

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 059 441

AC 012 302

AUTHOR Gwozdecki, Joseph; And Others
TITLE The Incidence of Training-Related Job Placement of
Draper Vocational Trainees: A Preliminary Report.
INSTITUTION Rehabilitation Research Foundation, Elmore, Ala.
Draper Correctional Center.
SPONS AGENCY Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jun 70
NOTE 37p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Correctional Education; Counselors; Data Collection;
Educational Programs; *Interaction; Interviews; Job
Development; *Job Placement; Manpower Development;
Program Evaluation; Rehabilitation Programs;
Statistics; *Surveys; *Trainees; Transfer of
Training; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *Draper Correctional Center

ABSTRACT

A preliminary survey of trainees' pre- and postrelease interactions with the State Employment Service (ES) was conducted by the Experimental Manpower Laboratory for Corrections (EMLC) as part of an overall evaluation of Manpower Development and Training (MDT) program effectiveness at Draper Correctional Center, Elmore, Alabama. Measures of the number and results of MDT trainees' interactions with ES offices before and after release from prison were made to determine the degree of effectiveness being achieved by ES personnel in securing training-related jobs for MDT trainees. Data were gathered from four sources: (1) the ES extension office records (at Draper) of 56 MDT trainees and an interview with the ES counselor stationed at Draper, (2) records of 41 MDT trainees (73% of the study group) released to the service areas of 13 ES field offices located throughout Alabama and interviews with office managers or responsible personnel in these offices, (3) postrelease interviews of 16 MDT trainees which had already been accomplished in connection with EMLC Objective 3, and (4) additional telephone interviews with 10 of those 16 MDT trainees. Results showed that the ES Draper Extension Office had placed 18 (32%) of the 56 MDT trainees in training-related jobs; 14 (25%) of them reported to work and 7 (13%) were still employed on those initial jobs at the time of the study. The 13 ES field offices placed 5 (12%) of the 41 MDT trainees released to their areas in training-related jobs. (Author)

ED 059441

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE **REHABILITATION RESEARCH FOUNDATION** **PER**-RELATED
VOCATION, **APER**
MINARY REPORT



Experimental Manpower Laboratory for Corrections
Draper Correctional Center
Elmore, Alabama

This report on the EMLC was prepared under contract No. 82-01-69-06 with Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor. Organizations undertaking such projects under Federal Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgement freely. Therefore, points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the Department of Labor or other Federal agencies mentioned herein.

**THE INCIDENCE OF TRAINING-RELATED
JOB PLACEMENT OF DRAPER
VOCATIONAL TRAINEES: A PRELIMINARY REPORT**

prepared by

**Joseph Gwozdecki, Research Associate
W. O. Jenkins, Ph.D., Consultant
Lynda Hart, Editor
Experimental Manpower Laboratory for Corrections**

for the

**U. S. Department of Labor
Manpower Administration**

under

Contract No. 82-01-69-06

**Rehabilitation Research Foundation
John M. McKee, Ph.D., Director
June, 1970**

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Abstract</i>	vii
<i>Introduction</i>	1
<i>Review of Related Research</i>	2
<i>Method</i>	3
<i>Results and Discussion</i>	4
<i>Conclusions and Recommendations</i>	5
<i>Additional Follow-up Data</i>	6
<i>References</i>	9
<i>Appendix A</i>	
<i>Method and Results</i>	11
<i>Appendix B</i>	
<i>Additional Follow-up Data: A survey of Basic Education Trainees'</i>	
<i>Interactions with Employment Service</i>	21
<i>Appendix C</i>	
<i>Instruments</i>	29

LIST OF TABLES

<i>Table</i>	<i>Page</i>
1. Number, Types, and Results of Interviews between Trainees and Employment Service	17
2. Number, Types, and Results of Interviews between Trainees on Parole and Employment Service	18
3. Number of Trainees in Vocational Fields and Number of Trainees Placed in Training and Nontraining-Related Jobs	18
4. Size of Population and Job Placement Success with Vocational Trainees by Employment Service	19
5. Results of 10 Trainees' Interactions with the 13 Employment Service Field Offices	19

ADDITIONAL FOLLOW-UP DATA: BASIC EDUCATION TRAINEES

1. Number, Types, and Results of Interviews between Trainees and Employment Service	26
2. Number, Types, and Results of Interviews between Trainees on Parole and Employment Service	27
3. Results of Four Trainees' Interactions with the 13 Employment Service Field Offices	27

PREFACE

Established in September 1968, the Experimental Manpower Laboratory for Corrections (EMLC) is operated by the Rehabilitation Research Foundation (RRF) at Draper Correctional Center, Elmore, Alabama. The EMLC evolved from and continues to operate around a Manpower Development and Training (MDT) experimental-demonstration model.

During its first phase--from September, 1968 to March, 1970--the EMLC conducted studies which were primarily exploratory in such areas as employment barriers for ex-offenders, factors within the prison influencing the functioning and acceptance of manpower training, transitional problems of MDT trainees released from prison and placed in jobs, and numerous related areas.

The project reported on herein was conducted as a sub-study of the EMLC's longitudinal follow-up of MDT trainees and a comparison group--Objective 3 of the EMLC's first phase operation.

It is important to point out that the EMLC's success in gathering the preliminary data discussed in this report would not have been possible without the full cooperation and help of the Alabama State Employment Service (ES). This agency has reviewed and concurred in the information included.

It is equally important to point out that because of incomplete data, the whole story of ES's participation in the Draper MDT project cannot be presented here. For example, while the study concludes that the rate of training-related job placement by ES is low, there are many contributing factors over which ES had little control, such as the lack of community resources. However, one finding is clear: There is a need for the concerted and full involvement of responsible state agencies in planning and executing an MDT project for prisoners. The director of the State Employment Service, responsive to this need, has urged the Experimental Manpower Laboratory for Corrections (EMLC) to take the initiative in establishing a state-level policy committee that would work out guidelines, policies, and procedures to insure a more effective MDT prison training program. The EMLC has accepted this recommendation and has moved to establish such a committee comprised of high-level representation from ES, the State Board of Corrections, the Division of Vocational Education and Vocational Rehabilitation, and the State Board of Pardons and Paroles.

ABSTRACT

A preliminary survey of trainees' pre- and postrelease interactions with the State Employment Service (ES) was conducted by the Experimental Manpower Laboratory for Corrections (EMLC) as part of an overall evaluation of Manpower Development and Training (MDT) program effectiveness at Draper Correctional Center, Elmore, Alabama.

Measures of the number and results of MDT trainees' interactions with ES offices before and after release from prison were made to determine the degree of effectiveness being achieved by ES personnel in securing training-related jobs for MDT trainees.

Data were gathered from four sources: (1) the ES extension office records (at Draper) of 56 MDT trainees and an interview with the ES counselor stationed at Draper, (2) records of 41 MDT trainees (73% of the study group) released to the service areas of 13 ES field offices located throughout Alabama and interviews with office managers or responsible personnel in these offices, (3) postrelease interviews of 16 MDT trainees which had already been accomplished in connection with EMLC Objective 3, and (4) additional telephone interviews with 10 of those 16 MDT trainees.

Results showed that the ES Draper Extension Office had placed 18 (32%) of the 56 MDT trainees in training-related jobs; 14 (25%) of them reported to work and 7 (13%) were still employed on those initial jobs at the time of the study. The 13 ES field offices placed 5 (12%) of the 41 MDT trainees released to their areas in training-related jobs; no follow-up data exist to indicate whether or not they are still employed.

Introduction

EMLC Objective 3 evaluation

Concern for training- related placement

Under Phase I, Objective 3, the EMLC at Draper Correctional Center began an analysis of the effectiveness of a manpower program for prisoners operated under guidelines set forth by Section 251 of amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act.¹

The EMLC's Objective 3 commitment to overall evaluation of 251 program effectiveness leads logically to a vital concern with the rate of training-related placement of 251 trainees. Since a trainee's eventual employment in a training-related job is one of the major criteria used by the various agencies involved in MDT program operation to measure program effectiveness, the EMLC Objective 3 questionnaires included specific items which would determine not only the training-related placement rate of 251 trainees but also some of the factors which appear to affect it.

In gathering definitive data on 150 prisoners (experimental Ss) trained in a 251 project and 100 prisoners (control Ss) who applied for but did not receive training (to compare trainees' postrelease employment experience with those of nontrainees), the EMLC discovered that the rate of initial training-related placement was significantly below the rate achieved by earlier manpower programs for prisoners² and equally below the rate achieved by the Alabama Employment Service in placing other disadvantaged persons trained in manpower programs.³

¹An operational difference between earlier manpower programs for prisoners (known as experimental-demonstration, or E&D, projects) and present projects led to an important bearing on this study. Earlier E&D projects were designed to determine what problems a regular MDT program would encounter in serving the employability needs of prisoners. E&D project findings as regarded the special problems of training, developing jobs for, placing offenders and following them up were taken into consideration in amending the MDTA in 1966 to provide special programs for prisoners. By authority of that amendment, Section 251 MDTA, job development, placement and follow-up services became the responsibility of the Employment Service agency in states where prisoner training programs were in operation.

²In two earlier manpower training projects for prisoners--the Draper Project in Alabama and Project Challenge in Lorton, Virginia--a special job development placement effort achieved a high degree of success in initially placing trainees in training-related jobs. The Draper Project reported an 80% initial training-related placement rate from a follow-up study of 228 graduates. Project Challenge achieved a 72% initial training-related placement rate.

³Recent figures from the Alabama Manpower Development and Training Office indicate 74% training-related placement for 1,043 disadvantaged persons who received training in 73 regular MDT projects. Placement of graduates of regular MDT projects is also primarily the responsibility of Employment Service.

*Relationship of
employment and recidivism*

*Changing role of
Employment Service*

The EMLC was sufficiently concerned with this discovery to initiate a short-term, preliminary survey of 13 Employment Service offices in Alabama, 16 former 251 trainees, and the Employment Service counselor stationed at the project site. The objective of survey was to examine more closely the trainees' pre- and postrelease interactions with Employment Service, and thus to gather more comprehensive data than could be extracted from Employment Service follow-up forms. It was anticipated that this information could be helpful in checking the low training-related placement rate and in identifying some of the special problems encountered by Employment Service in placing prisoners in training-related jobs.

Review of Related Research

Many authorities in the field of corrections maintain that the ex-offender's chances of avoiding recidivism are contingent upon his ability to obtain and hold a job. Glaser (1964) suggests that not only can the probability of a released prisoner's making a successful life adjustment be increased by employment, but that a job also presents him with alternatives to a life of crime.

A correlation between the success of released offenders and their postrelease employment records was also discovered by Babst and Cowder (1967); they reported that parolees who secured better jobs than the ones they had held six months prior to incarceration had significantly lower rates of parole violation than those who were unemployed or worked sporadically. These and other studies, as well as a growing national concern for the seriousness of the crime problem, have led the Federal Government to develop and expand training programs in the area of corrections (Nixon, 1968).

Government programs, such as the Office of Economic Opportunity, are operating within the framework of "opportunity theory"; that is, by providing vocational training, basic education, and job-placement assistance, unemployment should be reduced and an improved standard of living attained. These improvements, it is anticipated, will result in a reduction of recidivism rates (Cloward & Ohlin, 1960).

However, beyond raising both the number being employed and the quality of their employment is the need for improving the methods by which prisoners and the jobs they seek are brought together. In the past nine years, the role of the public Employment Service system has changed to assume not only the responsibility of placing the disadvantaged on jobs but also of seeking them out and providing counseling and other services necessary for their

adjustment to a new environment. Prisoners, a special group of disadvantaged persons with special employment problems, require even further reorientation of Employment Service's mission.

Pownall (1969) has observed that a majority of placements for prisoners are made by family, friends, or former employers with no regard to institutional experience or vocational training. Family and friends, probably employed in unskilled or semi-skilled positions themselves, do not have, Pownall maintains, the experience and know-how to find employment commensurate with the skills the offender has gained through training, and former employers are most likely to offer the same type of employment the offender held before incarceration and training.

In Pownall's survey of 169 released offenders, 73% of the prearranged jobs were not related to institutional vocational training; only 13% were so related. Seventy-nine percent of the cases secured jobs through family, friends, former employers, or their own efforts. The data clearly point to a problem in job placement assistance:

"It seems clear that the institutions, the probation officers, and the Federal and state employment services are not providing adequate placement, or if they have such services, they are not making them readily available to the releasees (p.149)."

Survey Objective

It would seem, then, that the return on the considerable investment in time, effort, and funds being expended for training can be maximized by effective job placement upon release.

In view of the close working relationship between Employment Service and the EMLC, this survey was conducted to provide information that could be used for the mutual benefit of both and for the ultimate benefit of the offender who receives MDT training and requires related placement. Although limited to a preliminary survey, it was also anticipated that the data gathered would aid the EMLC in planning with the State Employment Service agency an in-depth study of the problems encountered by this agency in effectively placing ex-offender trainees in training-related jobs.

Method

With the assistance of the State Employment Service, the EMLC surveyed (1) 13 ES field offices located throughout the state which had had MDT (251) trainees

Data sources

released to their service areas, (2) the MDT (251) ES counselor stationed at the Draper project site, and (3) 16 former MDT (251) trainees.⁴

The records of the ES offices were made available to the EMLC, and interviewees in the offices clarified and expanded upon various aspects of their records. Data on the 16 trainees were derived from postrelease interviews with these trainees conducted under EMLC Objective 3. Supplemental data were collected on 10 of these 16 trainees through telephone interviews.

Data were gathered to (1) measure the number and results of MDT trainees' interactions with ES offices before and after release, and (2) determine the effectiveness being achieved by ES personnel in securing training-related jobs for MDT trainees.

Results and Discussion

ES Draper office placement

The results of the survey show that the rate of placing MDT trainees into training-related jobs is significantly lower than that achieved by other correctional MDT projects. Of a total population of 56 vocational trainees, 18 (32%) were placed by the ES extension office at Draper into training-related jobs, but only 14 (25%) reported to the job; 7 of these were still working on those jobs at the time of the survey.

13 field offices placement

The 13 ES field offices succeeded in placing and having five vocational trainees report to training-related jobs. No follow-up data from the offices exist to indicate whether these five trainees were still employed in their training-related jobs. The explanation for the low placement rate of those who had contact with Employment Service, either at Draper or at the other field offices, cannot be determined from these data; only a study of the State Employment Service operations and their experience in job placements could reveal this information.

While incarcerated at Draper Correctional Center, all MDT vocational trainees had at least one contact with the

⁴Each of the 13 ES field offices and the ES Counselor stationed at the Draper project were surveyed regarding all MDT (251) trainees who had received training prior to September 1, 1969 and, in the case of the field offices, had been released to their service areas. The beginning dates for these surveys were September 11, 1969, respectively; the surveys were completed by September 15, 1969. An interview guide attached to the EMLC Objective 3 Postrelease Interview Guide No. 1 was administered as part of the three-month postrelease interview phase of Objective 3 to MDT (251) trainees released prior to September 1, 1969. This part of the survey began September 8, 1969; only 16 trainees had been interviewed by the cutoff date of the survey, September 15, 1969.

*ES Draper office contacts
with trainees*

*13 ES field offices
contacts with trainees*

ES counselor stationed there. The initial contact consisted mainly of a description of placement services, discussion of results of vocational preference tests, and related information. Therefore, the most significant interview from the standpoint of getting a job was the second one; 95% of the vocational trainees did have at least a second contact with the State Employment Service personnel at Draper. Ninety-five percent of the trainees released from prison to the service areas of the 13 surveyed field offices needed training-related job placement because they either (1) did not have training-related jobs when they were released, or (2) did not stay on their prearranged training-related jobs. However, only 23 of these 39 eligible trainees had any contact with the 13 field offices.

This significantly lower contact rate of the ES field office, when compared to that of the ES extension office at Draper, can perhaps be attributed to the lack of direct follow-up. The follow-up procedure of the Employment Service consists of mailing interview forms and asking the releasees to complete and return them to the ES office at Draper. To date, data indicating the results of the Employment Service follow-up have been incomplete, and it appears that no contacts were initiated with the trainees for placement purposes.

*Postrelease
location areas*

The area of the state to which the trainee located after his release from prison appears to affect job placement. The results have shown that in very small and very large population areas, the rate of job placement (both nontraining- and training-related) is lower than that of other areas. Although job placement difficulties are expected in very small population areas, the question of why difficulty is encountered in very large population areas needs further study.

The validity of the data must be established if solid conclusions and recommendations can be drawn from this study. The question is: Are the number of cases surveyed sufficient to constitute a valid sample of the total number of MDT releasees eligible for inclusion in the study?

At the time the study was made, 77 MDT trainees had been released. Thus, the sample of 56 was 73% of the total group constituting a fairly high number. Moreover, the data were so statistically significant it would have required an extremely marked departure in ES procedure to affect the data to any significant degree. In summary, it appears that the sample is valid and the data can be accepted as reliable for definite conclusions to be drawn.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

Since training-related placement is a criterion by which program effectiveness is measured, the results of the survey appear to be quite important. *The survey indicates that Employment Service may not be aware of some of the special problems connected with placing prisoners in meaningful jobs, i.e., training-related jobs.* It seems that prisoners may constitute a special disadvantaged population, in view of the ES's comparatively higher placement rate (74%) for regular MDT trainees in Alabama.

Community resources

Previous projects have realized the magnitude of the task involved in meaningful employment for ex-offenders and have drawn from community resources to supplement the work of the responsible agencies. Project Challenge in Lorton, Virginia, for example, utilized the services of at least 14 community agencies in addition to numerous civic organizations. In Alabama, interested and knowledgeable persons are becoming more aware of the needs of prisoners generally and their postrelease problems specifically. A group of businessmen have found that with proper supervision a majority of ex-offenders made valuable employees; this group has met with the State Probation and Parole Supervisors in Montgomery in an attempt to have a closer relationship and be more helpful in working with ex-offenders. Also, the Rehabilitation Research Foundation is working through its Advisory Committee to establish a community volunteer program which will provide postrelease assistance to offenders. Though only in early organizational stages, these groups could provide eventual state-wide resources for Employment Service. *Through them, Employment Service could perhaps open up jobs which were once closed to offenders, develop new jobs, and maintain open channels to the specific and special needs of ex-offenders in their postrelease adjustment to the world of work.*

To achieve the ultimate goal of MDT programs—training-related placement and successful work experience—and to provide the greatest possible return on the costly investment in training, the Employment Service needs to devise special strategies in handling the employment problems peculiar to the offender population. *Therefore, the EMLC recommends that a study of the problems and variables related to placing ex-offenders in training-related jobs be conducted and that the study provide an analysis of the continuing employment needs of ex-offenders.*

The specific objectives of the proposed study would be those of:

- (1) Providing data on all MDT trainees and expanding the number of relevant variables studied to include, for example, income, job changes, types of jobs held, etc.

- (2) Making a functional analysis of ES interactions with and on behalf of MDT trainees (pre- and postrelease). Such an analysis would encompass evaluating the effectiveness of interactions and determining the best strategies to use in obtaining jobs for trainees before and after release, including factors which facilitate or handicap job development, placement, follow-up, upgrading, job retention, etc.
- (3) Analyzing the requirements--cost, personnel, training--to strengthen the role of ES in its area of responsibility.

Such a study will necessitate the cooperation and participation of all agencies and groups (including employers) involved or potentially involved in providing data or assisting the ex-offender in obtaining the ultimate goal of successful and productive employment. However, an initial strategy must be decided upon to carry out this proposed study. Since the EMLC and the ES both have a vital stake in this matter, it is recommended that the two organizations set up a joint experimental team that would (1) design and implement the study, and (2) involve other essential agencies (perhaps by establishing an advisory committee to the study that would include the Board of Pardons and Paroles, the State Education MDT Office, the Board of Corrections, etc.).

Additional Follow-up Data

During the preliminary survey, aimed specifically at the interactions of vocational trainees and Employment Service, additional data were gathered on MDT trainees who had received training in basic education only. While the method, materials, and sources of data were identical to those employed in gathering the data on vocational trainees, the data are, for the purpose of this report, supplemental and are treated as such. (A detailed description of the data on basic education trainees may be found in Appendix B.)

Of a total of 19 basic education trainees, the ES Draper extension office placed 3 trainees in unskilled jobs and 1 in further MDT training. Of 13 trainees who needed placement, the 13 ES field offices succeeded in placing 2 trainees in unskilled jobs. The rate of placement of basic education trainees in any type of job appears to be low, even when taking into account that training-related jobs were not being sought.

However, in the determination of placement success rates, there is the problem of selecting a criterion for judging postrelease success for trainees who were enrolled full-time

in basic education. These trainees have only a limited number of marketable skills, and very few employment positions exist for which these skills (reading, writing, etc.) would be considered an asset rather than merely a basic requirement.

One alternative to postrelease job placement for basic education trainees would be to enroll them in other MDT projects and trade schools or place them in on-the-job training programs after their release from prison. The likelihood of overcoming possible barriers to any academic or vocational placement of trainees would need further investigation.

References

- Babst, D., & Cowden, J. S. *Program research in correctional effectiveness, report #1*. Madison, Wisconsin: Department of Public Welfare, Division of Research, 1967.
- Cloward, R., & Ohlin, L. *Delinquency and opportunity*. Illinois: The Free Press, 1969.
- Glaser, D. *The effectiveness of a prison and parole system*. New York: Babbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1964.
- Kerr, W. A. *Labor turnover and its correlates*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 31, 1947, 366-71.
- McKee, J. M., Seay, D. M., Fain, A. A., Learning, C. B., & Terry, M. T. *The Draper project: final report*. Vol. I. Elmore, Alabama: Rehabilitation Research Foundation, 1968.
- National Committee for Children and Youth. *Final report of project challenge*. U. S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, 1968.
- Nixon, R. A. Federal manpower legislation (1961-66) with special reference to youth, works, youth and unemployment. In Herman, M., Sadofsky, S., Rosenbert, B. (eds.), *Work, youth and unemployment*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1968.
- Pownall, G. A. *Employment problems of released prisoners*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, 1969.

APPENDIX A
METHOD AND RESULTS

METHOD

Sources of Data

The data for the survey were derived from four sources:

1. Alabama Employment Service's Draper extension office records of 56 inmates who had received vocational training
2. Records of a sample of 13 Alabama Employment Service's field offices which had had 41 vocational trainees (73% of this survey group) released to their service areas
3. Postrelease interviews of 16 vocational trainees
4. Telephone interviews of 10 of the above 16 vocational trainees

ES Draper extension office. The ES counselor located at Draper Correctional Center was interviewed for the survey. He had been responsible for arranging employment for the 56 vocational trainees before they were released. The EMLC also had access to the ES records on the 56 trainees.

ES field offices. Forty-one vocational trainees had been released within the service areas of 13 ES field offices located in Albertville, Anniston, Birmingham, Fort Payne, Gadsden, Huntsville, Mobile, Montgomery, Sheffield, Selma, Sylacauga, Troy, and Tuscaloosa. Personnel in these offices were interviewed and their records were made available to the EMLC.

Postrelease interviews. Only 16 vocational trainees had received their first postrelease follow-up interview in connection with EMLC Objective 3. (Of the remaining 77 trainees released to date, 9 were basic education trainees, 20 trainees had relocated to an out-of-state area, 5 trainees were "missing," and the projected time of the first follow-up interview of the remaining 27 trainees was beyond the cutoff date-September 15, 1969--of the data-gathering period used in this survey. Pertinent data obtained from the follow-up interviews of these 16 trainees were incorporated into the present survey.

Telephone interviews. Ten of the 16 trainees who had received follow-up interviews in connection with EMLC Objective 3 were contacted by telephone for additional information. (Although this method discriminated against those trainees without telephones, the data derived were only supplemental in nature.)

Materials

Four instruments were employed to collect data:

1. First postrelease follow-up interview designed for EMLC Objective 3

2. Job Placement Survey interview guide administered to the MDT ES counselor at Draper
3. Job Placement Survey interview guide administered to 13 ES field office managers or other personnel responsible for the placement of 251 trainees
4. Interview guide administered to released trainees by telephone

Forms (see Appendix C) which were used to gather data from ES were primarily designed to record specific behavioral events, such as number and type of contacts between trainees and ES personnel, types of jobs trainees were interviewed for, etc. Opinions and attitudes were kept to a minimum. Each of the experimental sub-populations surveyed had a similar interview form.

Procedure

Data from the first postrelease survey of trainees were on hand, and it was only a simple procedure to glean the relevant items from the questionnaires.

Personal interviews conducted with the State Employment Service counselor at Draper and the managers of various offices mainly centered on recording data from their records which they are required by Alabama law to keep. Interviewees in these two sub-populations served to clarify and expand upon various aspects of their records.

Direct interviews with 10 trainees were conducted over the telephone in the interest of time. Most of the interviews were carried out during the evening hours since a majority of these trainees were employed during the daytime.

No major problems were encountered during the process of gathering data, and all Sss contacted were cooperative and amenable to being interviewed.

RESULTS

Survey of the Alabama Employment Service

Results of both the ES extension office located at Draper and the 13 other ES field offices have been combined in this section.

General trends and interview results. Table 1 gives the general trends regarding the number, types, and results of interviews between ES and individual trainees.

The data of Table 1 show that the ES extension office at Draper, in comparison with the 13 ES field offices, contacted a significantly higher percentage of trainees needing jobs (100% as opposed to 59%), had a significantly higher percentage of trainees initiating contacts with them (75% as compared to 31%), and had a significantly higher percentage of those trainees receiving job offers receive training-related job offers (72% as compared to 54%).

ES interviews with trainees on parole. Because a substantial number of trainees were released on parole, data on these trainees were analyzed separately and are shown in Table 2.

The results from the ES extension office at Draper showed that trainees being released on parole did receive a significantly higher number of interviews arranged, interviews attended, and job offers than did those trainees not on parole.

Vocational fields and placement in training- and nontraining-related jobs. Table 3 discloses the number of trainees in each of the vocational fields and the number of trainees placed in training- and nontraining-related jobs.

Ninety percent of the training-related job placements achieved by the ES extension office at Draper were in the vocational fields of auto service station mechanic attendant (ASSMA), refrigeration, and welding; the only significant job placement success the 13 ES field offices achieved was with the welding trainees.

Job placement in various state localities. Another area of data investigation was locality of the state to which trainees were released. Results of this inquiry may be found in Table 4.

These results show that, in general, the number of job placements in "very small" and "large" populations areas were significantly lower than in "small" and "medium" population areas.

Postrelease Interview

Sixteen trainees were interviewed following their release from prison.

Sources for postrelease job placement. Of the 16 trainees interviewed following their release from prison, 4 reported having used the Employment Service, 8 had used their own initiative, and 4 had jobs located for them by their relatives.

Prearranged job placement. Ten trainees had jobs arranged for them by various people and agencies before their release from prison. Six of the trainees reported to their prearranged jobs. The range of time spent working at these prearranged jobs was 4 to 18 weeks with the average time spent working at these jobs being 9.7 weeks. Of the 6 jobs that trainees had arranged for them, 4 were training-related--2 in welding and 2 in ASSMA. Only 1 of these training-related jobs had been arranged by Employment Service.

Of the 10 trainees who had prearranged jobs, 3 have "quit": 1 for lack of transportation and 2 to accept better job offers. Two trainees were laid off: 1 because of a business recession and 1 due to physical injury. Only 1 trainee has returned to prison.

Overall employment history. All 16 trainees held jobs immediately after their release from prison; five vocational trainees held jobs which were training-related; 2 in ASSMA and 3 in welding; 16 trainees held and left 25 different jobs.

The range of time spent working at these jobs was 1 to 18 weeks with an average of 6.8 weeks. (Six of the trainees held 9 training-related jobs.) Eleven vocational trainees are presently employed; 3 have training-related jobs--2 in ASSMS and 1 in welding.

Average weekly earnings. The average weekly earnings from all jobs previously held and left was \$61. The 3 trainees presently working at training-related jobs are earning an average of \$95 weekly, and the 8 trainees presently working at nontraining-related jobs are earning an average of \$64 weekly.

Average amount of time employed. Since their release from prison, trainees have been employed 73% of the time.

Telephone Survey of Released Trainees

Ten trainees were contacted by telephone.

Trainee interaction with the 13 ES field offices. Table 5 presents the results from the telephone survey of 10 released trainees' interactions with the 13 ES field offices.

TABLE 1

Number, Types, and Results of Interviews
between Trainees and Employment Service

Item	Draper ES office	13 ES field offices
Trainees	56	41
Needing job placement	56	39
Having contact with ES	56	23
Face-to-face contacts	195	33
Telephone contacts	0	15
Mail contacts	0	2
Trainees initiating contacts	42	12
Contacts initiated by trainees	86	50
Having job interviews arranged for them	29	20
Attending job interviews	28	16
Receiving job offers	25	13
Receiving training-related job offers	18	7
Reporting to training-related jobs	14	5
Presently working at arranged training-related jobs	7	No data
Still in contact with ES	8	6

TABLE 2

**Number, Types, and Results of Interviews between
Trainees on Parole and Employment Service**

Item	Draper ES office	13 ES field offices
Trainees	56	41
Trainees on parole	62.5%	54%
Arranged job interviews received by parolees	76%	60%
Job interviews attended by parolees	78.5%	56%
Job offers received by parolees	75%	54%
Training-related job offers received by parolees	66.6%	29%

TABLE 3

**Number of Trainees in Vocational Fields and Number of Trainees
Placed in Training and Nontraining-Related Jobs**

Vocation	Total No. of trainees		Total No. of trainees placed		No. of trainees placed in training-related jobs	
	Draper ES	13 ES field offices	Draper ES	13 ES field offices	Draper ES	13 ES field offices
ASSMA	18	14	7	2	6	1
Refrigeration	7	3	6	1	5	0
Welding	17	14	9	6	6	5
Sign writing	7	6	3	2	1	1
Barbering	7	4	1	2	0	0

TABLE 4

**Size of Population and Job Placement Success
with Vocational Trainees by Employment Service**

Size of population of area	Total No. of trainees		Total No. of trainees placed		Total No. of trainees placed in training-related jobs	
	Draper ES	13 ES field offices	Draper ES	13 ES field offices	Draper ES	13 ES field offices
Very small ($X \leq 10,000$)	14	1	5	1	2	0
Small ($10,000 < X \leq 50,000$)	10	8	5	3	3	2
Medium ($50,000 < X \leq 200,000$)	16	13	10	7	9	4
Large ($200,000 < X$)	16	11	5	2	4	1

TABLE 5

**Results of 10 Trainees' Interactions with the
13 Employment Service Field Offices**

Item	No. of Trainees
Trainees	10
Needing placement	7
Contacts with Employment Service field offices	5
Job interviews	3
Receiving job offers	3
Receiving training-related job offers	1

APPENDIX B

ADDITIONAL FOLLOW-UP DATA: A SURVEY OF BASIC EDUCATION TRAINEES' INTERACTIONS WITH EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

ADDITIONAL FOLLOW-UP DATA: A SURVEY OF BASIC EDUCATION TRAINEES' INTERACTIONS WITH EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

During the process of gathering data on vocational trainees' interactions with Employment Service, like data were also gathered on MDT trainees who had had training in basic education only. The following describes the survey:

METHOD

Sources of Data.

The data on basic education trainees were derived from four sources:

1. ES extension office (at Draper) records of 19 inmates who had received basic education training only
2. Records of a sample of 13 of ES's field offices which had had 13 basic education trainees (69% of this survey group) released within their service areas
3. Postrelease interviews of 9 basic education trainees
4. Telephone interviews of 4 of the above 9 basic education trainees

ES extension office at Draper. The ES counselor located at Draper Correctional Center was interviewed for the survey. He was responsible for arranging employment for 19 basic education trainees before they were released. The EMLC also had access to the ES records of the 19 trainees.

ES field offices. Thirteen basic education trainees had been released within the service areas of 13 ES field offices located in Albertville, Anniston, Selma, Sylacauga, Troy, and Tuscaloosa. Personnel in these offices were interviewed and their records were made available to the EMLC.

Postrelease interviews. Only 9 basic education trainees had received their first postrelease follow-up interview in connection with EMLC Objective 3. (Of the remaining 77 trainees released to date, 16 were vocational trainees, 20 trainees had relocated to an out-of-state area, 5 trainees were "missing", and the projected time of the first follow-up interview of the remaining 27 trainees was beyond the cutoff date--September 15, 1969--of the data-gathering period used in this survey.) Pertinent data obtained from the follow-up interviews of these 9 trainees was incorporated into the present survey.

Telephone interviews. Four of the 9 trainees who had received follow-up interviews in connection with EMLC Objective 3 were contacted by telephone for additional information. (Although this method discriminated against those trainees without telephones, the data derived were only supplemental in nature.)

Materials

Four instruments were employed to collect data;

1. First postrelease follow-up interview guide designed for EMLC Objective 3.
2. Job Placement Survey interview guide administered to MDT ES counselor at Draper.
3. Job Placement Survey interview guide administered to 13 ES field office managers or other personnel responsible for the placement of 251 trainees.
4. Interview guide administered to released trainees by telephone.

Forms (see Appendix C) which were used to gather data from ES were primarily designed to record specific behavioral events, such as number and type of contacts between trainees and ES personnel, types of jobs trainees were interviewed for, etc. Opinions and attitudes were kept to a minimum. Each of the experimental sub-populations surveyed had a similar interview form.

Procedure

Data from the first postrelease survey of trainees were on hand, and it was only a simple procedure to glean the relevant items from the questionnaires.

Personal interviews conducted with the ES counselor at Draper and the managers of the various field offices mainly centered on recording data from their records which they are required by Alabama law to keep. Interviewees in these two sub-populations served to clarify and expand upon various aspects of their records.

In the interest of time, direct interviews with 4 trainees were conducted over the telephone. Most of the interviews were carried out during the evening hours since a majority of these trainees were employed during the daytime.

No major problems were encountered during the process of gathering data and all Ss contacted were cooperative and amenable to being interviewed.

RESULTS

Survey of the Alabama Employment Service

Results of both the ES extension office located at Draper and the 13 other ES field offices have been combined in this section.

General trends and interview results. Table 1 gives the general trends regarding the number, types, and results of interviews between ES and individual trainees.

The data of Table 1 show that the ES extension office at Draper, in comparison with the 13 field offices, contacted a significantly higher percentage of basic education trainees needing jobs (100% as compared to 39%), had a significantly higher percentage of trainees initiating contacts with them (53% as compared to 8%), and had a significantly higher percentage of those trainees receiving job offers receive training-related job offers (25% as compared to none).

ES interviews with trainees on parole. Because a substantial number of trainees were released on parole, data on these trainees were analyzed separately and are shown in Table 2.

The results from the ES extension office at Draper showed that trainees being released on parole did receive a significantly higher number of interviews arranged, interviews attended, and job offers than did those trainees not on parole.

The 13 ES field offices arranged a significantly higher number of job interviews for basic education trainees but these same trainees received no job offers whatever.

Placement in training and nontraining-related jobs. Of a total of 19 basic education trainees needing placement, the ES Draper extension office placed 3 (16%) in nontraining-related jobs and 1 (5%) in further MDT training. The 13 ES field offices placed 2 trainees (15%) in nontraining-related jobs out of 13 trainees who needed placement. None were placed in training-related jobs or in further MDT training.

Postrelease Interview

Nine trainees were interviewed following their release from prison.

Sources for postrelease job placement. Of the 9 trainees interviewed following their release from prison, 3 reported having used Employment Service, 3 had used their own initiative, and 2 had jobs located for them by their relatives; only 1 trainee had used the services of a private employment agency.

Prearranged job placement. Seven trainees had jobs arranged for them by various people and agencies before their release from prison; 6 of them reported to their prearranged jobs. The range of time spent working at these prearranged jobs was 8 to 31 weeks with the average time spent working at these jobs being 14.5 weeks.

Of the 6 trainees who had prearranged jobs, 3 have "quit": 2 because of low pay, and 1 returned to prison.

Overall employment history. The following statistics describe the overall employment history of the 9 trainees interviewed. All 9 trainees held jobs immediately after their release from prison; 6 trainees held and left 10 different jobs. One trainee is in further MDT training.

The range of time spent working at these jobs was 4 to 18 weeks with an average of 10.1 weeks.

Average weekly earnings. The average weekly earnings from all jobs previously held and left was \$77. Five basic education trainees presently employed are earning an average of \$91 weekly.

Average amount of time employed. Since their release from prison, trainees have been employed 88% of the time.

Telephone Survey of Released Trainees

Four trainees were contacted by telephone.

Trainee interaction with the 13 field offices. Table 3 presents the results from the telephone survey of the 4 released trainees' interactions with the 13 ES field offices.

TABLE 1

Number, Types, and Results of Interviews
between Trainees and Employment Service

Item	Draper ES office	13 ES field offices
Trainees	19	13
Needing job placement	19	13
Having contact with ES	19	5
Face-to-face contacts	54	7
Telephone contacts	0	0
Mail contacts	0	0
Trainees initiating contacts	10	1
Contacts initiated by trainees	20	7
Having job interviews arranged for them	5	4
Attending job interviews	4	3
Receiving job offers	4	2
Receiving training-related job offers	1	0
Reporting to training-related jobs	1	0
Presently working at arranged training-related jobs	0	0
Still in contact with ES	3	0

TABLE 2

Number, Types, and Results of Interviews between
Trainees on Parole and Employment Service

Item	Draper ES office	13 ES field offices
Trainees	19	13
Trainees on parole	42%	31%
Arranged job interviews received by parolees	80%	50%
Job interviews attended by parolees	75%	33%
Job offers received by parolees	75%	0%
Training-related job offers received by parolees	100%	0%

TABLE 3

Results of Four Trainees' Interactions with the
13 Employment Service Field Offices

Item	No. of Trainees
Trainees	4
Needing placement	4
Contacts with Employment Service field offices	2
Job interviews	0
Receiving job offers	0
Receiving training-related job offers	0

APPENDIX C
INSTRUMENTS

EML OBJECTIVE # 3
JOB PLACEMENT SURVEY
(FOR TRAINEES)

1. Were you interviewed by the employment service counselor before you left prison? 1. Yes ____

2. No ____

2. If not, why? 1. _____

2. Does not apply ____

3. How many times have you contacted the State Employment field office since your release? ____ times

4. How many times has the state employment field office contacted you since your release? ____ times

5. How many job interviews did the State Employment field office arrange for you? ____ interviews

6. How many of these arranged job interviews did you actually have with the employers? ____ job interviews

7. List the type of jobs offered as a result of these interviews, and why you did not accept them?

Type of Job

Reason

Can you think of anything that the State Employment field office can do to help you? 1. Yes _____

2. No ____

EML OBJECTIVE #13
JOB PLACEMENT SURVEY
(FOR 251 EMPLOYMENT SERVICE COUNSELOR)

1. How many contacts have the personnel in your office had with _____
_____?
 1. Face to face _____
 2. Phone _____
 3. Other _____
2. How many of these contacts were instituted by him? _____ contacts
3. How many job interviews did you arrange for him? _____ interviews
4. How many job interviews did he actually have? _____ interviews
5. What type of jobs were the interviews for and what were the results of those interviews?

<u>Dates</u>	<u>Type of Job</u>	<u>Disposition of Interview</u>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

6. Are you currently in contact with him?
 1. Yes _____
 2. No _____
7. If this trainee came in to see you before his release with plans to accept a non-training related job, What did you do? _____

**EMLC OBJECTIVE #3
JOB PLACEMENT SURVEY
(FOR STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE PERSONNEL)**

1. How many contacts have the personnel in your office had with _____
_____?

1. Face-to-face _____

2. Telephone _____

3. Other _____

2. How many of these contacts were instituted by _____?
_____ contacts

3. How many job interviews did you arrange for him? _____ interviews

4. How many job interviews did he actually have? _____ interviews

5. What type of jobs were the interviews for and what were the results of those interviews?

Dates

Type of job

Disposition of interview

6. Are you currently in contact with him? 1. Yes _____

2. No _____

QUESTIONS USED FROM THE POST-RELEASE INTERVIEW GUIDE #1
OF THE
EMLC OBJECTIVE #3

32. Was a job arranged for you at the time of your release?

1. No
2. Yes, and I took it
3. Yes, and I did not take it

33. If you had a job arranged for you at the time of release, how long did you work on that job?

1. _____ months
2. Does not apply

34. What happened with your arranged job?

1. Quit
2. Laid off
3. Discharged
4. Returned to custody
5. Not terminated
6. Does not apply

35. Reason for being fired from the arranged job:

1. Didn't appear interested to employer
2. Unable to get along with employer
3. Unable to fill duties adequately
4. Unable to get along with fellow employees
5. Other (specify) _____

6. Does not apply _____

36. Reason for quitting arranged job:

1. Pay too low
2. Secured better job
3. Not interested in this specific work
4. Returned to custody
5. Other (specify) _____

6. Does not apply _____

37. If you did not accept the job arranged for you, give the reason.

1. Employment refused because pay less than expected
2. Employment refused because working conditions less favorable than expected
3. Better job available
4. Job was filled by someone else
5. Employer decided not to hire him
6. Other (specify) _____

7. Does not apply _____

38. List the length of employment, type of jobs, and pay received for each of the jobs you have held and left since your release.

	<u>Length of Employment</u>	<u>Type of Job</u>	<u>MDTA Training Used</u>	<u>Beginning Salary</u>	<u>Salary at Termination</u>
1.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

39. Total income since release from prison: \$ _____

40. How many weeks (total) have you worked since leaving prison?

1. Number of weeks full-time: _____
2. Number of weeks part-time: _____ at _____ hours per week

41. How were these jobs obtained? (Specify which job(s) was obtained by the means indicated.)

1. Own initiative _____
2. MDTA project or staff _____
3. Relatives _____
4. Friends _____
5. State Employment Service _____
6. Private employment agencies _____

42. Are you working now?

1. Employed full-time (_____ hours per day)
2. Employed part-time (_____ hours per week)
3. Not working but looking for work
4. Not working and not looking for work for the following reason:
 - a. Illness
 - b. In school
 - c. Other (specify) _____

43. What type of work do you now do and what is your weekly salary?

1. Job: _____
Weekly salary: _____
Number of hours per week: _____

2. Does not apply

44. Is this job related to your MDTA training?

1. Yes (specify) _____

2. No

ERIC Clearinghouse

MAR 14 1972

on Adult Education