinquents. Social Psychology Quarterly, 17, 382-390.

Churchill Films. (1980). Job interview: Whom would you hire? Los Angeles, CA.

College Entrance Examination Board. (1963). Career development: Self-concept theory. Princeton, NJ: Author.

Consortium on Education for Employment. (1981). Education, training, and youth: An overview. (Contract No. 99-0-2189-33-23). Washington, DC.

Crandall, R. (1973). The measurement of self esteem and related constructs. In J. Robinson & P. Shaver (Eds.), Measures of social psychological attitudes. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.

Crites, J.O. (1978). Aministration and use manual CMI. Monterey, CA: McGraw-Hill.

Daly, M. & Burton, R. (1983). Self esteem and irrational beliefs: An exploratory investigation with implications for counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30, 361-366.

Donovan, A. & Oddy, M. (1982). Psychological aspects of unemployment: An investigation into the emotional and social adjustment of school leavers. Journal of Adolescence, 5, 15-30.

Eagly, A. H. (1967). Involvement as a determinant of response to favorable and unfavorable information. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 7, 1-15.

Eagly, A.H. (1969). Sex differences in the relationship between self esteem and susceptibility to social influence. Journal of Personality, 37, 581-591.

Ellis, A. (1962). Reason and emotion in psychotherapy. New York: Lyle Stuart.

Ellis, J. & Taylor, M. (1983). Role of self esteem within the job search process. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68, 632-640.

Fischer, B. & Bersani, C. (1979). Self esteem and institutionalized delinquent offenders: The role of background characteristics. Adolescence, 14, 197-214.

Fish, B. & Karabenick, S. (1971). Relationship between self esteem and locus of control. Psychological Reports, 29, 784.

Fitts, W. H. (1965). Tennessee Self Concept Scale Manual. Nashville, TN: Counselor Recordings and Tests.

Franklin, B. (1977). Career education and self concept: A median perspective. Teachers College Record, 78, 285-297.

Furnham, A. (1985). Youth unemployment: A review of the literature. Journal of Adolescence, 8, 109-124.

Gay, L. R. (1981). Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications. Columbus, OH: Bell and Howell Co.

General Accounting Office. (1985). Job Training Partnership Act: Initial implementation of program for disadvantaged youth and

adults. (GAO-HRD-85-4). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Goodwin, L. (1980). Poor youth and employment: A social psychological perspective. Youth and Society, 11, 311-351.

Greene, J. (1981). Apply the lessons of the research: The need for mandated training in federal youth employment programs. Education and Urban Society, 14, 55-56.

Himle, D. P.; Thyer B. A., & Papsdorf, J.D. (1982). Relationships between rational beleifs and anxiety. Cognitive Therapy and Research, 6, 219-224.

Holland, M. (1981). Relationships between vocational development and self concept in sixth-grade students. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 18, 228-236.

Hovland, C. & Janis, I. (Eds.). (1959). Personality and Persuasibility. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Jones, R. G. (1969). A factored measure of Ellis' irrational belief system, with personality and maladjustment correlates. Dissertation Abstracts International, 29, 4379-4380.

Korman, A. D. (1966). Self esteem as a moderator of the relationship between self perceived abilities and vocational choice. Journal of Applied Psychology, 51, 66-67.

La Pointe, K. & Crandell, C. (1980). Relationship of irrational beliefs to self reported depression. Cognitive Therapy and Research, 4, 247-250.

Lefcourt, H. (1966). Internal versus external control of reinforcement: A review. Psychological Bulletin, 4, 206-220.

Lefkowitz, B. (1982). Training the troubled ones. Psychology Today, 9, 12-15.

Lohr, J. & Rea, R. (1981). A disconfirmation of the relationship between fear of public speaking and irrational beliefs. Psychological Reports, 48, 795-798.

McCarthy, J. & Hoge, D. (1984). The dynamics of self esteem and delinquency. American Journal of Sociology, 90, 396-410.

Montross, D. & Shrinkman, C. (1981). Career development in the 1980's. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Murphy, D. & Pavasarat, J. (1980). Teenage undereducation and unemployment: What approaches work? (Research paper #1). University

of Wisconsin System Employment and Training Institute.

Oddy, M.; Donovan, A., & Pardoe, R. (1984). Do government training schemes for unemployed school leavers achieve their objectives? A psychological perspective. Journal of Adolescence, 5, 377-385.

Oinonen, C. M. (1984). Business and education survey: Employer and employee perceptions of school to work preparation Bulletin No. 4372. Washington,DC: Parker Project.

Pavlak, M. & Kammer, P. (1985). The effects of a career guidance program on the career maturity and self concept of delinquent youth. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 26, 41-54.

Platt, J.; Eisenman, R. & Darbes, A. (1970). Self esteem and internal-external locus of control: A validation study. Psychological Reports, 26, 162.

The Roosevelt Centenial Youth Project. (1984). A policy blueprint for community service and youth employment. Washington, DC: Author.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). Society and the adolescent self image. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 80, (one whole, No. 609).

Super, D. (1953). A theory of vocational development. The American Psychologist, 8, 189-190.

Super, D. (1957). The psychology of careers. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Tippett, J. & Silber, E. (1985). Self image stability: The problem of validation. Psychological Reports, 17, 323-329.

Tolbert, E. L. (1980). Counseling for career development. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Valecha, G. K. (1972). Construct validation of internal-external locus of control as measured by an abbreviated 11-item I-E scale. Unpublished doctoral disseratation, Ohio State University.

Wells, L. E. & Marwell, G. (1976). Self esteem: Its conceptualization and measurement. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publication.

Whiteman, V. L. & Shorkety, C.T. (1978). Validation testing of the Rational Behavior Inventory. Educational and Psychological measurement, 38, 1143-1149.

APPENDIX A

AT RISK CRITERIA CHECK-LIST

Name:_____

Age:_____

The following criteria determines if a youth is " at risk". Two of the following must be checked yes to be eligible.

_____ 1. Have low academic achievement.

_____ 2. Have Juvenile offender status.

_____ 3. Have the potential to become a high school drop out.

_____ 4. Have dropped out of school.

_____

Counselor/Probation Officer Date

APPENDIX B

FOR DETERMINING ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED INDIVIDUALS
Effective February 11, 1986
Issued April 9, 1986

NUMBER IN FAMILY (INCLUDING APPLICANT)	POVERTY GUIDELINES	70% OF THE LOWER LIVING STANDARD INCOME LEVEL (LLSIL)*		
		A. Non-Metro	B. Metro	C. Mil. SMSA
1	$ 5,360	$ 4,280	$ 4,370	$ 4,430
2	7,240	7,010	7,160	7,260
3	9,120	9,620	9,830	9,970
4	11,000	11,880	12,130	12,310
5	12,880	14,020	14,310	14,530
6	14,760	16,390	16,740	16,990
7	16,640	18,760	19,170	19,450
8	18,520	21,130	21,600	21,910
9	20,400	23,500	24,030	24,370
10	22,280	25,870	26,460	26,830
11	24,160	28,240	28,890	29,290
12	26,040	30,610	31,320	31,750
For each additional family member, add	$ 1,880	$ 2,370	$ 2,430	$ 2,460

*The LLSIL may vary according to location in the state.

COLUMN A is for all of the non-metropolitan areas of the state.

COLUMN B is for all of the metropolitan areas of the state, (except the Milwaukee Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area) including Douglas, Chippewa, Eau Claire, Marathon, La Crosse, Brown, Sheboygan, Outagamie, Winnebago, Calumet, Rock, Dane, Racine and Kenosha Counties.

COLUMN C is for the Milwaukee Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area which includes Ozaukee, Washington, Waukesha and Milwaukee Counties.

Please notice that for some SDA's with both metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas, you will have to use one of two columns, depending on whether the applicant lives in a metropolitan or non-metropolitan area, unless the PIC has chosen to use only one, in which case, you must use the lower (non-metro) column. (See map on back of this page.)

APPENDIX C

Using the scale provided, put the number that best answers that question for you.

1. Very often OR Much	2. Fairly often OR Much	3. Sometimes OR Average	4. Once in a great while OR Not much	5. Practically never OR Very little

____ a. How often do you have the feeling that there is nothing you can do well?

____ b. How often are you afraid or worried when you have to talk in front of a class or group of people your own age?

____ c. How often do you worry about whether other people like to be with you?

____ d. How often do you feel self-conscious?

____ e. How often are you troubled with shyness?

____ f. How often do you feel inferior to most of the people you know?

____ g. How often do you ever think that you are a worthless person?

____ h. How much do you worry about how well you get along with other people?

____ i. How often do you feel that you dislike yourself?

____ j. How often do you feel so discouraged with yourself that you wonder whether anything is worthwhile?

____ k. How often do you feel that you have handled yourself well at a social gathering?

____ l. How often do you have the feeling that you can do everything well?

____ m. How often are you pleased with your performance when you talk in front of a class or group of people your own age?

____ n. How often are you comfortable with starting a conversation with someone you don't know?

____ o. How often do you feel that you are a successful person?

____ p. How confident are you that your success in your future job or career is assured?

____ q. When you speak in a group discussion, how sure of yourself do you feel?

____ r. How sure of yourself do you feel when among strangers?

____ s. How confident do you feel that some day the people you know will look up to you and respect you?

____ t. In general, how confident do you feel about your abilities?

APPENDIX D

Using the scale provided, put the number in the blank that best shows how you feel about that statement.

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree 4. Strongly disagree

_____ a. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others.

_____ b. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.

_____ c. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.

_____ d. I am able to do things as well as most other people.

_____ e. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.

_____ f. I take a positive attitude toward myself.

_____ g. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.

_____ h. I wish I could have more respect for myself.

_____ i. I certainly feel useless at times.

_____ j. At times I think I am no good at all.

APPENDIX E

After each set of statements put the letter that is closer to your opinion AND THEN check whether the letter you put down is either much closer or slightly closer to your opinion.

EXAMPLE: a. There are certain people who are just no good.
b. There is some good in everybody.

__b__ Statement closer to my opinion
__x__ Much closer
____ Slightly closer

1. a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.
b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he/she tries.

____ Statement closer to my opinion
____ Much closer
____ Slightly closer

2. a. The idea that eachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
b. Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.

____ Statement closer to my opinion
____ Much closer
____ Slightly closer

3. a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.

____ Statement closer to my opinion
____ Much closer
____ Slightly closer

4. a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.

____ Statement closer to my opinion
____ Much closer
____ Slightly closer

5.a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
b. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.

____ Statement closer to my opinion
____ Much closer
____ Slightly closer

6.a. In my case, getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.

____ Statement closer to my opinion
____ Much closer
____ Slightly closer

7.a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.

____ Statement closer to my opinion
____ Much closer
____ Slightly closer

8.a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
b. There really isn't such a thing as "luck".

____ Statement closer to my opinion
____ Much closer
____ Slightly closer

9.a. In the long run, the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.

____ Statement closer to my opinion
____ Much closer
____ Slightly closer

10. a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.

____ Statement closer to my opinion
____ Much closer
____ Slightly closer

11.a. What happens to me is my own doing.
b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.

____ Statement closer to my opinion
____ Much closer
____ Slightly closer

APPENDIX F

FORM B

I B T

INSTRUCTIONS

This is an inventory of the way you believe and feel about various things. There are a number of statements with which you will tend to agree or disagree. You will be given an answer sheet with spaces to circle one of five possible answers to each item. For each statement, you should mark your answer sheet as follows, according to your own reaction to the item:

circle D if you STRONGLY DISAGREE
circle d if you MODERATELY DISAGREE
circle n if you NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE
circle a if you MODERATELY AGREE
circle A if you STRONGLY AGREE

It is not necessary tc think over any item very long. Mark your answer quickly and go on to the next statement.

Be sure to mark how you actually feel about the statement, not how you think you should feel.

Try to avoid the neutral or "n" response as much as possible. Select this answer only if you really cannot decide whether you tend to agree or disagree with a statement.

Before you start, be sure to print your name, sex, and age at the top of the answer sheet where indicated. In the space for "grade", place the number of the highest school grade completed. If you have had college, one year would be 13, four years would be 16, etc.

1. It is important to me that others approve of me.
2. I hate to fail at anything.
3. People who do wrong deserve what they get.
4. I usually accept what happens philosophically.
5. If a person wants to, he can be happy under almost any circumstances.
6. I have a fear of some things that often bothers me.
7. I usually put off important decisions.
8. Everyone needs someone he can depend on for help and advice.
9. "A zebra cannot change his stripes".
10. There is a right way to do everything.

11. I like the respect of others, but I don't have to have it.
12. I avoid things I cannot do well.
13. Too many evil persons escape the punishment they deserve.
14. Frustrations don't upset me.
15. People are disturbed not by situations but by the view they take of them.
16. I feel little anxiety over unexpected dangers or future events.
17. I try to go ahead and get irksome tasks behind me when they come up.
18. I try to consult an authority on important decisions.
19. It is almost impossible to overcome the influences of the past.
20. There is no perfect solution to anything.

21. I want everyone to like me.
22. I don't mind competing in activities where others are better than I.
23. Those who do wrong deserve to be blamed.
24. Things should be different from the way they are.
25. I cause my own moods.
26. I often can't get my mind off some concern.
27. I avoid facing my problems.
28. People need a source of strength outside themselves.
29. Just because something once strongly affects your life doesn't mean it need do so in the future.
30. There is seldom an easy way out of life's difficulties.

31. I can like myself even when many others don't.
32. I like to succeed at something but I don't feel I have to.
33. Immorality should be strongly punished.
34. I often get disturbed over situations I don't like.

35. People who are miserable have usually made themselves that way.
36. If I can't keep something from happening, I don't worry about it.
37. I usually make decisions as promptly as I can.
38. There are certain people that I depend on greatly.
39. People overvalue the influence of the past.
40. Some problems will always be with us.

41. If others dislike me, that's their problem, not mine.
42. It is highly important to me to be successful in everything I do.
43. I seldom blame people for their wrongdoings.
44. I usually accept things the way they are, even if I don't like them.
45. A person won't stay angry or blue long unless he keeps himself that way.
46. I can't stand to take chances.
47. Life is too short to spend it doing unpleasant tasks.
48. I like to stand on my own two feet.
49. If I had had different experiences I could be more like I want to be.
50. Every problem has a correct solution.

51. I find it hard to go against what others think.
52. I enjoy activities for their own sake, no matter how good I am at them.
53. The fear of punishment helps people be good.
54. If things annoy me, I just ignore them.
55. The more problems a person has, the less happy he will be.
56. I am seldom anxious over the future.
57. I seldom put things off.
58. I am the only one who can really understand and face my problems
59. I seldom think of past experiences as affecting me now.
60. We live in a world of chance and probability.

61. Although I like approval, it's not a real need for me.
62. It bothers me when others are better than I am at something.
63. Everyone is basically good.
64. I do what I can to get what I want and then don't worry about it
65. Nothing is upsetting in itself-- only in the way you interpret i
66. I worry a lot about certain things in the future.
67. It is difficult for me to do unpleasant chores.

68. I dislike for others to make my decisions for me.
69. We are slaves to our personal histories.
10. There is seldom an ideal solution to anything.

11. I often worry about how much people approve of and accept me.
12. It upsets me to make mistakes.
13. It's unfair that "the rain falls on both the just and the unjust".
14. I am fairly easygoing about life.
15. More people should face up to the unpleasantness of life.
16. Sometimes I can't get a fear off my mind.
17. A life of ease is seldom very rewarding.
18. I find it easy to seek advice.
19. Once something strongly affects your life, it always will.
10. It is better to look for a practical solution than a perfect one.

11. I have considerable concern with what people are feeling about me.
12. I often become quite annoyed over little things.
13. I usually give someone who has wronged me a second chance.
14. I dislike responsibility.
15. There is never any reason to remain sorrowful for very long.
16. I hardly ever think of such things as death or atomic war.
17. People are happiest when they have challenges and problems to overcome.
18. I dislike having to depend on others.
19. People never change basically.
6. I feel I must handle things in the right way.

1. It is annoying but not upsetting to be criticized.
2. I'm not afraid to do things which I cannot do well.
3. No one is evil, even though his deeds may be.
4. I seldom become upset over the mistakes of others.
5. Man makes his own hell within himself.
6. I often find myself planning what I would do in different dangerous situations.
7. If something is necessary, I do it even if it is unpleasant.
8. I've learned not to expect someone else to be very concerned about my welfare.
9. I don't look upon the past with any regrets.
0. There is no such thing as an ideal set of circumstances.

APPENDIX G

PROGRAM EVALUATION

Community Action Program

Please indicate, using the 5-point scale below, the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. Place the number corresponding to your response in the space to the left of the question.

1 STRONGLY AGREE 2 AGREE 3 NEUTRAL 4 DISAGREE 5 STRONGLY DISAGREE

_____ 1. I was satisfied with the kinds of things I did at work.

_____ 2. I was satisfied with the levels of responsibility I had at work.

_____ 3. I was satisfied with how busy I was at work.

_____ 4. I was satisfied with the kind of place I worked at. (for example, a school, hospital, or the Boy Scouts, etc.)

_____ 5. I was satisfied with the people I worked with.

_____ 6. I found the information presented on resumes at the job seeking skills workshop to be helpful.

_____ 7. I found the information presented on interviewing at the job seeking skills workshop to be helpful.

_____ 8. I found the information presented on job search strategies at the job seeking skills workshop to be helpful.

_____ 9. The leader presented materials at the job seeking skills workshop that were at an appropriate level for me.

_____ 10. The leader explained the materials at the workshop clearly.

_____ 11. I believe the job seeking skills workshop was helpful.

_____ 12. I would recommend this JTPA program to a friend.

_____ 13. Overall, I was satisfied with this JTPA program.

List the most helpful parts of this program:_____

List the least helpful parts of this program:_____

List any changes you would recommend for this program:_____

APPENDIX H

PLEASE FILL OUT THE ENCLOSED EVALUATION AS HONESTLY AS POSSIBLE...IT WILL NOT HAVE ANY EFFECT ON YOUR JOB OR ANYTHING ELSE...IT IS FOR MY RESEARCH PURPOSES ONLY!!!

THE LEADER REFERRED TO IN THE EVALUATION IS ME, GRETCHEN.

PLEASE RETURN THIS EVALUATION AS SOON AS YOU CAN IN THE ENCLOSED SELF-ADDRESSED STAMPED ENVELOPE.

I REALLY APPRECIATE ALL THE PAPERWORK AND FORM AND TESTS YOU HAVE FILLED OUT FOR ME.

THANKS !!!!

GRETCHEN
782-4877

APPENDIX I

Wisconsin Coulee Region Community Action Program, Inc.
201 Melby Street, Westby, Wisconsin 54667 (608) 634-3104

Working with people and communities in Crawford, La Crosse, Monroe and Vernon Counties

Dear

As you may recall, the employment and training program you are currently enrolled in includes a career education component.

In fulfilling this component of the program I have scheduled the following sessions, and attendance is mandatory---you must attend. Please fill out the personal data sheet that is enclosed and be sure to bring it with you on the first session. This is very important, and I will not be happy with you if you forget.

Your employer has been notified of these career sessions and has agreed not to schedule to work during these hours. If you think there will be any problems, please let me know as soon as possible---not two days before hand!

Scheduled times are as follows:

3/20/86	Thursday	5-8 p.m.
3/22/86	Saturday	10-1 p.m.
3/25/86	Tuesday	7-9 p.m.

All sessions will meet in Main Hall Room 122 at the Univeristy of Wisconsin-LaCrosse.

Again, you must attend all of these sessions--your job may be at stake should you decide not to come.

See you soon!

Gretchen

Gretchen Koehler
333 Buchner Place
LaCrosse, WI 54603
782-4877

APPENDIX J

Wisconsin Coulee Region Community Action Program, Inc.
201 Melby Street, Westby, Wisconsin 54667 (608) 634-3104

Working with people and communities in Crawford, La Crosse, Monroe and Vernon Counties

Dear Employer:

As you may recall, the employment and training program for youths at Wisconsin Coulee Region Community Action Program includes a career education component.

In fulfilling this component of the program I have scheduled the following sessions, and would aqppreciate it if you would not schedule _____ to work during these times:

3/20/86	Thurdsay	5-8p.m.
3/22/86	Saturday	10-1p.m.
3/25/86	Tuesday	7-9p.m.

Your cooperation in this matter is appreciated.

Thank you,

Gretchen Koehler

Gretchen Koehler
Community Action Program
333 Buchner Place
LaCrosse, WI 54603
(608) 782-4877

APPENDIX K

Personal Data Form

PERSONAL DATA

Name_____
(Last) (First) (Middle)

Address_____
(No. & Street) (City) (State) (Zip)

Permanent
Address _____
(No. & Street) (City) (State) (Zip)

Phone no._____ Social Security no._____

Date of birth _____ Age_____Ht._____Wt._____

Marital status _____ No. of dependents_____

EDUCATIONAL RECORD

Name of School	Address (City & State)	Dates Attended	Grade Completed
Grade School 1.			
2.			
3.			
Junior High School 1.			
2.			
3.			
High School 1.			
2.			
3.			
Other 1.			
2.			

Course of Study_____

Copyright © Teachers College, Columbia University, 1975.
Copyright is claimed until 1985. Thereafter, all portions of this work covered by this copyright shall be in the public domain. This work was developed under a grant from the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. However, the opinions and other content do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Agency, and no official endorsement shall be inferred.

EMPLOYMENT RECORD

1 *(list most recent job first)*

Name of employer _____ Phone no. _____

Address _____
(No. & Street) (City) (State) (Zip)

Position or job held _____ Department _____

Description of job _____

_____

Dates of employment: From _____ To _____
month / year month / year

Starting salary _____ Ending salary _____

Name and title of supervisor _____

Reasons for leaving or seeking new position _____

_____

2

Name of employer _____ Phone no. _____

Address _____
(No. & Street) (City) (State) (Zip)

Position or job held _____ Department _____

Description of job _____

_____

Dates of employment: From _____ To _____
month / year month / year

Starting salary _____ Ending salary _____

Name and title of supervisor _____

Reasons for leaving or seeking new position _____

_____

EMPLOYMENT RECORD

3

Name of employer _____ Phone no. _____

Address _____
(No. & Street) (City) (State) (Zip)

Position or job held _____ Department _____

Description of job _____

_____

Dates of employment: From _____ To _____
month / year month / year

Starting salary _____ Ending salary _____

Name and title of supervisor _____

Reasons for leaving or seeking new position _____

_____

4

Name of employer _____ Phone no. _____

Address _____
(No. & Street) (City) (State) (Zip)

Position or job held _____ Department _____

Description of job _____

_____

Dates of employment: From _____ To _____
month / year month / year

Starting salary _____ Ending salary _____

Name and title of supervisor _____

Reasons for leaving or seeking new position _____

_____

EMPLOYMENT RECORD

5

Name of employer _____ Phone no. _____

Address _____
(No. & Street) (City) (State) (Zip)

Position or job held _____ Department _____

Description of job _____

_____

Dates of employment: From _____ To _____
month / year month / year

Starting salary _____ Ending salary _____

Name and title of supervisor _____

Reasons for leaving or seeking new position _____

_____

6

Name of employer _____ Phone no. _____

Address _____
(No. & Street) (City) (State) (Zip)

Position or job held _____ Department _____

Description of job _____

_____

Dates of employment: From _____ To _____
month / year month / year

Starting salary _____ Ending salary _____

Name and title of supervisor _____

Reasons for leaving or seeking new position _____

_____

MILITARY SERVICE

Service / Branch_____From_____ (month / year) To_____ (month / year)

Rank at induction_____ Rank at discharge_____

Type of discharge_____ Reserve status (active / inactive)_____

Date entered active reserve_____ (month / year) Date discharged from active reserve_____ (month / year)

Draft classification_____

Additional information_____

_____

NATIONALITY–CITIZENSHIP

U.S. citizen: Yes_____No_____ Natural born: Yes_____No_____

Date of citizenship_____Alien registration no._____

Permanent visa no._____

PEOPLE TO NOTIFY IN CASE OF EMERGENCY

Name_____ Relationship _____

Address _____ Home phone no._____

Place of work_____ Business phone no._____

Name_____ Relationship _____

Address_____ Home phone no._____

Place of work_____ Business phone no._____

PHYSICAL PROBLEMS AND ILLNESSES

Physical problems _____

Limitations on work _____

_____

Current illnesses _____

Limitations on work _____

_____

Mental or nervous illness _____

Limitations on work _____

_____

REFERENCES

Name _____

Address _____

Title or position _____ Phone no. _____

Name _____

Address _____

Title or position _____ Phone no. _____

Name _____

Address _____

Title or position _____ Phone no. _____

Skills

Machines you can operate_____

Tools you can use_____

Things you can do (make)_____

Other_____

*Interests*_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

*Abilities*_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX L

JOB SEEKING SKILLS WORKSHOP
(File Folder Contents)

Avoid Application Form Errors
Tips for Filling Out Application Forms
Preparing a Resume'
Resume' Guidelines
Contents of a Resume'
Resume' Styles
Resume' Selection Process
Key Action Words
Letterwriting
Sample Letters of Application
Letter Content and Format
Telephone Call Checklist
Interview Planning Form
Job Applicant Rating Form
Make the Most of a Job Interview
Tough Interview Questions
How to Answer Tricky Job Questions
Interview Questions Designed to Destroy You
Questions to Ask When Interviewing
30 Ways to Avoid Being Hired
Job Interview: Exhibiting Unacceptable Behavior
Grooming for Employment
Appearance: Self Evaluation
Work Habits: What Is Important to the Employer
Turned Down for that Job?
Where to Locate Jobs
Library Can Lead a Hand in Searching for a Job
Job Lead Log