

# 1

## **U.S. Job Training**

### **Types, Participants, and History**

Christopher J. O'Leary  
Robert A. Straits  
Stephen A. Wandner

Job training is a pervasive aspect of American life. Wage and salary employment is the single largest source of aggregate personal income in the United States. Every person holding a job has benefited from job training. Although most job training in the United States is undertaken by private employers in their normal course of doing business, each year hundreds of thousands of Americans in precarious economic conditions use publicly funded job training as a path to employment.

The focus of this book is on the government role in job training. To place this examination in perspective, the book also includes reviews of private job training efforts and an international comparison of government job training programs. The chapters review the effectiveness of major federal job training programs, examine important features of current programs, and speculate about directions for future job training programs.

This book is directed mainly to employment policymakers and practitioners at the local, state, and federal levels. The exposition is relatively concise and nontechnical. However, sufficient detail is included in footnotes and references to make the book a useful resource for students, researchers, consultants, and policy scholars.

## TYPES OF JOB TRAINING

Job training involves teaching someone the skills required to do a job competently. It is distinct from general education because of the exclusive focus on preparation for employment. Job training can range from remedial training, which teaches people the skills they need to learn other skills, to very sophisticated occupation specific training, which teaches people detailed procedures to perform at a high level in a specific occupation. An overview of job training types is provided in Table 1.1.

Job training usually refers to short-term occupational skill training to increase job readiness. The popular notion of job training comes from the common experience in a school classroom. However, general occupational job skills training in an institutional classroom setting away from the workplace is only one of many types of job training which are used in a wide variety of settings.

Ideally, job training is selected to address the component of aggregate unemployment resulting from a structural mismatch between job seekers and job vacancies, so that training is targeted to occupations with local job vacancies. Classroom job training may be customized to fill the request of an employer with available job slots; such training could either be privately or publicly funded. Alternatively, choice of the training type and provider may be exercised by the participant through a publicly funded job training voucher program. When vouchers are used, choice for eligible training participants is framed by rules regarding eligible training provider quality and local occupational labor demand.

Job skill training may also be provided in an experiential private sector workplace setting through on-the-job training (OJT). Learning by watching someone else is one of the oldest types of occupational skill training. Such training may be paid for either privately or publicly, and may provide skills valued only in the context of the particular establishment or more generally in the job market. When OJT is privately financed, costs may be shared by trainees through lower wages (Barron, Berger, and Black 1997). When OJT is provided by a public agency, it is sometimes called work experience. Work experience may

**Table 1.1 Types of Job Training**

---

**Occupational skill training**

Provided in group setting is called institutional or classroom training and usually for occupations in general demand.

**Customized** is designed to suit the specific requests of an employer with available job slots or employees already on-board.

**Vouchers** are a vehicle to allow participants to choose among approved topics and training providers.

Skill training provided in an experiential workplace setting is referred to as on-the-job training (**OJT**).

When OJT is provided through a public agency it is sometimes called **work experience**.

**Remedial training**

General training which seeks to remedy basic gaps in reading and mathematics skills to make job seekers ready for skill training.

**Classroom soft skills training**

Conveys knowledge about proper workplace behavior or job search skills.

**Postemployment training**

Combines classroom and practical activities intended to promote retention and advancement within a given career path.

**Youth training programs**

Basic skills training in a workplace context, support for further general education and credentials, mentoring, school-to-work and school-to-apprenticeship transition services, intensive residential education and occupation and job training.

---

be either volunteer or paid, and it may be either unsubsidized or publicly subsidized.

Direct job creation programs also have a training dimension in that they provide knowledge and practice in basic workplace behaviors such as punctuality, cleanliness, and cooperation. Practice in such behaviors through community service employment can be valuable to both new workforce entrants and to prevent deterioration of such established skills among the long term unemployed (Cook, Adams, and Rawlins 1985).

When job seekers possess neither the occupational skills in demand locally, nor the fundamental abilities required to acquire such skills, often remedial training is appropriate—that is, general training which seeks to remedy basic gaps in reading and mathematics skills to make job seekers ready for skill training. It is common for such training to be provided through local school districts with funding from federal, state, and local sources. However, increasingly employers have found it profitable to provide such training in classroom settings at the job site (Hollenbeck 1993).

In addition to occupational skill training, OJT, and remedial education, short-term job readiness training may include what is sometimes called “classroom soft skill training.” This includes knowledge about workplace behavior skills or job search skills. Such training is often publicly funded and available through arrangement with the public employment service.

A relatively recent form of publicly funded job training is called postemployment training. It may combine classroom, laboratory, and related activities which are directly linked to continued employment and advancement in a specific job or occupational field. Such retention and advancement efforts have become more prominent as welfare policy has become focused on employment as a means of economic self sufficiency (Rangarajan, Schochet, and Chu 2002).

Publicly funded job training programs in the United States also often provide supportive services for training participants. These include help with child care, transportation, health care, and other personal matters, including counseling for domestic relations or substance abuse.

Youth programs include basic skills training with a workplace context and integrated with occupational skills testing, tutoring, and study

skills training; alternative high school services; instruction leading to high school completion or the equivalent; mentoring; limited internships in the private sector; training and education combined with community and youth service opportunities in public agencies, nonprofit agencies and other appropriate agencies; entry-level employment experience; school-to-work transition services; school-to-postsecondary transition services; school-to-apprenticeship transition services; preemployment and work maturity skills training, and support services (including limited needs based cash payments).

States also provide customized training to employers for their new hires and incumbent workers. In 1999, 45 states had customized training programs, and the total spending on these programs in 1998–1999 was \$593 million. Most of this training was funded from state general revenue or from state taxes that were offset from the state unemployment insurance taxes (Ducha and Graves 1999).

## **FEDERALLY FUNDED JOB TRAINING IN THE UNITED STATES**

Federal lawmakers clearly expose ideologies when debating job training policy. Some have asserted a responsibility to assist individuals who cannot support themselves, calling government assistance an entitlement. Others contend that public assistance obliges the recipient to work in exchange for government support. In the end, laws concerning employment and training policy usually have been shaped from input across the political spectrum, even during the few times that one political party has controlled both the legislative and executive branches of federal government.

As a result of bipartisan negotiation, most federal employment and training laws include provisions for program evaluation. Furthermore, employment laws often have “sunset” provisions which terminate programs failing to demonstrate sufficient cost effectiveness.

Government action to promote employment in the United States has always been prompted by crisis. The federal–state Unemployment Insurance (UI) program was conceived in the widespread hardship experienced from job loss during the Great Depression of the 1930s.

Federal training policy also had its origin in depression era "New Deal" programs for public works. Renewed training efforts thirty years later were greatly influenced by new economic goals and the resulting political struggles fought during President Johnson's "War on Poverty." A summary of the four main postwar federal job training programs is provided in Table 1.2.

### **Manpower Development and Training Act**

The Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) of 1962 was marketed to the American public as an antipoverty program. With MDTA, the federal government pursued a centralized and categorical approach to eradicating poverty. Job training was targeted to the low income and welfare recipient populations. Funds were available on a formula basis to communities based on population and estimates of the proportion below the poverty income level.

The federal government managed MDTA funding through 12 regional offices of the U.S. Department of Labor, each of which supervised activity in between four and six states. Sometimes competing agencies within localities bid against each other for federal funding by submitting separate proposals to regional offices for review. Federal grants often did not jibe with one another and occasionally were a duplication of effort. The need for high-level coordination became painfully obvious.

Sunset provisions ended the MDTA in 1969. Though some evaluations had been done by that time, evidence about job training effectiveness did not prevent reauthorization (Mangum 1968). The prime reasons for the demise of MDTA were the administrative structure whereby the authority of state and local political entities was circumvented with federal contracts going directly to local service providers, and the duplication of service delivery at the local level.

### **Job Corps**

The Job Corps, a one-year residential program for disadvantaged youth, was established in 1964 by the Economic Opportunity Act. It provides remedial academic instruction, job training, and other support services. It has remained largely unchanged over the years.

**Table 1.2 A Chronology of Federal Job Training Programs in the United States**

Program	Training types	Eligibility	Intergovernmental relations
Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA), 1962	Institutional and on-the-job training (OJT).	Low income and welfare recipients.	Federal funding granted directly from 12 regional offices to agencies in local areas. Administration and reporting structures similar.
Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA), 1973	On-the-job training, classroom skill training, classroom soft skills training, work experience in public agencies, and Public Service Employment (PSE).	Training was targeted to low income persons, welfare recipients, and disadvantaged youth.	Federal funding granted to prime sponsors in substate regions which numbered about 470. Performance monitoring with results reported to the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL).
Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), 1982	On-the-job training, Classroom skill training, Classroom soft skills training, and Work experience in public agencies.	Low income, public assistance recipients, dislocated workers, and disadvantaged youth.	Federal funding through state governors to private industry councils (PICs) in each of 640 service delivery areas. PIC performance reports to governors who reported to USDOL.
Workforce Investment Act (WIA), 1998	On-the-job training, Customized classroom skill training, Classroom soft skills training, and Work experience in public agencies.	Access to core services like job search skills and job referral is unrestricted. Training is targeted to the most difficult to reemploy.	Like JTPA, but PICs became fewer (600) workforce investment boards (WIBs) with private sector majority membership. Monitoring is reduced relative to JTPA practice.

SOURCE: O’Leary and Straits (2004).

The first major evaluation of Job Corps was quasi-experimental (Mallar et al. 1980). It found modest positive effects on employment and weekly earnings but no impact on hourly wage rates. A recent study was done as a classically designed field experiment. That study found that Job Corps participation results in significant earnings gains for disadvantaged youth. "Furthermore, earnings gains, educational progress, and other positive changes were found across most groups of participants and are expected to persist as they get older" (Burghardt et al. 2001). Among training programs for youth, evaluation research finds that the interventions most likely to work are intensive, costly, and of relatively long duration.

### **Comprehensive Employment and Training Act**

The 1970s brought a more comprehensive approach to addressing the problems of the economically disadvantaged. Decentralization became the employment policy theme for the decade. It involved the transfer of decision-making authority from the federal to state and local governments. Authority as defined in the legislation and regulations often included responsibility for designing, implementing, and evaluating program activities.

The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) of 1973 introduced the concept of a local advisory board to assure that local public interest would guide program planning. The private industry council membership and role were established in the regulations, and in some localities representation was "guaranteed" for constituencies like education and labor. CETA job training was targeted to the economically disadvantaged, welfare recipients, and disadvantaged youth.

Three main findings emerged from 11 major CETA evaluations (Leigh 1990, p. 11). First, there were no measurable employment or earnings impacts for men; however, impacts for women were positive and significant. Second, OJT training is usually more effective than classroom training. Finally, the range of impact estimates was quite wide, despite the fact that all analysts used the same CLMS reporting data. However, it was journalists rather than economists who brought the end to CETA. The public service employment component of CETA became a target for national media criticism when careless manage-

ment of funds and enrollment of program ineligibles were widely reported.

### **Job Training Partnership Act**

The arrival of the Reagan administration in 1981 came with a “conservative challenge on the principles, policies, and programs of the liberal tradition of federal activism in economic and social affairs as it evolved in the half of the century starting with the New Deal” (Palmer 1987, p. 9). A major objective of Reagan-era legislation was to increase earnings and employment as well as decrease welfare dependency. Classroom skill training was identified as a major weakness of existing programs because it was often not the kind of training desired by local employers.

The Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) of 1982 limited training choices to skills that were in demand by local employers. JTPA also increased the private sector share of members on the advisory committees to ensure that their interests were taken into consideration. Evaluation was an integral part of the program, which was said to be performance-driven through a system of performance standards for participant reemployment rates and earnings. Absent from JTPA was anything remotely resembling public service employment. In response to the widespread layoffs associated with economic restructuring in American business during the 1980s, JTPA job training was targeted to dislocated workers in addition to the economically disadvantaged and welfare recipients.

The performance standards system allowed governors receiving federal JTPA training grants to structure incentive systems, thereby simplifying relationships with substate areas. The performance monitoring system changed training program management and intergovernmental relations. It also complicated the net impact evaluation of programs by introducing the risk of *cream skimming* in program assignment. That is, program managers might select mainly the most able applicants for participation. The result is high observed reemployment rates, although many of the selected program participants may already possess the skills and abilities to get reemployed themselves.

To assure an objective net impact evaluation, Congress authorized a major national evaluation of JTPA based on methods of field experi-

mentation with random assignment of subjects both to training and to comparison groups in 16 sites across the country. Orr et al. (1996, p. 109) report that training to economically disadvantaged adults resulted in 11 percent greater earnings for women and 6.7 percent greater earnings for men. For both genders the earnings gains were mainly due to increases in hours worked. There were positive net benefits to both men and women, and the net benefit to society for both genders was just over \$500 per participant (Orr et al. 1996, p. 189).

An evaluation of dislocated worker programs was initiated during the 1990s but was cancelled in anticipation of substantial program changes resulting from implementation of a new dislocated worker program under the Workforce Investment Act. An evaluation of the new dislocated worker program is now needed.

Our focus on the main job training programs for economically disadvantaged and dislocated workers should not obscure the fact that the number of federal job training programs had proliferated to the point that by the early 1990s there were 163 distinct programs receiving funding (U.S. General Accounting Office 1994). While the great majority of these were small and targeted, including, for example, a variety of distinct programs for separate native American groups, the overlapping management burdens from the large number were seen as a problem. Funding streams for job training of particular target groups sometimes originated in two or more executive departments.

During 1999, which was the final year of JTPA authorization, there were 40 major employment and training programs funded by seven executive departments of the federal government (U.S. General Accounting Office 2000). Two-thirds of the total funding went to just six programs, three of which were JTPA dislocated workers, JTPA summer youth, and Job Corps.

### **Workforce Investment Act**

By the late 1990s, economic conditions had improved to the point where full employment existed in most of the United States. The more than 30 years of searching for ways to reduce poverty through employment policy evolved into a new approach that shifts responsibility from government to the individual, and divests authority from the federal government to the states. It exchanges an emphasis on skill training as

a path to economic security for an emphasis on job placement leading to self-sufficiency and a reduced dependence on public assistance payment.

Two pieces of legislation signed into law by President Clinton, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act (PRWORA) of 1996 and then the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) of 1998, illustrate the intended change in federal human resources policy towards self sufficiency and local control.

PRWORA reformed the nation's welfare laws. A new system of block grants from the federal government to the states named Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) was created, changing the nature and provision of welfare benefits in America. A key feature of the new law was a five-year lifetime time limit on cash assistance.

WIA, signed into law on August 7, 1998, includes many of the political characteristics that are in the PRWORA. It reforms federal job training programs and creates a new comprehensive workforce investment system. The reformed system is intended to be customer focused, to help individuals access the tools they need to manage their careers through information and high-quality services, and to help employers find skilled workers.

Key innovations brought by WIA are 1) one-stop career centers where all employment and training programs are assembled in one physical location; 2) individual training accounts which act as vouchers for job seekers requiring skills improvement for labor market success; 3) universal access to core employment services with sequential, more restricted access to intensive services and training; and 4) accountability monitored through performance indicators.

## **JOB TRAINING EXPENDITURES AND PARTICIPANTS**

While WIA offers broadened eligibility for core employment services, job training remains targeted to economically disadvantaged and dislocated workers. The mix of funding types supported during fiscal year 2001, which was the first full year of WIA operation, is summarized in Table 1.3. Expenditure estimates indicate that a total of nearly \$68 billion was spent on job training during fiscal year 2001. Of this,

**Table 1.3 Estimated Expenditures for Job Training Programs in the United States, Fiscal Year 2001 (thousands of dollars)**

Programs	Federal funding (\$)	Share of federal funding (%)	State supplemental funding (\$)	State financed customized FY 1998 (\$)	Employer financed 1998 (\$)	Grand total of funding (\$)
Adult and dislocated worker activities	2,540,040	39.6				
Youth activities	1,377,965	21.5				
Job Corps (youth)	1,399,148	21.8				
National programs	528,150	8.2				
Other programs (Non-WIA)	4,500	0.1				
TAA training	94,400	1.5				
NAFTA training	37,150	0.6				
CSE for older Americans	440,200	6.9				
Total funding	6,421,553	100.0	276,621	593,191	60,700,000	67,991,365
Percentage of grand total of funding	9.4		0.4	0.9	89.3	100.0

NOTE: WIA: Workforce Investment Act; TAA: Trade Adjustment Assistance; NAFTA: North American Free Trade Act; CSE: Community service employment.

SOURCE: Wandner, Balducchi, and Spickard (2001).

89.3 percent was privately financed by American employers, 9.4 percent by the federal government, and 1.3 percent by state governments.

International comparative statistics from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) set the total federal expenditures on job training programs in the year 2000 at 0.04 percent of gross domestic product (GDP). As shown in Table 1.4 this level places the United States in the bottom 20 percent of OECD member nations in terms of government spending on job training. Among the top five spending national governments in 2000, only Germany is among the world's leading industrial nations. Public spending on job training in Japan and the United Kingdom closely matches that of the United States.

Considering spending on all active labor market programs (ALMPs) in 2000—which include the public employment service, wage subsidies, and programs for the disabled and youth—federal job training expenditures amount to 26.7 percent of spending on ALMPs in the United States. Within the broader category of expenditures on all U.S. labor market programs (LMPs)—which for the United States adds UI benefit payments to ALMPs—job training amounted to 10.5 percent of all labor market programs in 2000. So while the United States ranks low among OECD countries in public job training expenditures as a share of GDP, among government labor market programs job training is a relatively important activity in the United States compared to other countries.<sup>1</sup>

Among the fiscal year 2001 federal spending on job training, Table 1.3 shows that 39.6 percent went to adult disadvantaged and dislocated workers, 43.3 percent to youth programs (Job Corps and others), 6.9 percent to community service employment for older workers, and 2.1 percent to workers impacted by changing patterns of international trade.

Background characteristics for participants in the three main federally funded employment and training programs are summarized in Table 1.5. Among 113,774 adult participants (JTPA Title II-A) who received more than just assessment in program year 1999, most were female (65 percent), most had at least completed high school (78 percent), the ethnic make-up included 35 percent black and 16 percent Hispanic, disabled amounted to 7 percent, 26 percent were on public

**Table 1.4 Government Expenditures on Job Training as a Percentage of GDP in OECD Countries, 2000**

Country	Training	As a percentage of GDP		Training as a percentage of spending on	
		ALMPs	LMPs	ALMPs	LMPs
Denmark	0.84	1.55	4.51	54.2	18.6
Finland	0.35	1.07	3.29	32.7	10.6
Germany	0.34	1.23	3.12	27.6	10.9
Sweden	0.31	1.38	2.72	22.5	11.4
Netherlands	0.30	1.57	3.65	19.1	8.2
Portugal**	0.30	0.51	1.34	58.8	22.4
Spain	0.29	0.84	2.18	34.5	13.3
France	0.28	1.36	3.12	20.6	9.0
Belgium*	0.25	1.36	3.70	18.4	6.8
New Zealand	0.18	0.55	2.17	32.7	8.3
Austria	0.17	0.49	1.58	34.7	10.8
Canada	0.17	0.51	1.49	33.3	11.4
Greece**	0.17	0.35	0.83	48.6	20.5
Italy*	0.12	0.63	1.28	19.1	9.4
Korea	0.09	0.46	0.55	19.6	16.4
Switzerland	0.09	0.48	1.05	18.8	8.6
Norway	0.08	0.77	1.16	10.4	6.9
Hungary	0.07	0.40	0.88	17.5	8.0
United Kingdom	0.05	0.36	0.94	13.9	5.3
Mexico*	0.04	0.08	0.08	50.0	50.0
United States	0.04	0.15	0.38	26.7	10.5
Japan	0.03	0.28	0.82	10.7	3.7
Australia	0.02	0.45	1.50	4.4	1.3
Czech Republic	0.02	0.22	0.52	9.1	3.9
Poland	0.01	0.15	0.96	6.7	1.0

NOTE: \*1999; \*\*1998. Where GDP is gross domestic product, ALMP is active labor market programs, and LMP is labor market programs. No data available for OECD countries: Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Slovak Republic, and Turkey.

SOURCE: OECD (2001).

**Table 1.5 Characteristics and Outcomes of JTPA Training Participants, PY 1999**

Characteristics	Adult Title II-A	Youth Title II-C	Dislocated workers Title III
Number of program participants	113,774	58,548	189,794
Female (%)	65	58	54
Aged 14–15 (%)		7	
Aged 16–21 (%)		93	
Aged 22–54 (%)	97		89
Over 55 (%)	3		11
Less than high school (%)	22	71	11
High school (%)	56	26	50
Post high school (%)	22	3	39
Black (%)	35	34	19
Hispanic origin (%)	16	23	13
White (%)	43	38	62
Disabled individual (%)	7	12	2
Welfare recipient (%)	26	19	2
Ex-offender (%)	18	13	5
UI recipient (%)	10	1	69
UI exhaustee (%)	3	1	5
Veteran (%)	6		11
<b>Outcomes</b>			
Entered employment rate (%)	68	47	69
Average hourly wage (\$)	8.75	7.07	11.95

SOURCE: Social Policy Research Associates (2001).

welfare assistance, 10 percent were UI recipients, and 6 percent were military veterans.

Among 58,548 youth participants (JTPA Title II-C) who received more than just assessment in PY 1999, a majority were female (58 percent), some (7 percent) were very young workers (aged 14 to 15), most had not yet completed high school (71 percent), the ethnic make-up included 34 percent black and 23 percent Hispanic, disabled amounted to 12 percent, 19 percent were on public welfare assistance, and only 1 percent qualified to be UI recipients.

The JTPA program provided more than just assessment to 189,794 dislocated workers in PY 1999. Of these, a slight majority were female (54 percent), the great majority (89 percent) were prime-aged workers, a sizeable proportion (39 percent) had education beyond high school completion, the ethnic make-up included 19 percent black and 13 percent Hispanic, disabled amounted to 2 percent, only 2 percent were on public welfare assistance, and 69 percent were UI recipients.

The bottom of Table 1.5 provides some gross outcome information for participants in the three major JTPA-funded programs. Entered employment was 68 and 69 percent for the adult and dislocated worker programs, respectively, while it was 47 percent for the youth program. For youth, sizeable proportions also achieved an employment enhancement or competency which JTPA also regards as success. Among those entering employment at program exit, hourly earnings rates were estimated to be \$8.75, \$7.07, and \$11.95 for adult, youth, and dislocated workers, respectively.

## **PROLOGUE**

This introductory chapter has provided background for the examination of public job training policy in the United States. A review of evidence from evaluation studies of prior job training programs in the next two chapters completes setting the context for a consideration of current and future job training programs. The subsequent three chapters of this book address issues critical to implementation of the new job training strategy established by WIA. This is followed by an examination of the private sector role in job training which involves mainly employed, or

incumbent, workers. An international comparison of public efforts in job training rounds out the exposition. We then offer speculation about future directions for public job training in the United States.

Evaluation of job training in the United States has involved both monitoring gross outcomes through performance management systems, and estimation of net program impacts through comparison group designs. In Chapter 2, "Performance Management of U.S. Job Training Programs," Burt Barnow and Jeff Smith review the development, use, and incentive effects of performance monitoring under CETA and JTPA, and they speculate on the practicality and value of the new approach being tried under WIA. They offer suggestions on ways to improve the implementation and use of performance management systems.

Chris King in Chapter 3 reviews a vast literature on evaluation of federally funded job training programs in the United States, and identifies the population groups and economic contexts where particular types of job training have been most effective.

WIA operations began in most states on the officially designated starting date of July 1, 2000. Ron D'Amico and Jeffrey Salzman provide an overview of the experience to date in Chapter 4, "Implementation Issues in Delivering Training Services to Adults under WIA."

A core theme of WIA is the market orientation of job training selection which involves disclosure by training providers on service effectiveness and informed choice among alternative training services by participants. Janet Javar and Steve Wandner examine mechanisms for screening and certifying job training institutions and other labor market intermediaries in Chapter 5, "The Use of Service Providers and Brokers/Consultants in Employment and Training Programs."

Expression of individual choice in job training selection is facilitated under WIA by the use of job training vouchers. However, the job training market is not *laissez faire*. Vouchers are government funded and customer choice is bounded by information on occupational job demand and job training provider quality. Using information from a classically designed field experiment, Paul Decker and Irma Perez-Johnson in Chapter 6 examine "Individual Training Accounts and Eligible Provider Lists" under WIA.

The focus of this book is on government-funded job training programs. However, American employers spend nine dollars on job training for every dollar spent by government agencies. Robert Lerman,

Signe-Mary McKernan, and Stephanie Riegg balance our investigation with Chapter 7, "The Scope of Employer-Provided Training in the United States: Who, What, Where, and How Much?" Their summary aims to identify areas where public expenditure may fruitfully supplement employer-provided job training.

In Chapter 8, "International Experience with Job Training," Lori Kletzer and William Koch view American job training policies in a broader context. They examine U.S. policy and experience compared with that in selected developed and developing nations. In the concluding chapter, we, the editors of this book, speculate on "Public Job Training: Experience and Prospects" based on the job training experience and trends in the United States and other countries.

## Notes

Opinions expressed are those of neither the W.E. Upjohn Institute nor the U.S. Department of Labor, but are those of the authors. Errors and omissions are also ours.

1. These comparisons abstract from the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) paid to low-income workers with dependent children in the United States. In recent years the EITC, which is essentially a targeted wage subsidy, totaled about \$30 billion or roughly equal to the total expenditures for LMPs listed in the text.

## References

- Barron, John M., Mark C. Berger, and Dan A. Black. 1997. *On-the-Job Training*. Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.
- Burghardt, John, Peter Z. Schochet, Sheena McConnell, Terry Johnson, R. Mark Gritz, Steven Glazerman, John Homrighausen, and Russell Jackson. 2001. "Does Job Corps Work? Summary of the National Job Corps Study." Document No. PR01-50. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., June.
- Cook, Robert F., Charles F. Adams, and V. Lane Rawlins. 1985. *Public Service Employment: The Experience of a Decade*. Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.
- Ducha, Steve, and Wanda Lee Graves. 1999. "State Financed and Customized Training Programs." Research and Evaluation Report Series 99-E. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

- Hollenbeck, Kevin. 1993. *Classrooms in the Workplace*. Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.
- Leigh, Duane E. 1990. *Does Training Work for Displaced Workers?: A Survey of Existing Evidence*. Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.
- Mallar, Charles, Stuart Kerachsky, Craig Thornton, and David Long. 1980. "An Evaluation of the Economic Impact of the Job Corps Program." Project Report 80-60. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
- Mangum, Garth L. 1968. *MDTA: Foundation of Federal Manpower Policy*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.
- OECD. 2001. *OECD Employment Outlook*. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, June.
- O'Leary, Christopher J., and Robert A. Straits. 2004. "Intergovernmental Relations in Employment Policy: The United States Experience." In *Federalism and Labour Market Policy: Comparing Different Governance and Employment Strategies*, Alain Noël, ed. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, pp. 25–82.
- Orr, Larry L., Howard S. Bloom, Stephen H. Bell, Fred Doolittle, Winston Lin, and George Cave. 1996. *Does Training for the Disadvantaged Work? Evidence from the National JTPA Study*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press.
- Palmer, John L. 1987. "The Next Decade: The Economic, Political, and Social Context of Employment and Training Policies." *Policy Studies Review* 6(4): 685–694.
- Rangarajan, Anu, Peter Schochet, and Dexter Chu. 2002. "Targeting Job Retention Services for Welfare Recipients." In *Targeting Employment Services*, Randall W. Eberts, Christopher J. O'Leary, and Stephen A. Wandner, eds. Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, pp. 245–268.
- Social Policy Research Associates. 2001. *PY 99 SPIR Data Book*. Oakland, CA: Social Policy Research Associates.
- U.S. General Accounting Office. 1994. *Multiple Employment and Training Programs: Overlapping Programs Can Add Unnecessary Costs*. GAO/HEHS-94-80. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, January.
- . 2000. *Multiple Employment and Training Programs: Overlapping Programs Indicate Need for Closer Examination of Structure*. GAO-01-71. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, October.
- Wandner, Stephen A., David E. Balducci, and Amanda B. Spickard. 2001. "Expenditures on Active and Passive Labor Market Policy in the United States Estimates for Fiscal Year 2001." Paper presented at the international workshop "Active Labor Market Programs: Improvement of Effective-

ness,” sponsored by Ministry of Labor and Social Development of the Russian Federation, World Bank, and Russian Foundation for Social Reforms, October 2–3, Moscow.

# **Job Training Policy in the United States**

Christopher J. O'Leary  
Robert A. Straits  
Stephen A. Wandner  
*Editors*

2004

W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research  
Kalamazoo, Michigan

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

Job training policy in the United States / Christopher J. O'Leary, Robert A. Straits, Stephen A. Wandner editors.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-88099-306-5 (pbk.: alk. paper)—ISBN 0-88099-307-3 (hardcover : alk. paper)

1. Occupational training—Government policy—United States. 2. Occupational training—United States—Evaluation. I. O'Leary, Christopher J. II. Straits, Robert A. III. Wandner, Stephen A.

HD5715.2.J626 2004

331.25'92'0973—dc22

2004007770

© 2004

W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research  
300 S. Westnedge Avenue  
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49007-4686

The facts presented in this study and the observations and viewpoints expressed are the sole responsibility of the authors. They do not necessarily represent positions of the W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

Cover design by J.R. Underhill.  
Index prepared by Nancy Humphreys.  
Printed in the United States of America.  
Printed on recycled paper.