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Abstract

This study examined the extent to which the California Department of Correctional (CDC) vocational education program uses follow-up studies as a model to assess the effectiveness of their correctional vocational education system. This model determines if a post release prisoner with technical skills would lower the recidivism rate. Post released parolees responded to demographic questions that solicited data to examine the extent of their vocational education training. The CDC vocational education effectiveness was measured to indicate if programs prepared the prisoner for successful employment upon their release from imprisonment. A standardized deviation frequency and percentage determined the sample used for quantitative comparison of the properties between the demographics of post-released parolees, selective group of employers, and parole agents. There were no significant differences found among employers, parole agents, and post-released parolees. A mean and median score was illustrated in the findings. It was recommended that the post release prison remand the parolee to the workforce in the community transition program; and that studies on follow-up systems need to be further explored in the CDC vocational education programs.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Background

The California Department of Corrections (CDC) has a high recidivism rate according to reports from the (Institution and Parole Population and Movements Summary, [IPPMS], 1993). In 1993, the CDC reported a prison population of 109,240 incarcerated males and females behind bars. Dickover, Maynard & Painter (1969) stated "As a solution, correctional institutions and the CDC in particular have implemented extensive systems of vocational training to develop the needed job skill" (p.1). According to R. Dickover (personal communication, April 5, 1994) "It's a little ironic that there has been very little research done by the CDC if not any."

According to (IPPMS, 1993) CDC offers 65 vocational education programs at their correctional institutions. The purpose of this study was to develop a model to assess the effectiveness of the vocational training programs that are being offered at the CDC penal institutions. Research was also focused on those ex-felons who have been paroled and have received their vocational training at the CDC institutions. For the purpose of identifying the vocational training which may or may not prepare prisoners for the transition from the prison to the workforce.

In order to determine whether it was necessary to identify existing correctional vocational training programs. It was vital to proceed by examining literature reviews
comparable to follow-up studies on correctional vocational education program. There was a great number of parolees who have completed vocational / technical training during their incarceration. According to (IPPMS, 1993) it costs $21,360 per year on average to house a prisoner. The question raises as to what extent is the percentage of the per prison costs in vocational training and follow up on trainees upon release. The CDC stated that 1-9% of their budget goes towards vocational education and 2.5% was work related. Based upon this information this study will attempt to research the discrepancies that have affected the correctional vocational education programs at the CDC institutions.

The vocational programs at the CDC are in apparent need of a comprehensive follow-up system for those who have taken and completed the vocational education programs. An apparent need is to develop a prison for work transition that would enable staff to track ex-felons and determine whether or not the vocational / technical training affects recidivism. According to Anderson (1987), "vocational completers have a higher employment rate and fewer arrests than vocational non-completers across the 12 month tracking period" (p.6). Another study by Black, Turner & Williams (1993) indicated that a tracking and follow-up system is a crucial part of the Southeastern Illinois College Correctional Educational Division (SIC-CED) program. As indicated by SIC-CED, ex-felons upon release from prison, formed a bond with mentors and staff and continued to communicate for a long time after being released from imprisonment.

The major focus of this study was to 1) assess the effectiveness of the follow-up study of the correctional vocational education program at the CDC institutions; and, 2) develop a
model that will act as a guide for follow-up studies on parolees, in order to determine if the training they completed will enable them to obtain meaningful employment upon release from imprisonment.

According to (IPPMS, 1993) there was a total of 84,777 ex-felons paroled during the 1992-93 year period, from those figures 13,031 were released “at large.” Because of the high numbers of parole reported it is an indication that the present system that had been implemented by the CDC Parole and Community Services Division need further expansion. One must assume that there are deficiencies within the CDC vocational education programs. Evidence to support that conclusion is the high recidivism rate that has been experienced / reported by the vocational trained parolees. Assessing the CDC follow-up and tracking system was deemed necessary to complete this study.

Black et al. (1993) found that the SIC-CED have scientifically proven that a follow-up system for the vocational completers was an important part of the success of their correctional vocational education programs. Therefore, the prison to workforce transition was not necessary but a necessity, that is to enhance the quality of the vocational education program in order to reduce the recidivism rate.

**Nature of Problems**

The majority of the vocational education graduates from the CDC who were released from prison with vocational / technical training are returning to prison at an alarming rate. According to reports from the California Department of Corrections (1993) a high percentage
of those released from the prison system return. The CDC indicated that there were sixty-five vocational educational programs throughout the state of California prisons. According to another study by Ryan and Woodard (1987) the CDC served 4,016 prisoners who were enrolled during that time span.

With all of these vocational programs that are offered together with the present reported rate of recidivism it is fair to question the existence of those correctional vocational education programs in the California Department of Corrections prison system. "The After Prisons" by Black et al. (1993) stated that "an extremely important process within the Southern Illinois College Correctional Educational Division (SIC-CED) programming is the tracking and follow-up of ex offenders" (p.12). It was stated that the SIC-CED bond between the prisoner and staff is important because it allows their staff to follow-up on the vocational completers. This relationship has inevitably contributed to the success of the SIC-CED vocational education program. Therefore, in order for the California Department of Corrections to implement this concept it is essential that an open line of communication be established and prolonged after the prisoner has been released from prison. Not since 1969, has the CDC completed a follow-up study on vocational education completers to determine whether or not their vocational education programs are effectively reducing recidivism or whether the vocational education completers were a major factor in reducing the overall recidivism rate.

Significance of the Problem

Black et al. (1993) suggested that correctional vocational education programs offered
at the institutions can play a significant role that vastly improve the transition for prisoners to
the workforce. According to Dickover et al. (1969) "The result has been that the vocational
training programs elsewhere and in the California Department of Corrections have been
limited in their effectiveness" (p. 1).

Therefore, the major concern for the CDC was that the majority of their vocational
correctional education completers who were paroled are returning to prison at a rate even
higher than before. This data clearly outlines something terribly inappropriate with the present
administration of the penal system at CDC institutions. Dickover et al. (1994) indicated that a
follow-up system for CDC correctional education program has not been completed since
1969. This is an indication of the symptoms that have affected the CDC and their need of a
follow-up system is imperative since the last follow-up studies were completed.

According to Black et al. (1993) in reference to SIC-CED and JTPA, vocational
education and employability skills were certainly an important component of the transition
process, and that other areas of the prisoners life should be taken into consideration as well.

The CDC is in need of a uniform system in order to develop an innovative tracking
system or follow-up for their vocational education completers. The CDC will need to assess
their vocational educational programs more accurately because it would allow them to make
changes to their existing system. It will provide an aid to reduce the recidivism rate among
parolees in the near future. Anderson (1993) reported that the former Chief Justice Warren
Burger indicated that education at the correctional institution is an essential element of the
prison system as he stated; "It is common sense and in society's collective self-interest that the criminal justice system makes sure that not one should leave the prison without at least being able to read, write, do basic arithmetic and be trained in a marketable skill" (p.3).

Statement of Problem

The CDC has not completed a study on the correctional vocational education programs since 1969. Therefore, it is very difficult to develop a model to assess the effectiveness of their vocational programs based upon old data. This researcher's intention was to inquire, "why hasn't the CDC developed a model on a follow-up system?"

The CDC appears to have experienced a lack of uniformity and conflicting information related to their follow-up system. It was indicated by one of the CDC institutions program administrators (anonymous personal communication, February 9, 1994) "... their program has had no tracking or follow-up system on record." However, Dickover (1994) stated that there was a follow-up study completed in 1969.

Furthermore, the most obvious problem that the CDC has experienced was the lack of updated follow-up study on ex-felons who have completed vocational education training at the institutions. The CDC needs to develop an updated follow-up study that would serve as a base for vocational education completers and therefore will add credibility to correctional vocational programs. In addition, the CDC would attract numerous employers who have and will hire parolees.
The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research was to develop a model to assess the effectiveness of the follow-up study of correctional vocational education programs offered at the California Department of Corrections Penal Institutions. The intent of this work was to identify whether or not correctional vocational completers who were paroled with a skill are able to reduce the recidivism rate.

It should be noted that the data compiled from this study will assist the vocational instructors as well as program administrators to evaluate their current vocational education program, therefore improving training programs in the near future.

Research Questions Guiding the Study

The fundamental research questions under investigation in this study provide verification as to why the California Department of Corrections needs to implement a follow-up system regarding their correctional vocational completers. To what extent is a follow-up system most required and least required by the CDC penal institutions? These questions were further explored.

Limitations

There were limited references found on follow-up studies completed in the CDC vocational education programs. In addition, the retrieval of statistical data was not available to meet research deadlines.
Therefore, the theoretical framework that was designed for this specific population was essentially developed by: Black et al. (1993), Hackett (1987), Dickover et al. (1969). Thus, the sample populations were limited to a selected group of employers who hire parolees and parolees at the CDC Parole and Community Services Division and parole agents.

Hackett's study (cited in Dickover, Maynard and Painter, 1969)
Definitions:

**Adult Basic Education (ABE):** Ryan et al. (1982) "Adult basic education includes instruction designed to improve literacy, linguistic, and numeracy skills of those who are functionally illiterate and unprepared for implementing the responsibilities of adults while incarcerated" (p. 3).

**California Department of Corrections (CDC):** The prison institutions in the state of California (Dickover, Maynard, William 1968, p. 2).

**Correctional education (CE):** Ryan (1982) "Is the part of the total correctional process of changing the behavior of the offenders through purposeful contrived learning experiences and learning environment. Correctional education seeks to develop or change the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values of offenders" (p. 2).

**Hard money:** Funding for a program that is continuing over a period of time.

**Pre-released Parolee:** Are prisoners who have been or are in the process of being classified as parolees.

**Post-release Parolee:** Are parolees who have been released and are under specific conditions of parole.

**Recidivism:** The re-incarceration of ex-felons to the prison system according to (Davis and Chown, 1986, p. 1).

**Secondary/General Education Development:** Ryan (1982) "Secondary education is for those who are functioning at the secondary level of achievement. These programs may be provided through regular high school diploma courses, but more commonly they are provided
in correctional institutions through the GED preparation programs designed to prepare individuals for taking and passing the General Equivalency Examination" (p. 2).

*Vocational education:* Day et al. (1982) "As the instruction offered within correctional systems to enable offenders to be employment ready upon their return to the free society" (p. 11). It entailed obtaining the fundamental pre-requisite for vocational training in mathematics, reading, writing, and a variety of job preparedness training, including learning good work ethics and basic living skills.
Chapter Two

Literature Review

Introduction

The literature that were reviewed by this researcher reveals that assessing the CDC correctional vocational education programs was critical to the function of their system. Therefore, it was found that a follow-up study was an effective vehicle in order to determine quality of the CDC vocational education programs. It was indicated that other correctional vocational education programs have identified specific barriers that have limited the effectiveness of their follow-up programs.

However, it has been indicated that a follow-up system enables correctional institutions to determine what has worked and what is not working. It is an essential component for correctional vocational education programs, because it allows correctional institutions such as the CDC to modify their existing program as needed. Black et al. (1993) identified specific deficiencies that were missing from their correctional vocational education programs. That is, a five year longitudinal follow-up study for ex-felons. Studies revealed that there were other barriers that affected the vocational completers ability to adjust from the prison transition to workforce that needs further exploration.

Furthermore, without a follow-up system the task of assessing the CDC correctional vocational education programs would not be meaningful. Therefore, effective correctional vocational education programs are able to design a system to follow-up on their graduates that would provide their programs with a model to follow. In order to aid the readers to
comprehend the nature of a follow-up system, a review of the CDC vocational education programs was required to complete this assessment.

**Philosophical Foundation of Correctional Vocational Education**

The origin of correctional education (CE) stems from the need to bring about prison reforms which has been a recurrent theme since CE was instituted in the United States. Day and McCane (1982), outlined a 1978 study by Silberman which found that except for one short period near the turn of the nineteenth century," there has never been a time when the correctional system did not appear to be in need of a rapid and substantial change" (p. 5). However, the need for prison reform has remained, creating a broad uncertainty; because authors have disagreed philosophically regarding their views about the purpose and goals of incarceration. The authors disagreement was due to what they have experienced in the past.

Rudousky, Borstein and Koren (1977) outlined, that they disagreed with the goals of incarceration because it relies heavily on the provision of vocational training. Rudousky et al. (1977) indicated that vocational education is not a constitutional right, but is a privilege provided to inmates by their local, State, and Federal government. Furthermore, it was important that this researcher investigate the vehicle that created the philosophical arguments, as it was necessary that the philosophy of correctional vocational education be examined in order to determine the rationale of this study. In order to understand the process of this study, one should ask, what is the purpose for offering vocational education courses at the correctional institutions? Day et al. (1982) found that there were four eras that have been
identified by Scholars that will attempt to answer the purpose of offering vocational education
courses at the CDC institutions.

*Rudousky's, Borstein's and Koren's study (cited in Day and McCane, 1982).*
The question has contributed to the development of the vocational correctional education programs in the United States. Day et al. (1982), outlined that Barrens and Teeters (1959) Mcelvey (1972) Rothmans (1980) Tappan (1960) were the authors who contributed to the development "of the era of punishment and retribution, the era of restraint, the era of rehabilitation and the emerging era of reintegration" (p.3).

**Historical Movement in Correctional Vocational Education**

Rowh (1985) found that the history of correctional institutions offering vocational training stem as early as 1865, that was when the Weeks School of Vermont taught vocational education to felons for the purpose of rehabilitation. It should be noted however, that this primarily represents, the true reformatory in America, called the Elmira reformatory in Elmira, New York. It was developed in 1876, which was solely for inmates. Rowh et al. (1985) outlined by Allen and Simonsen (1985) found that the inmates were taught thirty-six different trades: "mechanical and free hand drawing, wood and metal-working, cardboard construction from work, cabinet making, and iron molding" (p. 3).

Rowh indicated (1992) that vocational education did not blossom in the prison system until the past decades. However, it experienced a major setback during the 1930's which was a result of the reconstruction period, caused by the transportation of produces that were manufactured at the prison "by industry supervised by Federal government." "This lack of emphasis prevailed until the 1960's, when renewed interest in vocational education surfaced" (p. 5).
Allen's and Simonsen's study (cited in Rowh, 1992).
Studies by Schlossman and others (1992) found that the 1970's and 1980's represented a critical period for vocational programs, whereas, questions concerning their effectiveness were contested and supported by different political ideas. During that same period, that was from the 1970's to the 1980's, it was concluded that the consensus for the political figures were informed that the notion of "treatment in corrections came to be seen as intellectually bankrupt" (p.12).

For the most part correctional education was neglected during the 1980's. It was noted that the consensus during the 1980's drifted further apart from the mainstream of the American thinking than any other period since the 1920's, therefore, this period was referred to as the "get-touch" policy.

Schlossman et al. (1992) stated that it was not until the late 1800's and even as late as the early part of the 1900's that the prison system decided to eliminate the reform policies, because it would have a drastic affect on the structure of the vocational correctional education programs. It should be noted that "corrections was not a financial burden on the local, state and federal government that is apparent in today's prison system" (p. 15). Schlossman et al. (1992) indicated that from the beginning of corrections, "vocational training in prisons were sold in value-laden ideological and as well as educational terms," that was the good guys versus bad guys" (p. 15).
Zebulon Brockway and the Elmira Reformatory

Schlossman et al. (1992) indicated that superintendent Zebulon Brockway of the Elmira Reformatory, who was a pioneer educator, had been overly represented by the literature. Schlossman et al. (1992) stated that he found that Brockway's contributions in the correctional vocational field were used as data source for correctional educators in this century. It was stated that Brockway's "work represented not triumphant first steps, but a false start toward more general correctional reform" (p. 18). Brockway was a "major icon" who was considered to be more of a significant contributor to the theories and practice of the modern corrections during 1876 and the 1900's than anyone else. Schlossman et al. (1992) indicated that his ideas may not have been original to Brockway, nevertheless, the credit goes to him because of the new standards that were set for correctional education in the U.S. prison institutions. It was also indicated that "we need to root Brockway firmly in the late nineteenth century, not in the late twentieth century" (p. 19).

Brockway's study (cited in Schlossman and others, 1992).
**Progressive Era of Prison Reform**

According to Schlossman et al. (1992) the Progressive era brought with it the declining period of vocational training. Therefore, near the end of the 1920's, the Elmira Reformatory had lost its credibility for maintaining a track record which was later earned by Brockway. The Progressive era was noticed for a brief period when vocational education was introduced. Thomas Osborne was the superintendent of Sing Song prison during 1910, however his efforts were recognized for that short period because of the contribution he made in correctional education programs.

The vocational education program in prisons has always been plagued by the absence of prison reform. Therefore, it affected the potential for those prisoners who had been trained in their vocation to seek employment. It was indicated that the Brockway prison program faced the similar problem over a century ago. It should be noted that during the progressive era "the champions of correctional education never tried to collect detailed or systematic data to examine whether institutional programs had helped inmates upon release from imprisonment" (p. 63).

**The Era of Punishment and Retribution**

The era of the American correctional education program stemmed from punishment and retribution. Day et al. (1982) found that historically, houses of corrections or "debtors prisons", as they were sometimes called, had little connection with either crime or criminals. Day et al. (1982), outlined a 1973 study by Nagel where they indicated that correctional
institutions were associated more with welfare and the economics of labor than with the administration of justice.

Studies by Day et al. (1982) found that Franks (1979) indicated that prior to and during the seventeenth century, correctional institutions were used to teach poor citizens helpful skills and to "...punish beggars, tramps and prostitutes" (p. 15). The criminals and poor citizens were confined side by side, in part to minimize the potential for violence. During that same period criminals were confined primarily on a pre-trial basis. After their trial, those who were found guilty suffered corporal punishment. Thieves were either executed or transferred to prison colonies. The consequences of choosing crime was that the punishment and retribution were the major goals as well as the turning point for those who were thinking about crime as a way of life.

American Correctional Vocational Education: The Era of Restraint

Day et al. (1982) stated that the American correctional systems era in its history was referred to as the era of restraint, according to a report study by Feldman (1974) and Nagel (1973). During this era, the whip and stockades were replaced by "hard labor", which resulted in exploitation of prisoners. Day et al. (1982), outlined a 1976 study by Rid when he stated that prisoners were often treated like slaves. Therefore, work was contracted with private industry and other governmental agencies, and was assigned as punishment for inmates. Prison reform commenced during the era of restraint, as this era introduced vocational training into the prison system. It was stated that the influence of
the Quaker theology, brought the Philadelphia Society which alleviated the mires of public prison reform. During that period in 1878 the first prison school in America was established at the Walnut Street Jail in Philadelphia.

Day et al. (1982), revealed by Barnes and Teeters (1959) and McElvey (1972) that inmates at this institution were provided with the opportunity to learn various skills, including "tailoring, weaving, and shoemaking" (p. 6). In 1825, the Boston Prison Discipline Society added academic instruction to religious training. In Maryland, formally sanctioned training programs were directed toward prison reform. A philosophy that affirmed the need for both religious and secular education and training was also adapted. The European idea of intermediate sentencing was also advocated by the national congress.

Day et al. (1982), outlined a study by Walker (1980) when he stated that the prisoners were expected to be released from prison 90 percent of the time. Their first condition of release was that they were required to demonstrate the ability and motivation to assume a law abiding role in society "through work in prison industry programs". Although the process of granting releases to prisoners was authorized by higher officials prior to their parole status: It was required that the prisoner reside with a board of guardians who monitored their behavior. Thereby, facilitating their successful transition from prison life, to a community transition program and to the workforce. This was the introduction for the beginning of Parole and Community Services Division. It eventually evolved into the criminal justice system both the state and federal government level. The individual who was responsible in opening the channels in order to implement this new philosophical order, was the noted prisoner reformer Zebulon as he introduced it in the 1930's.
Barnes, Teeter's and Mcelvey's study (cited in Day; 1982).
According to Day et al. (1982) one of the first comprehensive educational programs in corrections was held at the Detroit House of Corrections. By 1870, nearly two-thirds of the 335 inmates at the facility were engaged in vocational training classes. Day et al. (1982) indicated that a study found by Martin (1976) stated that "this was undoubtedly an expectation to a national pattern in 1870 in which only 8,000 of some 20,000 illiterate prisoners were receiving some form of instruction" (p. 12).

In 1870, the isolated and fragmented changes in the earlier part of the century became the subject of a national conversation for prison reform. It was indicated that the National Congress of Penitentiary and Reformatory Discipline, or the 'Cincinnati Congress' initiated in 1870, should develop strategies to relieve severe prison overcrowding and to develop plans for the future of prison construction and program reform.

The correctional officials and theoreticians from the United States, Canada, and South America were significant in several major respects. That is, the Declaration of Principals which emerged was able to provide national unity. Brockway, who administered the Detroit program during the 1960's, later accepted the post of superintendent at Elmira Reformatory, and was successfully able to put the philosophy of the Cincinnati Congress into practice. Brockway drew on the resources of Elmira College to establish a comprehensive educational program. Day et al. (1982), reported by Roberts in 1971, that vocational skill development classes included those in tailoring, printing, and plumbing. It was unfortunate that the comprehensive educational program at the Elmira facility proved to be the exception rather than the rule in prison operations.
It was nearly sixty years, after the Cincinnati Congress, that Austin H. MacCormick had engaged with the Carnegie Corporation to assess the quality and scope of educational programs in the prisons systems. MacCormick (1931) made a conclusion after he visited sixty of the nation's sixty-four federal and state prisons. He concluded that few reformatories had established well balanced and effective vocational training programs, and that no prison in the country had a program for vocational education worthy of that name. Furthermore, MacCormick observed that no prison had been successful in organizing industrial or maintenance programs that were able to provide meaningful vocational training. There were seven major barriers identified that constituted the effective delivery of a vocational educational program. They are as follows:

- Vocational training failed to take into account individual analysis and guidance of the inmates.
- Skilled trades were emphasized to the exclusion of other occupations.
- Equipment was meager and outdated.
- Trade instructors were frequently incompetent.
- Emphasis was placed on routine drills rather than on participation in practical work experience.
- Prison industries were substandard.
- There was little match between theoretical instruction and practical application (p. 14).

It was indicated that many of MacCormick's observations regarding vocational education programs in the institutions, during the 1920's and 1930's, are apparently true today.

*MacCormick's study (cited in Schlossman and Others, 1992).*
**Correctional Vocational Education The Era of Rehabilitation**

Day et al. (1982), outlined a study by Walker (1980) when he found that during the early part of the twentieth century the era of prison rehabilitation emerged, and was marked in part by advances in the social and behavioral sciences. Psychologists therefore, advocated that individual offenders be diagnosed and treated. While sociologists determined that the causes of crime were a result of the interaction between individual personalities and the social environment.

The National Commission on law observance and enforcement supported the views made by the offenders psychologists and their sociologist. It should be noted that the Wickershaw Commission enabled the executive order of the President to be made in 1929. Day et al (1982) reported a study by Barnes and Teeter (1959) Yavis (1978) and indicated that the Wickershaw Commission issued a series of fourteen reports in 1931, covering a wide spectrum of the criminal justice system of the United States. The reports reiterated the Declaration of Principles issued by the Cincinnati Congress in 1870, which stated that their report drew heavily on social research that was later justified when probation and parole was expanded.

Several major reforms have taken place since the establishment of the Wickershaw Commission in the prison system. Six of them were identified specifically to be used with vocational education programs. In 1930 the Federal Bureau of Prisons was established, therefore, they served as a model for service delivery system for many states.
The U.S. Department of Education increased the aid of their funding in order to improve vocational training programs under the "legislation of the Adult Education Act PL 91-230, Title II of the elementary and secondary education act "PL 94-600" (p. 14).

_Barnes, Teeter's and Yavis's study (cited in Day, 1982)._
The U.S. Department of Justice and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services increased the funding of the U.S. Department of Labor by providing them with technical assistance. Day et al. (1982) indicated that the organization which developed the International Correctional Education Association, known as an affiliate of the American Correctional Education Association, developed minimum standards for correctional educational programs; including the American Correctional Association Commission on Accreditation (1977) and the National Center for Research in Vocational Education.

Day et al. (1982), outlined a study by Rudousky (1977) Bailey (1970) Lipton (1975) and Martison (1974) which indicated that another reform was identified to enhance the intervention of the correctional vocational education program. In reference to the prison reform during the early part of the twentieth century. It has had a significant impact on vocational education programs in the correctional settings. Many individuals in the field of corrections have been dissatisfied with the notion of rehabilitation, therefore, it has created controversy among evaluators of various vocational programs; whereas, others have questioned prison administrations about the solution for proving that effective rehabilitation program would deter the repeated felons from returning to prison.

The Emerging Era of Reintegration

Allen and Simonsen (1978) indicated that efforts to rehabilitate offenders have little success unless they are linked to the offender's home communities. The concept of reintegration is based on the belief that there are needs for gradual release of prisoners from extended periods of incarceration through such means as transition centers, halfway houses,
work furlough programs, and educational release projects. The commission's final report indicated that the general underlying premise for the new directions in corrections was that crime and delinquency are symptoms of failure and disorganization of the community as much as the individual offenders. Thus corrections too often encompasses rebuilding solid ties between the offender and the community, integrating or reintegrating the offender into community life, restoring family ties, obtaining meaningful employment and education, and securing in larger sense a place for the offender to revert back into the norms of society. Jones (1977) stated that the notion of reintegration provides a rationale for vocational education programs in the correctional institutions that will allow offenders to make adjustments to the mainstream of society.

**Leadership at California Department of Corrections Penal Institutions**

The CDC Resource Directory (1994), stated the leadership commences with the commander in chief, Governor Pete Wilson and associates, and filters down to the director of CDC James Gomez. However, leadership at the institutions begins with the warden, associate wardens, and program administrators. The correctional education administrator is responsible for all school operations and reports directly to the prison associate warden. At the CDC institutions the warden is responsible for requesting vocational education programs.

Studies by the Lehigh University Ryan et al. (1987) indicated that in 1977, the agency which was primarily responsible in administering correctional education, was the institution itself which "was responsible in 69% of the cases, followed by the state Department of Corrections (44%), higher education institutions (16%), the State Department of Education
(9%), the public school system or school district (3%), the State Department of Welfare (1%),
and other types of administration (12%) (p. 26). It should be noted that the agency that was
responsible for administering correctional education programs in the prison institutions was
the State Department of Correction Institutions in 49% of the cases.

which stated that the leaders who put top priority on staff training and development will
increase their skills and knowledge, and therefore enhance the quality of work. This appears
to be lacking at the CDC vocational education programs. The CDC correctional leaders need
to accommodate their program needs in the near future. It was stated that "these leaders
work from a firm theoretical basis" (p. 5). Therefore, they should discipline themselves
because they need to apply more theory in order to complete their work.

The Function of Vocational Education at the Penal Institution

Day et al. (1982), he observed that the majority of the existing vocational education
programs were institutionally based. Therefore, one must ask, "what is the function of the
vocational education at the CDC institutions?" Dickover et al. (1969), found that for the most
part, the vocational education program at CDC institutions made "agreement and is advocated
as a means of providing inmates with the job skills which they need in order to function in a
non-criminal way in society" (p. 11). Day et al. (1982) reported that it was obvious how
different institutions contradicted their statements when they indicated that their vocational
programs were institutionally based.
It should be noted that these studies demographic data were not compatible and their comparisons were difficult to comprehend. It was apparent that the variables were not consistent from one study to the next. There were two other kinds of institutionally based programs that have had significant effect on the success of vocational education programs. They are the community-based and institutional maintenance programs. Day et al (1982), found that the community based program allowed the prisoner to seek job training within the proximity of their community. They also stated that the institutionally based programs were designed to provide maintenance of the prison institutions by the inmate workers.

Day et al. (1982) stated that "...the concept of combining realistic work opportunities with useful skill training has not been fully implemented in corrections" (p. 12). It should be noted that the Free Venture Project was used to trap the potential effort made recently. It was also noted that the Free Venture Project was to develop vocational programs in order that the correctional leaders authorize a prototype organizational structure for vocational education programs. It should be noted that the Free Venture Project would be related to the present penal institution industrial programs.

**Vocational Education Training Program at CDC Institutions.**

Ryan et al. 1987 reported a study by bass (1993) and stated that the total number of correctional vocational training programs that were offered was 80 different locations. The programs with the highest enrollment were as follows: "(1) Welding, (2) Auto Mechanics, (3) and Carpentry" (p. 1). The average number of class hours that prisoners participated in vocational training ranged from 5 to 40; this is, the mean was 25 hours per week, and the
mode was 30 hours per week. Ryan et al (1987) reported that the number of prisoners who were active participants in vocational training ranged from a low 20 to a high of 7,500. Therefore, the average was 877, which represented 13% of the overall prison population. It was reported that 90% of the state prisoners were able to respond to the questionnaire, although reluctantly, and 41 out of 45 reported attendance in vocational training programs.

Ryan et al. (1987) indicated that the states with the highest number of enrolled participants were: "New York with (7,500), California (4,016), and Florida (3,561)" (p. 15). He stated that the "states with the least enrollment were Hawaii (20), and North Dakota (27)" (p. 15). The states with the largest percentage of prisoners enrolled were as follows: "Wyoming at (55%), Nebraska (40%), New Mexico (35%), and New Hampshire (31%)" (p. 16). There were seven states of which, "17% reported enrollment below the 5%; and a total of 24 states (59) had enrollment below the 10% mark" (p. 15). The vocational education training was offered at different locations, that is, 38 of the US prisons that equate to 86%, offered their classes in the community, and 4 states (9%) offered vocational training in both community and correctional institutions.

Ryan et al. (1987) reported that the CDC number of enrolled participants was "4,016 which equates to 11.79 of the prison population" (p. 16). The following represents the type of training programs and the number of enrolled participants: Air Conditioning (92), Electric engineer (18), Air Frame (18), Animal Grooming training (18), Auto Body (177), Auto Mechanics (358), Auto Service (18), Building Maintenance (36), Business Typing (10), Carpentry (234), Commercial Sewing and Tailoring (110), Commercial Drawing (8), Cosmetology (30), Data study computer (144), Diesel Mechanic (18), Drafting (116), Electricity (90), Electronics (203), Emergency Medical Technician (30), Energy Solar Technician (56), Food Services (185), Furniture Repair (36), Heavy Equipment (36), Horticulture Landscape (14), Mechanic Shop/ Small Engine Repair (527), Masonry
(109), Marine Engine (18), Heat process (81), Nurses Aide (18), Painting (51), Plumbing (90), Pre-vocational skills/Independent Study (8), Printing Silk Screen (123), Sheet Metal Technician (108), Shoe Repair (54), Upholstery (166), (p. 15).

_Bass Study (cited in Ryan, 1987)._
Regulation of Correctional Vocational Education Programs

Sources stated that the regulation of vocational correctional education programs is a requirement for the Ohio Department of Education (Ohio State Council on Vocational Education [OSCVE] 1983). Therefore, they must follow certain basic requirements, such as instructors must be certified in order to teach vocational courses. If not, funding will not be allocated until these basic requirements are fulfilled. A review stated that the Ohio correctional system has to file for courses of study for approval with the Division of Vocational and Career Education. It was also stated that the [OSCVE] were mandated to organize an advisory committee.

Because the California Department of Corrections vocational education programs will compete with other vocational education programs, it is imperative that they maintain a higher standard of vocational instructors. That is, they must be certified in their respective disciplines as well as maintain ongoing training. If the vocational completers are going to have any chance of competing in the highly technical labor market, the instructors must be adequately trained and certified. According to (CDC, 1994) it was indicated that their vocational instructors are required to obtain their teaching credential and that it is a standard prerequisite for teacher employment. The vocational instructors are required to participate with the CDC program improvement, development, and expansions. Black et al. (1993) reported that their instructors participant roles are similar to that of the other correctional vocational programs. One example would be where vocational teachers are required to have contact with their former student upon parole. Dickover et al. (1969) indicated that a follow-up system does
exist at CDC vocational institutions, an important transition from prison to parole in the competitive labor market unfortunately, it was outdated.

It was indicated that many lists of goals have been developed for the field of correctional education. Allison (1979) concluded that "Corrections is impoverished in many respects, but there is one thing the field has in lavish abundance... goals, and proposals on reforming itself" (p. 26). Day et al. (1982) found that the development of prison standards was traced as far back as the 1870's when the "Declaration of Principles," which was originally a philosophical charter of the American Prison Association, was developed; it is now the American Correctional Association.

According to Schroeder (1977), he found that in (1977), the National Center of research in Vocational Education at Ohio State University was responsible for developing the first prison standards specifically for vocational education at the correctional setting. According to Schroeder (1977) these elements are essential for a successful vocational education program. They are areas of curriculum, staff, participants, organization and administration, physical plant, equipment and supplies. Although these standards have been widely recognized, there is no documented information on the way that they have affected vocational education at the CDC penal institutions.

*The Employment of Vocational Trained Offenders at CDC Penal System*

Dickover et al. (1969) indicated that inadequate employment training has been a major barrier to the prisoners in the CDC for years. However, with the advent of prison reform, this statement is not valid in today's correctional institutions. Therefore, the CDC was responsible
for providing extensive placement of vocational training in order to fulfill the required training skill. Dickover et al. (1969) noted that the reasons for implementing vocational educational programs in the CDC institutions was to provide the prisoner with adequate training to obtain meaningful employment upon release from the penal institutions; the intention is to help the prisoners obtain a skill for employment and prevent the return to crime life.

Dickover et al. (1969) reported that the vocational programs at the CDC and other correctional institutions have experienced unexpected complications which have limited their effectiveness. He also noted that one of the several problems has been the inability to develop productive correctional vocational education programs to deal with the multiple attitudes, personality, motivation and socio-economic life style of the average prisoner.

Dickover et al. (1969) indicated that a survey is necessary to assess the effectiveness of vocational education programs at the correctional institutions and that criteria are required as a standard format. He stated that the first criteria was based on the number of parolees who have obtained training in related skills and the second was based upon the objective of the Parole and Community Services Division. Therefore, the problem that was identified stated that out of 6,000 inmates and parolees surveyed, 729 were found to be qualified in the vocational training of their choice.

Dickover et al. (1969) reported that the primary outcome of the CDC vocational education programs was to secure job skills. It was in the best interest of the CDC to conduct a six month follow-up study in order to determine if the parolees obtain an occupation in their related trade upon release from imprisonment. It was stated that at the end of six months to one year 35% of the parolees were placed in their respective trade. The question was asked,
whether or not CDC was accountable for the provision of the vocational education program that would reduce recidivism. The CDC must restructure their existing vocational education programs in order to increase the labor market skills of prisoners, as it is necessary that the prisoners obtain the essential skills and values required to enjoy the benefits of balanced jobs in technical trades.

Is the instructional method provided by the experienced vocational instructors assisting the prisoner to become successful in finding a job? Dickover et al. (1969) found that the success of correctional vocational programs have been judged on their ability to reduce recidivism. The CDC stated that they are not willing to accept and admit that vocational training programs is to teach job skills and not to become concerned with socio-economic problems.

As was noted, the inadequate job plan that would aid the parolee to anticipate future problems upon prison release is least looked upon by parolees. Therefore, it must be assumed that the parolee did not understand what training meant in relationship to financial opportunities. The parolee experienced other problems with job placement. However, these are not a major problem today because of active involvement of the Unemployment Development Department.

According to Dickover et al. (1969) he indicated that the selection process used to determine what classification of inmates would be appropriate to receive training was complicated. It seems that there were issues that had to be taken into consideration before the inmate student was placed into training. The problem arose when the CDC administrative procedure for choosing vocational students was filled with conflicting intentions. Also, it
should be noted that the type of testing used to recruit vocational inmate students was an issue as well.

Dickover et al. (1969) found that, the vocational instructors who were interviewed during their 6-12 month follow-up study indicated that they were not keeping abreast with the changes in technology. Therefore, very little contact was made with business and industry. The instructors were also limited because they were teaching with outdated curriculum. The student's performance would be ineffective outside of the prison setting upon their release. It was obvious that this problem was evident throughout the CDC vocational institutions.

According to Dickover et al. (1969) the motivational problems experienced by inmate students in the vocational training programs was related to prior life style and not necessarily related to the vocational training itself. However, it has been assumed that the prisoner will be able to visualize their lack of job skills, from the perspective of labor markets and that they will create the motivation in order to want to satisfy their deficiencies.

Furthermore, vocational instructors at the CDC penal institutions stated that the difficulties they have experienced with inmate population stems from the fact that the traditional schools have failed to deal with the educational problems experienced by disadvantaged students. Dickover et al. (1969) asserted that "...the difficulties with vocational training in CDC do not basically lie with inadequate instructor in job skills themselves" (p. 55). "The problem with training itself lie in providing the kind of socializing experience that develop the motivation and values in inmates that are conducive in getting involved with vocational training" (p. 55).
Prison to Work Transition

Black et al. (1993) reported that the major problem experienced by ex-felons upon release from prison was failure to look for jobs, and if hired, the uncertainty of maintaining it. It was indicated that these were the obstacles that hindered the progress of Southeastern Illinois College Correctional Educational Division (SIC-CED) ex-felons. The SIC-CED was contracted by Illinois Department of Corrections to provide vocational education training to the prisoners.

Therefore, the SIC-CED conducted a five year longitudinal study in order to improve the prison to work transition. It was concluded that the results of the five year tracking system which was between 1983-88, that the employment skills of the prisoner increased, and therefore lead to jobs. However, it was found that the development of a life Skills Employment Awareness Program improved the prison to work transition because the ex-felon had difficulties adjusting to "life after prison," thus, the SIC-CED felt that the vocational training obtained by the ex-felons was not in itself successful without the "Holistic Approach Incorporated." According to SIC-CED "Holistic Approach" was a concept used to interrogate, a means of providing the prisoner with variety of program assistance upon release from imprisonment.

The Funding of Carl D. Perkins Funding for Special Programs

The funding of vocational correctional education programs per student was a vital part of the function of the penal institutions. Inadequate funding was a major problem experienced by California Department of Corrections. Ryan et al. (1987) reported that the budget spent
on correctional education as well as the overall cost per student reveals that 38 of the states studied (84%) elicited information regarding their budgets. However, only 7 states (16%) were unwilling to reveal any information.

Ryan et al. (1987) found that the reported amounts ranged from "$0 budgeting in from the State of Nevada to $110,000 in North Dakota to a significant amount of $21,181,000 in California" (p. 19). The average amount for correctional education budget was $4,415,882 in 1987. The three states with the highest correctional education budgets were as follows: "California (21,181,000), Texas at ($19,541,744), and New York ($19,000,000)" (p. 19). These were also the states with the largest population. "In terms of the percentage of the total correctional budget spent on correctional education, the range was from 0.00% to 11.42%" (p. 20).

Ryan et al. (1987) found that the average percent of the budget that was allocated per individual states was 3.18% overall. Texas spent the highest on their correctional programs at 11.42% followed by Kansas 5.09%, and New York at 4.42%" (p. 21). The states with the least budget was "Nevada at 0.00%, Vermont 1.07%, Maryland 1.51% and Massachusetts (p. 20). It was reported that the average cost per student for providing correctional education ranged from a low of $150 to a high of $5,010.

Studies by Day et al. (1982) stated that the subsidies called "Unit Funding" has had a great impact on the vocational programs at the Ohio Department of Education during 1983. The Ohio Department of Education set aside specific amounts of money that were submitted for approval by the correctional vocational education division. The correctional vocational education programs was provided with hard money with the advent of "Unit Funding". "Unit
Funding is the amount of money used to allocate to fund vocational education programs. Day et al. (1982) indicated that the Carl D. Perkins Education Act of 1984 allocated 22% of its funding to disadvantaged students such as the prison population. It should be noted that the Carl D. Perkins Act also set aside one percent of its funding specifically for criminal felons in correctional institutions.

**Vocational Correctional Education and Recidivism**

According to Caffrey (1982) studies indicated that vocational education did not reduce recidivism rate. Sources revealed that there are many reasons why Caffrey (1982) stated that the correctional institutions, including California, do not have a firm goal as to the direction that their correctional vocational education programs are headed.

The prison population is filled with individuals who have a long history of failures. They are bombarded by restrictive experiences, low-socio-economic backgrounds, major attitude problems, and negative attitude about success and education. They are put into a position of change, that is, to rehabilitate themselves through vocational training in order to become productive citizens of society. However, the years of all the negative experiences is shifted into the vocational education setting. Therefore, this process interferes with rehabilitation.

Caffrey (1982) indicated that the inmate students were lacking the fundamental skills that are required to function in vocational training. It was also stated that vocational instructors are not capable of teaching reading and writing, nor are they authorized to teach those subjects.
According to studies by Davis and Chown (1986) they found that after completing a survey which was based on a random sample of prisoners, a comparison was made regarding the sex, race, and offenses that were committed by the released prisoners. During a three year follow-up study it was noted that the non-violent prisoners were found to be the group with the least success, compared to the violent prisoners who were paroled and were successful in seeking employment.

_CDC Neglects It's Correctional Vocational Programs_

It should be noted that the CDC has not conducted a recent follow-up study that would recognize what problems exist as the basis of reorganizing them. Dickover (personal interview, April 8, 1994) stated that a follow-up study..."has been neglected by the department for a long time."

Lathimore, Witte and Baker (1990) found that the implementation of vocational education programs have created problems for two North Carolina prisons. In order to enhance the post-released employment for prisoners it was necessary to use a theoretical basis to determine their vocational programs effectiveness.

Lathimore et al. (1990), outlined by Langan (1984) was a study on the problems with Washington State Penitentiary Walla Walla, Washington. It was stated that they, "had failed to attain objectives" (p. 3), which resulted in policies being changed in order to solve immediate problems; such as dealing with prison overcrowding, an issue that directly affected the functioning of their programs. It appears that limited space was a major problem for Walla Walla State Penitentiary. The challenge that was experienced by program
administrators was to provide a comprehensive vocational training in order to prepare the prisoner for the labor market upon release from prison.

*Langan's study (cited in Lathimore, Witte and Baker, 1990).*
Designing a Curriculum Evaluation for a Vocational Educational Program in a Large Correctional System

A study conducted by Maurice Eash (1992) indicated that when the curriculum evaluations were conducted in an unusual setting such as the correctional institutions, the method used in order to understand the problems was by combination of variables that were rather unique to the prison surroundings.

Eash (1992) found that the Department of the Bureau of Justice system released a follow-up study regarding ex-felons and found that nearly 63% of felons were re-arrested, 47% re-convicted, and 42% incarcerated all within a three year period upon release. The Bureau of Justice stated that of the 63% felons who were re-arrested, were charged with an average of five other offenses. During that same period some studies have stated that vocational education programs have contributed to the success of the prisoners rehabilitation. It was indicated that the curriculum developed in correctional institutions addressed two major deficiencies that were modularized as job-specific as well as competency based curriculums.

Eash (1992) indicated that he had requested to part take with the unique problems that were most observed among inmate students. Prisoners were frequently transferred from one facility to the other in order to continue their education. The curriculum that has been implemented over a three year span for funding also included 16 vocational sections which consisted of a total of 13 correctional penal institutions. Therefore, it was stated that the correctional programs need to be evaluated for three years in order that the imposed requirements have satisfied competency based standards. Integration of vocational education
and academic skills, licenses, and credentials, were also required according to the Massachusetts Department of Corrections, Division of Inmate Training, (1991).

Eash (1992) reported that during the (1991-92) school year, Massachusetts altered their competency based vocational education curriculum. The new curriculum composed of both of their specific occupational competencies (n=16) and academic competencies. An evaluation instrument was also developed in order to offer a uniform standard for the data that were collected from various sites.

It was asked what exactly determined whether or not the inmate student would enroll in vocational courses. This process was completed during the inmate's initial entry into the penal system, which was decided between the inmate and the counselor. Eash (1992) stated that "because of the high percentage of illiteracy among the inmates population, their as a great need for applicants to become qualified in basic reading and mathematical skills prior to entering the vocational programs" (p. 15).

Eash (1992) stated that from the 16 programs that were found to have a wide variety of problems, it was obvious that the curriculum was a part of those problems. The student assessment records did not reflect the competency curriculum from a broad sense. Therefore, it was not possible for the students to improve, and, most showed an informed position regarding participant's improvements. It should be noted here that vocational competency based instruction was identified as an area needing restructuring; "A closer coordination of the teaching of literacy skills by computer aided programs and the vocational program was a major area for future curriculum improvement" (p. 14).
Shapario (1987) found that correctional education faculty would benefit from the contribution of the needs assessment which has been identified. It was stated that when the faculty become aware of the lack of quality in the curriculum, it enabled others to become motivated to seek specific quality curriculum guides as well. Eash et al. (1992) found that “The quality of the facility varies in the vocational programs.”

Shapario's study (cited in Eash, 1992).
That was, the classroom was not built with educational purposes in mind" (p. 15). For example, the transition of vocational programs in the community work environment would change the goals of the parolee. Therefore, it was wise to place a job training program in a natural community setting that would reduce the transitional process from prison to the work force.

**Evaluating the Effectiveness of Vocational Correctional Program**

Dickover et al. (1994) indicated that evaluating CDC vocational education was difficult. This was because developing a model for follow-up studies on assessing the effectiveness of vocational education programs in the CDC institution "has been ignored in the department for a long time" Dickover (personal communication, April 8, 1994). Therefore, it was impossible to have reviewed literature on assessing the effectiveness of CDC's vocational education program. It should be noted that this particular researcher thinks that you must closely evaluate the correctional vocational education programs, because by judging and monitoring these programs it allows you to make modifications as required.

According to Day et al. (1982) Abram and Schroder (1977) Anderson (1977) Bell et al. (1977 b) Dell Apa (1973) [Education Commission (1976)] Jones (1977) found that "... for the most part have identified barriers to effective program administration and delivery, as well as needed changes" (p. 20).

It should also be noted that Bell (1977) and his associates recognized that the deficiency which has crippled the correctional vocational education program has been the
"lack of rigorous and system program evaluation" (p. 20).

Abrams's, Schroder's, Anderson's, Bell's, Apa's and Jones study (cited in Day and Mc Cane, 1982).
As indicated by Day et al. (1982) the data collected was found to lead to "confusion and ambiguity about the purpose, meaning, and content of the program evaluation and the quality, effectiveness, and purpose of most evaluations," "was at best, questionable and at worst meaningless" (p. 20).

**Summary**

Prison reform has influenced the correctional institutions to make rapid changes which first originated around the turn of the nineteenth century. Day et al. (1982) outlined by Silberman (1978) found that there were substantial changes that occurred as a direct result of the prison reform. The correctional institutions throughout the United States have been influenced by these changes, especially the California Department of Corrections.

R. Dickover (personal interview April 8, 1994) stated that the "CDC has ignored follow-up studies for a long time." Therefore, the intention of this study is to develop a model on assessing the effectiveness of the vocational training programs at the CDC institutions, particularly focusing on those post-released parolees who have completed their vocational training during incarceration and to determine if there is a link between the training provided and the type of employment obtained.

Rowh et al. (1985) stated that the history of correctional institution, offering vocational training was intercepted in 1865. However, during that same period the Weeks School for Vermont taught vocational education to prisoners solely for the purpose of rehabilitation. According to Rowh et al. (1985), outlined by Allen and Simonsen, the truly
reformatory prison was in Elmira New York which was developed in 1876, where the felons were taught 36 different trades.

Nagel (1973) found that the era of punishment and retribution, had stemmed from the American Correctional Education (ACE), which is currently known as the Correctional Education Association (CEA). During that period correctional institutions were associated more with the welfare and economics of labor other than with the administration of justice. The Era of Restrain brought with it the beginning of vocational training into the penal institutions.

Day et al. (1982), outlined by Barnes and Teeters (1959) indicated that during that era which was essentially the introduction of the first prison school in 1778, prisoners, were held at the Walnut Street Jail in Philadelphia. Later, the Era of Rehabilitation that emerged during the early part of the twentieth century was marked in part by advances in the social and behavioral sciences. That followed the Emerging Era of Reintegration which indicated that efforts to rehabilitate offenders have little success unless they are linked to the offender's home based community.

Furthermore, the leadership sub-titled section indicated the organizational body of CDC hierarchy. This section on the function of vocational education program, discussed several studies that explained the purpose of vocational education at the penal institutions including the CDC. The sub-titled on Vocational Programs at the CDC institutions discusses various types of vocational education programs offered at the CDC institutions.

The section on Regulation of Correctional Vocational Education Programs discusses the studies completed in other vocational programs. This institution set, high standards in
order to establish credibility. The section on Employment of Vocational Trained Offenders at CDC penal institutions emphasized several studies and identified barriers that affected the success of their vocational education programs. The prison to work transition explained what function the transitional process played in order to aid the prisoner back to the mainstream of society.

The section on Carl D. Perkin's funding indicated the allocation of funding for the prison population. The sub-titled section on Vocational Correctional Educational and Recidivism explained the stigma found among the prison population. The section on Neglect of the Correctional Vocational Education Programs discusses common problems found among institutions correctional vocational education programs. The section on Designing a Curriculum Evaluation for a Vocational Education Program in a large Correctional System indicated that there were complicated variables found among penal institutions.

In submission, the sub-titled on Evaluating CDC Vocational Programs reiterated that evaluating CDC vocational programs was critical, however, it was also difficult because the last follow-up study to assess their vocational education program has not been completed by CDC since (1969).
Chapter III
Methodology

Theoretical Framework

This research used a cooperative education model called 'Cap Stone' education as a theoretical bases for this study. According to Black et al. (1993) the theoretical framework has its basis in the long established, traditional, cooperative education that has always been used in that manner, since the interception of vocational educational programs. This researcher was interested in learning more about other factors that are vital to follow-up studies that could be used to provide much needed information for the CDC program administrators and instructors that would aid them with scientific data in order to lower their recidivism rate.

The psychological theory of Schlossman et al. (1992) indicates that inmate's psychological predisposition affects rehabilitation in terms of vocational training. The Social cognitive theory of Eash et al. (1992) also states that those who are lacking in social problem-solving skills would not be proficient in vocational/technical training skills, because studies have found that institutionalized felons are more apt to indicate cognitive behavior problems.

Therefore, studies indicated that because of the cognitive behavior problems, the inmate population had limited skills needed to function at the vocational level Ross and Fabiano (1985). The motivational problems theory of Dickover, Maynard and Painter (1969) stated that a vast portion of the CDC prison population was deficient in job skills and education. Black et al. (1993) showed that for this study, tracking system allowed contact to
be made between the parolee and the vocational staff in order to document their experiences during the reintegration process. Therefore, this follow-up is used as a vehicle to assess the successfulness of this cooperative and theoretical model of education.

This study was designed to develop a model to assess the effectiveness of the CDC tracking system and determine if such follow-up systems were used to track released parolees who were vocational completers. Therefore, the intent of this study was to assess the effectiveness of the CDC tracking system in a wider, more abstract way than would be used as a model for correctional vocational education programs at the penal institutions. The research design used a critical science model based on various theoretical frameworks and value laden questions in order to elicit opinions and valued type of responses from the sample population.

Schlossman et al. (1992) found that vocational education in correctional institutions is to be "sold" in value-laden ideological as well as in educational terms. Therefore, the researcher's model presented is appropriate for this project. This chapter was based on a theoretical framework and will be used as a guide for the foundation and procedures of the study. Chapter 4 will enable readers to obtain an overall view of the findings and the discussions of results from description data.

**Population Sample and Description**

The population respondents (N = 50) consisted of post-released parolees who have completed vocational training at the CDC institutions. The parolees were drawn from the San Bernardino/Riverside County Parole and Community Service Division. The respondents were between the ages of 18-50; 25 females and 25 males were sampled.
The employers (N=20) 10 males and 10 females who hired parolees between 1990-94 and are located in the Riverside and San Bernardino areas. The parole agent respondents (N=30) were 15 males and 15 females between the ages of 30-65. They were included in a drawn sample at the California Department of Corrections Parole and Community Services Division.

Because of the scheduling complications of the parole agents, it was difficult to mail a questionnaire to every parole agent during the process of collecting data. This also applies to those respondents who had otherwise participated in this research procedure. The reasons for not mailing the questionnaires to other CDC parole agents was due to limited time constraints. The individuals who were selected may have observed themselves as possible targets, which might have had a negative effect on the way that they responded on the survey questionnaire.

**Demographic Information**

Demographic data were obtained to assess the effectiveness of the CDC vocational education programs. The survey instrument consisted of closed-ended questions and responses that were used to elicit the demographics of: employers, parolees, and parole agents.

Demographic data were used to determine each respondent's characteristics of their population perception. In order to develop a model to assess the effectiveness of vocational education programs in correctional institutions, respondents were asked to complete a
questionnaire that solicited:

- age
- gender
- educational background
- grade level
- perception
- values
- socio-economic status
- ethnic backgrounds

**Research Questions**

The following research questions were addressed by this study:

(1) Are the parolees from the CDC penal institutions released with the training that is required by employers in order to complete in highly technical labor markets?

(2) Do the vocational completers value the kind of training that was provided to them by the CDC vocational institutions a factor?

(3) Do the parole agents perceive the instruction provided at the CDC institution differently than the employers and parolees?
Questionnaire Design

A letter of consent (see Appendix A) and survey instrument (see Appendix B) consisting of closed-ended questions, and standard deviation technique was used to determine the demographics. Questions 1-15a and 15b solicited data in order to establish the respondents demographic characteristics. Each question and it's assessment were as follows:

1-15b Pre-Post Released Parolees

Question 1: position/identity--stated the percentages of the respondents status--What is your relationship with CDC?

Question 2: age--indicated current mean age of the respondents being studied--What is your age?

Question 3: gender--stated the percentage of males/females of the study--What is your gender?

Question 4: ethnic background--to establish the percentage of the population ethnic background--What is your ethnic background?

Question 5: level of education--this data was used to measure the mean educational level of the respondents--Highest grade in school or level of education completed?

Question 6: unemployment--indicated the percentages of those parolees employment in vocational training--What difficulties were often experienced as obstacles for seeking employment?

Question 7: evaluation--stated the frequency distribution of those respondents who completed vocational training--How would you evaluate the vocational education training program at the CDC institutions?

Question 8: resource assistance program--to collect data to measure the means of those receiving support--What assistance was provided upon completion of vocational education training?

Question 9: value--stated the differences between the respondents completing the data--Do you value the type of vocational training that is provided at the CDC institutions?
Question 10: change of work—to collect data to measure the mean of those respondents enrolled in vocational education programs—What field would you have preferred to obtain your training in if you had that choice?

Question 11: assess program successfulness—to establish the mean score of those respondents who have completed the CDC vocational education programs—How would you assess the quality of the vocational education training that you received at the CDC institutions?

Question 12: student interest—indicated the frequency percentage of the favored respondents—What was your interest in taking a vocational education training course at the CDC institutions?

Question 13: motivated—to collect data to compare the percentages of the result of the respondents—Why did you decide to take a skill in vocational education?

Question 14: success of the program completion solicited—data from those respondents affiliation with the CDC vocational education program—Did you complete all of your vocational education courses?

Question 15: income range—to establish the median scores of those respondents who completed the vocational training—How much money per hour do you expect to earn when you have completed all of your vocational education training?

1-15a Parole Agents & Employers

Question 1: affiliation—stated the percentages of the respondents status—What is your relationship with CDC?

Question 2: occupation—established to collect data on the mean average of those employed—What was your occupation prior to incarceration? Also, this data elicited sources regarding socio-economic status.

Question 3: purpose for courses—these were used to establish the reason for implementing vocational education courses at the correctional institution—What is the purpose for providing vocational education courses at the correctional institutions?

Question 4: perception—to solicit data to determine the number of similar responses—What is your perception of the vocational training program at the CDC institutions?
Question 5: training obtained--to elicit the mean average of those respondents who are in favor of the CDC training--Did you feel that the training received will prevent this person from returning to prison?

Question 6: training in vocational education--measured the relationships between a respondent's enrollment in training programs at the CDC institution--What vocational training is more frequently offered?

Question 7: quality of training--established the percentage of respondents receiving the training at the penal institutions and the providers of the training programs--Do you feel that the training offered at the CDC institution adequately prepared pre and post released parolees for the work force?

Question 8: vocational training/lower recidivism--established a percentage of those respondents in favor of vocational education programs--Do you feel that the training offered at the CDC vocational education program lowered the recidivism rate?

Question 9: number of graduates--established the percentage of vocational education completers from CDC--Did you know if the parolee completed his/her vocational training at the CDC institutions?

Question 10: work ethics--was used to determine the number of respondents who value work ethics--What did you like most or least about your work ethics of the parolee?

Question 11: frequent problems experience--data were used to indicate the number of respondents who reported problem areas--How often do you experience problems with the pre and post released parolees?

Question 12: advisory committee--data to elicit groups of the respondents knowledge of the importance of a advisory council--Do you think that the CDC advisory committee insisted that the vocational education program maintain a current revision status?

Question 13: competency based instruction--established the average means of the respondents responses--Is the vocational education program at the CDC institution competency based?

Question 14: better job opportunity--established the average means of the respondents opinions or collected data--Do you think that the students will have a better opportunity as a result of his/her vocational training in the CDC institutions?

Question 15: follow-up system--this data was used to establish the percentages of those respondents who responded to the existence of a follow-up study as opposed to those who
indicated that there was not such a system—Does a follow-up system exist at the CDC institution?

**Pilot Testing**

The researcher design provided a small sample group (N = 20) of profile questionnaires consisting of parolees at the California Department of Parole and Community Services Division San Bernardino/Riverside County, who were not included in the study population. The draft profile questionnaire was modified to increase the usefulness of the instrument.

The open-ended questionnaire yes/no and responses options, that was provided to measure the behavior frequency of the population selected was changed to a modified closed-ended questionnaire to enhance the respondents choices. The survey questionnaire was used to complete the research project. These questions preceded the actual prescribed distribution of the survey questionnaire. The questionnaires were designed by the researcher and the results were transcribed and analyzed.

**Treatment of Data**

The treatment for this study used quantitative descriptive statistics, and a closed-ended questionnaire to determine the demographics in order to develop a model and assess the effectiveness of the CDC correctional vocational education programs. The survey instruments used a standardized deviation frequency and percentages to analyze the data collected from their correctional vocational education programs.
Demographic data from questions 1-15a was analyzed for individual variables to determine the respondents' option for responses that were also analyzed in order to determine this population responses. Standard deviation was used to analyze how each variable respondents preferred to make their choice as they answered the instrument. Therefore, a mean, median, and standard deviation were computed to compare the results of data collected from the instrument completed by employers, parolees, and parole agents that would determine the effectiveness of their vocational education programs. Also, a profile of the demographics were designed from the data.

Research Questions 1-3 Were Addressed as Follows:

In order to address research question number one, the data demographics for collecting the mean scores were found to be useful for measuring the central tendency of the quality of CDC vocational education programs.

Research question number two addressed the data demographic characteristics for measures of variability to determine the average respondents who completed the instrument and were used to answer value typed questions. Research question number three addressed the data demographics characteristic to measure variability to determine the mean of respondents that solicited this data.
Instruments and Related Procedures

A questionnaire was developed with the total cooperation of the California State University of San Bernardino (J. English, coordinator of graduate studies, personal communication, February, 1993).

The principle method of this instrument was to collect data information, regarding the individual's responses to develop a model to assess the effectiveness of vocational education programs at the CDC penal systems. According to Dickover (1994) the purpose of the survey questionnaire was to elicit data from the California Department of Corrections Parole and Community Services Division. After the questionnaires were designed, they were distributed to businesses and various industries in the San Bernardino and Riverside County Parole Community Service Division. The questionnaires consisted of implementations of vocational education programs, program evaluations, the employer's quality of training, value of the CDC programs, student value of training, and lastly the parole agent's perception.

In addition to each questionnaire section there was time allowed for comments, where individual respondents were able to make their comments on the questionnaires. The purpose of the comment section was to allow the respondents to make an assessment, that is, to provide input from their perception which would increase the probability of the survey instrument. A copy of the questionnaire will be available under appendix B.
Outline For Chapter IV
Findings and Discussion

**Demographic Findings**

Instrument data questions 15a and 15b were used to obtain the demographics of the respondents. These data were designed specifically to elicit all of the responses that were made. As illustrated in figure 1, respondents population (N = 50) was 80% male and 20% female, with an average age of 31 years and mean scores of 1.360.

Related data illustrates that a significant percentage of respondents completing the instrument were males at 80% and females at 20%. Ten percent held a High School diploma, 15% completed vocational training, and 60% did not graduate from high school, whereas 8% completed their G.E.D. only see figure 2.

The percentage of the respondent's grade levels who were involved in vocational training at the correctional institutions was 100%. The mean scores for these data were 3.833 with 44% of the respondents between grades of 9-11th.

From a drawn sample (N = 30) of 50% of the respondents answered that they perceived the vocational program at CDC as being good. 6.7% identified the programs as strong in quality. 40% of the population indicated that the program did benefit them marked unknown. 0.123.3% attested other as shown in figure 3. The median score was 2.00.

Of the population (N = 50) who responded that they valued the kind of training they received, 80% selected yes that the vocational programs were beneficial, 12% marked "no," that they did not benefit from the vocational programs, and 4% indicated "unknown," that
they had no concept as to the kind of vocational training that is being offered by the CDC institutions.

Of those respondents (N = 30) 13.3% responded that they were employed during their incarceration, 13.3% were employed, 50% marked not applicable, 16.7% showed unknown, and 6.7% marked other. The mean average score was 2.9%. 86.7% of the parole agents indicated an income of zero for post release parolee during their arrest. 10 percent reported an income of $200.00 per week and 3.3% noted an income of $400.00 per week. The computerized range score was 400.00, the mean was 33.333 and the median average score was .000 percent. These data did not indicate an unusual answer to the questionnaire because 86.7 percent of the population did not state their salary.

Forty percent of the respondents were white of non-Hispanic origin, twenty percent were Hispanic, twenty percent were black, and eight percent were native Americans. These results may be due to the fact that whites are more apt to obtain their vocational education training during incarceration. These data were used to establish the percentage of respondents ethnic backgrounds in order to determine what influences them to obtain their vocational training.

It appears that there is no significant indication that the respondent's background will effect the results of the data that would have affected the assessment of the CDC Vocational Education Programs. Of respondents (N = 50) twenty percent were between $4.50-$5.50 range, four percent between $5.50-$6.50 range, 12% between $8.50-$9.50 range, 16% between $18.50-$19.50 range as shown in figure 7. The median score was 4.00 with a range of 7.00 and mean score of 3.737.
The Variation of the Results of Data from Survey Questionnaire Section B

Questionnaire 1 number 6 indicated that 68% of those who responded marked that the barrier for unemployment was being a parolee, as 4% noted that their barrier was due to being over qualified, 8% marked that their barrier was being under qualified, 11% indicated that their barrier was lack of basic skills, and 16% showed their barrier as other. 60% of those being evaluated responded to question number 7, and indicated that the program was good, 20% marked it was poor, 16% stated it was strong, and 4% showed other. The mean score was 1.958.

Question number 8 gathered data on resource assistance program that was used to measure the mean score of those who are receiving support. Of respondents (N = 50) participants 32% noted that they were assisted with job seeking skills instruction. Family support was marked the least with 8% of those who responded. The mean score was 1.00.

Question number 11 was designed to assess CDC program successfulness. Of (N = 50) respondents 56% indicated that the vocational education program was highly effective with "other" being the least with 4% of the responses. The mean score was 1.917.

Question number 12 was designed to elicit data about the students interest for enrolling in vocational education programs. Of respondents (N = 50) 40% showed that they enrolled to learn a new skill with other being selected the least, reported a tied score with boredom; 12% indicated boredom and other. The mean score was 3.318.

Question number 13 was designed to collect data and to compare the results. (N = 50) 60% of the respondents stated that they enrolled in vocational education programs during
their incarceration because they wanted something to do. The least responses that the respondents marked was labor market at 4%. The mean score was 2.833%.

Question number 14 which was designed to solicit data of those who completed the vocational program. Of (N = 50) respondents 16% responded "yes" they did complete their training and 24 percent indicated "no" they did not. The mean score was 1.240.

The result of the data for question number 5 showed that 30% of the parole agents and the selected group of employers indicated that the vocational training obtained made an impact. 20% reported that it did not make a difference. 6.7% stated it changed the lives of the parolees. 3.3% selected they returned to prison and 36.7% showed other. The mean score for this population was 2.897.

The results of the data for questionnaire number 6 showed the vocational training that was most frequently offered at the CDC Institutions. The most frequent responses were auto mechanics which was 33.3% with a mean score of .200%. Followed by air conditioning at 20%. Lawn mower repair and masonry marked 16.7% each with a mean score of .167. Cabinet maker, computer programming, shoe repair, and welding showed a score of 13.3%. The mean score was .133. 6.7 percent of the respondents marked carpentry with a mean score of .067. 3.3% selected computer repair and painting, with a mean score of .033. 10% marked leather crafting with a mean score of .100.

**Results of Data for Section A**

The results of the data from question 1 section A was completed by parole agents (N = 30) and selected groups of employers (N = 20). 56.7% of the respondents identified
themselves as parole agents and 43.3% did not identify themselves. 1.83% of the employers did not mark who they were and 16.7% identified who they are. The mean score for parole agents was .567% and employers .167%.

Data for question number 3 indicated that (N = 30) 43.3% of parole agents and selected groups of employers noted that the purpose of offering vocational education courses for the post-released parole was to learn new skills; 16.7% stated that the purpose was for career development. 23.3% selected that the purpose was for preparing the post-released parole for jobs. The mean average score was 2.040%.

Dog grooming, electrical, plumbing, tile and welding reported no responses. Question number 7 results show that 63.3% of the parole agents and selected population of employers indicated they felt that the vocational education program prepared the post released parolee for the work force; 10% marked "no," it did not prepare the parolee for the work force, and 4% stated unknown. The mean score was 1.900%.

The results of the data for question number 8, which elicited data to lower the recidivism rate, showed that 43.3% of parole agents and employers noted "yes," that vocational training lowered the recidivism rate; 33.3% responded "no," that is, post released parole recidivism rate is not lowered with vocational training. 40% indicated unknown and 6.7% of the population showed other. The mean score was 2.800%. The results of the data for question number 9 solicited that 20% of the parole agents and employers responded that the post released parole did not complete their training. 40% stated that they do not know whether or not the post released population completed their vocational training, and 6.7% selected other for their response. The mean score was 2.800%.
The data results from question number 11, which was completed by parole agents and employers, was regarding the work ethics of post released parolees. 3.3% indicated that they were hard workers, 10% chose moderate workers, and 13.3% noted that the post released parolee had good work ethics. 20% of the post released parolees were perceived to be lacking in motivation whereas 40% indicated other. The mean score was 3.071%.

The results of the data for question number 11, which solicited information on the most frequent problems that are experienced, resulting in 30% of the parole agents and the selected group of employers identifying what the problems were. 13% noted that they do sometimes, 10% showed that they hardly experienced any problems, and 40% responded to other. The mean score was 2.056%.

The results of the data for question 12 was elicited about the persistence of the advisory committee. In order to revise the curriculum, it was indicated that 40% of parole agents and employers marked yes, 13.3% responded no, 43.3% selected unknown, and 3.3% showed other.

The data results for question number 13 that solicited data on competency based instruction was completed by the parole agents and employers, of which 26% responded yes, 10% marked no, 56.7% marked unknown and 6.7% indicated other. The mean score was 3.067.

The result of the data for question number 15, which elicited data on CDC follow-up system, indicated that 16.7% of the parole agents and employers showed "yes", that a follow-up system does exist. 23.3% marked "no," that there's no follow-up system, 53.3% of this
population indicated unknown, 3.3% marked they were not sure, and 3.3% noted "other."
The mean score was 2.448%.

**Findings That Address Research Question 1**

1) Are the Parolees from the CDC institutions released with the training that is required by the employers in order to compete in the highly technical labor market? The study of the population showed the variables of question 14. The questions measured the effectiveness of the CDC's vocational education program. The respondent's scores range was zero. Statistical analysis of the mean, median and standard deviation were summed in order to establish the population distribution. The respondent's mean was 1.00, median 1.00, and the standard deviation was zero, N=100. The results of the data suggests that the population section B felt that prisoners with vocational training are inclined to have better opportunity for successful employment upon release from imprisonment. The data was analyzed and its results were based on a random sample that was administered to a population of parole agents (N=30) and employers (N=20) respectively. 30 of those respondents responded to the question as saying they thought that parolees have as equal or better opportunity when they have obtained their vocational training at the CDC institutions. This signifies that the vocational education programs at the CDC institutions are valued by employers.

**Findings That Address Research Question 2**

2) Do the vocational completers value the kind of training that was provided to them by the CDC vocational institution as a factor to reduce recidivism? The results of the data indicated
that of the 25 respondents who completed the instrument, 80% stated that they valued the vocational training they received during their incarceration. 20% responded that they did not value their vocation training and 8% stated that they were uncertain. The mean average was 1.360. The study of the data population shows that the respondent's process came from variables of question 14. The question measured the effectiveness of the CDC's vocational education program. The respondent's scores range was zero.

**Findings That Address Research Question 3**

3) Do the parole agents perceive the instruction differently, than the employers and parolees?

The results of the data in figure number 3 indicated that 50% of those who responded perceived the vocational education program as good quality where as 6.7% stated it was of strong quality; 40% responded that they were uncertain and 3.3% marked other. The staff were more likely to give higher ratings than students. But the difference in their ratings was not statistically different. The "A" test for staff and employers mean score was 2.1176 and the post-released parolees were 2.00.

**The Diversity of Socio Economic Influences of the Populations Ethnic Backgrounds**

The survey questionnaire for section A, question number 2 was used in order to determine if there was any significant correlation between the respondent's ethnic background and their socio economic status. The results of the population ethnic background reveals that of the respondents (N=50) surveyed 48% were Caucasians. The results of the socio-economic status reports that from the respondents (N=50) 13% of those surveyed marked
"yes" the parolee was employed during their incarceration. 51.1% of the respondents (N=50) were able to complete survey questionnaire section A.

Parole agents and selected groups of employers responded to individual questions as "yes" or "no" for employment. The mean score of those who were employed was 2.9%. The individual responses indicated that the data for the survey instrument was determined based upon the data collected.

**Psychological Barriers of Employment on Prisoners Belief System**

Sixty-eight percent of the population noted that their barrier for employment was being a parolee. The result of this data is unusual because a significant percentage have this particular psychological belief. Compared to the 4% who responded to being over qualified and lacking of basic skills, 8% marked that their barrier was being under qualified and the other 4% indicated other.

This significant response may be due to the fact that most ex-felons believe that no employer will hire parolees because of their past. The assumption that the results of these data were inconclusive because of their psychological belief system.

**Effectiveness of CDC Vocational Education Programs**

According to the post released parolee population, 56% of those surveyed noted that the vocational training offered at the correctional institution was highly effective, compared to the 16% that marked least effective, the 24% of those who noted "average", and the 4% group that showed other.
These data collected from the parole agent and the selected group of employers indicated that 63.3% of the population responded "yes", that they feel that the vocational training offered at the CDC institution adequately prepared the post released parolees for employment, compared to the 10% of the population who responded "no," that the training the CDC's offered did not prepare the post released parolees for employment, and the 26.7% that selected other.

There were 56 responses completed, of which 63.3% of the population indicated that they were opposed to the vocational training that are offered at the correctional institutions. These data concludes that the CDC vocational training programs are effective for employment preparation.

Data Existence of a Following Up System

The results of the data prove that the existence of a follow-up was inconclusive due to the fact that 16.7% of the surveyed population marked "yes," that a follow-up system existed, compared to the 23.3% that selected "no," the 53.3% who chose unknown, the 3.3% that noted they were not sure and the 3.3% that indicated other.

Therefore, the result of the data is that the CDC correctional education institution does not have a standardized follow-up system on record. The conclusive evidence was based on the responses of parole agents and from the selected group of employers population who had taken part in the research.
Supplementary Findings

It was vital that this researcher investigate the data that results from the assessment of the first data analysis. This study noted that a follow-up system would develop a whole new era of prison vocational education programs. These may be apparently due to the lack of exposure by many of the employers and those who can benefit from the transformation of prison to the community workforce. Therefore, in order to explore this further it is necessary to enhance knowledge and clarify the nature of the existence of correctional education programs. In order to accomplish this it would be wise to conduct a thorough examination of the data from a broad sense of the respondents whose demographics had a significant variation. It seems that the impact of vocational education on prison system was positive.

To verify this assumption, it would be necessary to conduct an investigation of sampled populations (N=100). A comparison was developed between the high and low frequency group of demographics which were dissected. The variables of the respondents were composed of distinct groups of post released parolees, parolee agents, and selected groups of employers represented as high and low frequency groups. The first group consists of post-released parolees (N=30). Noted were the 20 "low frequency groups" that responded they were predominately post-released parolee males and 5 low frequency groups of females who did not perceive themselves as parolees.

Data was not compiled on the demographics of the parole agent and selected groups of employers, therefore, there was no significant high frequency measure reported. Among (N=30) parole agents, 17 responded that they were parole agents and 13 responded that they
were not; the mean score was .567. Of (N=30) respondents five identified themselves as employers and 25 were other. The mean score was .167.

**Discussion of Findings**

**Population Demographics**

With 80% of the respondents being male and 20% female, it seems that there is an unequal balance within the study. The unbalance represents a male gender ratio that is referred to as a male dominated trade. The average age category for post-released parolees was 31 years of age. Statistics show that the average mean age category for prisoners was 31, a finding which correlates with the results of this study.

The respondent's educational background indicated a high of 44% between 9-11th grade and 4% between the 9-8th grade range. The question that shows a significant difference was the ethnic background of a respondents, a high of 48% White, followed by a tied score of 20% Hispanic and Black respondents and 8% Native Americans. There was no demographic data collected on the parole agents and selected groups of employers.

**Research Question 1**

Are the Parolees from the CDC institutions released with the training that is required by the employers in order to compete in the highly technical labor market? The data gathered for responding to this question stated that the vocational education program at the prison institutions are valued by the employers. From N=20 respondents, 100% reported that they perceived the CDC vocational education program of value.
**Research Question 2**

Do the vocational completers value the kind of training that was provided to them by the CDC vocational institution as a factor to reduce recidivism? According to the analysis of the data, there seems to be significant percentages of respondents (N=50) as 80% marked that they value the skill they obtained during their period of incarceration.

**Research Question 3**

Do the parole agents perceive the institution differently than the employers and parolees? The data results revealed that of N=30 respondents, 50% of the parole population valued the CDC vocational education programs. This summed up a 100% response rate from the post-released parolee, 80% from the selected group of employers, and 50% from parole agents. This concludes that the CDC vocational education program, have tremendous value for the parolee population. The other segment of this study will address these findings and make recommendations for change needed at the CDC vocational education program.
Chapter Five

Conclusion and Recommendations

Conclusions

Vocational correctional education programs have made a significant impact on the lives of those ex-felons who have taken the opportunity to obtain a technical skill. Although it appears that there is a lack of collaboration among agencies to work with the CDC to develop community transition programs, these programs greatly aid the parolees upon their release from imprisonment. Conclusive literature reviews noted that the community transition program is an intricate part of the success of their correctional vocational education system. Data were collected which addressed specific variables that would be used as an aid to respond to the questionnaire.

As indicated by the findings, correctional vocational education programs provide effective training to their fellow students. The CDC made a positive change towards the training that the post released parolees obtained. The respondents showed that the results of the data were inconsistent with those who were employed during their initial incarceration period. A significantly high rate of respondents stated that they valued the kind of training the received at the CDC correctional institution. Unfortunately, evidence shows that of the respondents (N=100) surveyed, only 13% were meaningfully employed.

This signifies a lack of uniformity about the training that is being offered at the CDC institutions. The results measured whether or not the CDC has developed an effective follow-up system. Respondents were uncertain if in fact a follow-up system does exist. During the
preliminary research project the survey population showed that there was a follow-up or tracking system in place.

However, after receiving the results of the data, it was suggested that 16.7% of the surveyed population noted that a follow-up system in fact existed, which indicated that the CDC is lacking of a standardized follow-up system for their vocational education program on recovered felons. The assumption was based on the parole agents responses and from the selected groups of employers,

It was ironic that half of the respondents surveyed stated that they perceived the vocational training at the CDC as being good as opposed to 40% who marked "uncertain" to assess the quality of the CDC correctional vocational education program. The data results marked that of the population (N=25) surveyed, 24% stated that they were above a higher than average salary scale. These results may be because of the quality of the CDC vocational education program.

According to the results of the data, more than 60% of those surveyed selected that their barriers for employment stemmed from being on parole. The results of the data were affected because the respondents who completed the application were driven by their psychological belief system. The data that offered vocational courses indicated that 33% chose auto mechanics. That was not supportive of the (N=30) parole agents and selected group of employers at 57.7% and the 43.3%, who did not respond to the data as parole agents. The CDC vocational education program has demonstrated that their program does contribute to the reduction in parole class level participation.
**Recommendations**

The rationale for this study was to develop a model to assess effectiveness of the CDC follow-up studies, which will be used to determine if in fact post-released parolees are more apt to reduce the recidivism rate; the clear analysis of the data coming from an objective and statistical point of view. I recommend that further studies be conducted, of which pre-released, vocational instructors and administrators are to send in surveyed instruments. The fact is, there is a process for obtaining written consent from the CDC to conduct research that must be approved by several committee departments. This process can take as long as eight months to a year. Therefore, I urge you to plan long ahead of schedule because there will be some challenging obstacles that must be overcome.

I am reluctant to state that the CDC needs to develop an incentive plan for those employers who are willing to hire parolees. Summed up, it is the deficiency that appears to be missing from their program. Therefore, it is recommended that the CDC vocational education program develop a community transition plan which will filter post-released parolees from prison to the community plan to the competitive workforce.

It is recommended that the CDC develop a networking relationship with the local community employers primarily to educate them as well as the public about these comprehensive vocational programs that their tax dollars are helping to pay for. I recommend that every pre-released parolee who is eligible for parole should be taught to read and write, and complete a competency based vocational education course prior to post-release parole status.
Therefore, I recommend that no prisoner will be released from the penal institution until those standards are fulfilled. I also recommend that every Community Parole Services Division have adequate financial resources in order to transition the parolee to the pre-community environment where they will integrate into their communities through an incremental process. The parolees will be taught skills to cope with life after prison, coping with the family, job skills, institutionalization, stress reduction, and behavior problems.
Appendix A

Letter of Consent
To whom it may concern,

I am a graduate student at Cal. State University San Bernardino majoring in vocational education. It also should be noted that I am employed by the State of California Department of Corrections as an instructor. I am presently doing research on assessing the effectiveness of the California Department of Correctional Vocational education programs, in partial fulfillment of my Masters Degree. However, in order to make this research valid it would be incomplete without responses from the employers such as yourself who have hired or employed parolees. Particularly, those who have obtained their vocational training during incarceration.

I would appreciate if you could kindly take a few moments to complete the enclosed questionnaire. Please check the column on the left hand side that you feel is appropriate to you. Also, there is a separate section for comments. Please feel free to be sincere and candid.

When you have completed that survey, please mail the enclosed envelope to the State of California Parole and Community Service Division 431 W. MacKay Drive, San Bernardino, Ca. 92408

Thank you for your cooperation.

Yours sincerely,

Jeffery N. Polonio
Appendix B

Demographic Survey Questionnaire A & B
Assessing the Effectiveness of the Correctional Vocational education Programs.

Survey Questionnaire A

Please make a check mark that relates to you or complete the comment section. Your honesty is greatly appreciated.

1) What is your affiliation with the California Department of Corrections (CDC)?
   [ ] Pre-released parolee
   [ ] Post-released parolee or paroled status
   [ ] Vocational instructor
   [ ] Vocational administrator, supervisor or coordinator.
   [ ] Employer
   [ ] Parole Agent
   [ ] Other ______________
   [ ] Comments: ____________________________________________

2) Did the pre and post-released parolee have a job during the period of his/her incarceration?
   [ ] Yes
   [ ] No
   [ ] Unknown
   [ ] N/A
   [ ] Other ______________
   [ ] Comments: ____________________________________________

IF YOU ANSWERED "YES" TO THE ABOVE QUESTION:

Write in the space below the kind of work he/she did.
______________________________
______________________________

How much money did the person make per week from the previous job?

$_________ Per Week
3) What is the purpose for providing vocational education courses at the correctional institutions?

[ ] Obtain a new skill
[ ] Career development
[ ] Give students something to do
[ ] Prepare pre-and post-released students for employment
[ ] Other __________
[ ] Comments: ___________________________________________

4) What is your perception of the vocational training program at the correctional institutions?

[ ] Poor quality
[ ] Good
[ ] Strong quality
[ ] Unknown
[ ] Other __________
[ ] Comments: ___________________________________________

5) Did you feel that the training received will prevent the person from returning to prison?

[ ] It made an impact
[ ] Did not make a difference
[ ] Made a change in my life
[ ] Returned to prison
[ ] Other __________
[ ] Comments: ___________________________________________

6) What vocational training program are more frequently offered at the CDC institutions?

[ ] Air conditioning and refrigerator repair
[ ] Auto mechanic
[ ] Cabinet Maker
[ ] Carpentry
[ ] Computer Programmer
[ ] Computer Repair
[ ] Dog grooming
[ ] Electrical technician
[ ] Lawn mower repair
[ ] Leather crafting
7) Do you feel that the vocational training offered at the CDC institutions adequately prepared the pre and post-released parolee for the work force?

[ ] Yes
[ ] No
[ ] Unknown
[ ] Other
[ ] Comments: ________________________________

8) Do you feel that the training offered at CDC vocational education program lower the recidivism rate?

[ ] Yes
[ ] No
[ ] Unknown
[ ] Other
[ ] Comments: ________________________________

9) Did you know if the parolee completed his/her vocational training at the CDC institution?

[ ] Yes
[ ] No
[ ] N/A
[ ] Other
[ ] Comments: ________________________________

10) What did you like most or least about the work ethics of the parolee?

[ ] Hard worker
[ ] Moderate worker
[ ] Good work ethics
[ ] Lack of motivation
11) How often did you experience problems with the pre and post-released parolees?

- [ ] Sometimes
- [ ] Frequently
- [ ] Hardly
- [ ] Other __________
- [ ] Comments: _______________________________

12) Do you think that the CDC advisory committee insist that the CDC institution competency based?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Unknown
- [ ] Other __________
- [ ] Comments: _______________________________

13) Is the vocational education program at the CDC institution competency based?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Unknown
- [ ] Other __________
- [ ] Comments: _______________________________

14) Do you think that the student will have a better opportunity as a result of his/her vocational training in the CDC institutions?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Other __________
- [ ] Comments: _______________________________

15) Does a follow-up system exist at the California Department of Corrections?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Unknown
- [ ] Not Sure
Assessing the Effectiveness of the Correctional Vocational education Programs.

Survey Questionnaire B

Please make a check mark that relates to you or complete the comment section. Your honesty is greatly appreciated.

1) What is your relationship with the California Department of Corrections (CDC)?

[ ] Pre-released parolee
[ ] Post-released parolee or paroled status
[ ] Vocational instructor
[ ] Vocational administrator, supervisor or coordinator.
[ ] Employer
[ ] Parole Agent
[ ] Other ____________
[ ] Comments: ____________________________________________

2) What is your age?

[ ] 18-30
[ ] 30-40
[ ] 40-50
[ ] 50-65
[ ] Other ____________
[ ] Comments: ____________________________________________

3) What is your gender? (mark one box)

[ ] Male       [ ] Female

4) What is your Ethnic Background (mark one box)

[ ] Native American
[ ] Asian
[ ] Pacific Islander
[ ] Filipino
[ ] Hispanic
[ ] Black not of Hispanic origin
[ ] White not of Hispanic origin
[ ] Unknown
[ ] Other ____________
[ ] Comments: ____________________________________________
5) Highest grade in school or level of education completed (mark one box)

[ ] Grades 1-4
[ ] Grades 5-8
[ ] Grades 9-11
[ ] High School
[ ] G.E.D.
[ ] Some College
[ ] College Graduate (4 years)
[ ] More than 4 years of College
[ ] Other ____________
[ ] Comments: ____________________________

6) What difficulties were often experienced as obstacles for seeking employment?

[ ] Over qualified
[ ] Under qualified
[ ] Lack of basic skills
[ ] Too long on one job
[ ] Being on parole
[ ] Other ____________
[ ] Comments: ____________________________

7) How would you evaluate the vocational education training program at the CDC institutions?

[ ] Poor quality
[ ] Good quality
[ ] Strong quality
[ ] Unknown
[ ] Other ____________
[ ] Comments: ____________________________

8) What assistance was provided upon completion of vocational education training?

[ ] Job seeking skill instruction
[ ] Job contacts
[ ] Obtaining your driver's license and Social Security card
[ ] Financial assistance
[ ] Family support
[ ] Other ____________
[ ] Comments: ____________________________
9) Do you value the type of vocational training that is provided at the CDC institutions?

[ ] Yes
[ ] No
[ ] N/A
[ ] Unknown
[ ] Other __________
[ ] Comments: __________________________________________

10) What field would you prefer to obtain your vocational education training in if you had a choice?

[ ] The same field that you selected
[ ] Unknown
[ ] N/A
[ ] Other __________
[ ] Comments: __________________________________________

11) How would you assess the quality of the vocational education training that you receive at the CDC institutions?

[ ] Highly effective
[ ] Least effective
[ ] Unknown
[ ] Average
[ ] Other __________
[ ] Comments: __________________________________________

12) What was your interest in taking a vocational education training course at the CDC institutions?

[ ] Boredom
[ ] To obtain a good parole status
[ ] To learn a new skill
[ ] To prepare myself for a job
[ ] To gain more knowledge
[ ] Other __________
[ ] Comments: __________________________________________

13) Why did you decide to take a skill in vocational education training?

[ ] Advised by a teacher
[ ] Heard that they were looking for skilled laborers in a certain that I was interested in
[ ] Wanted something to do
[ ] Other __________
[ ] Comments: ______________________________________________________

14) Did you complete all of your vocational education training?

[ ] Yes
[ ] No (can you please explain why) __________________________
[ ] Other __________
[ ] Comments: ______________________________________________________

15) How much money per hour do you expect to earn when you have completed all of your vocational education training?

[ ] $4.50-$5.50
[ ] $6.50-$7.50
[ ] $8.50-$9.50
[ ] $10.50-$11.50
[ ] $12.50-$13.50
[ ] $14.50-$15.50
[ ] $16.50-$17.50
[ ] $18.50-$19.50
[ ] Other __________
[ ] Comments: ______________________________________________________
Appendix C

Standard Deviation and Frequency Percentages
Question number 2 Survey Questionnaire B

Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 25 100.0 100.0

MEAN 1.840 Std err .160 Median 2.000

MODE 1.000 Std dev .800 Variance .640

KURTOSIS -1.344 S.E. Kurt .902 Skewness .307

S.E. SKEW .464 Range 2.000 Minimum 1.000

MAXIMUM 3.000 Sum 46.000

Question number 3 Survey Questionnaire B

Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 25 100.0 100.0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistical Measure</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>1.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std err</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODE</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std dev</td>
<td>.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KURTOSIS</td>
<td>.593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E. Kurt</td>
<td>.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>1.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E. SKEW</td>
<td>.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAXIMUM</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>30.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question number 4 Survey Questionnaire B

Ethnic Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native Americans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 25  100.0  100.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>5.875</td>
<td>Std err</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODE</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>Std dev</td>
<td>1.702</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KURTOSIS</td>
<td>4.315</td>
<td>S.E. Kurt</td>
<td>.918</td>
<td>Skewness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E. SKEW</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAXIMUM</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>141.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question number 5 Survey Questionnaire B

Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.E.D.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN 3.833  Std err .231  Median 3.500
MODE 3.000  Std dev 1.129  Variance 1.275
KURTOSIS -.371  S.E. Kurt .918  Skewness .750
S.E. SKEW .472  Range 4.000  Minimum 2.000
MAXIMUM 6.000  Sum 92.000
Question number 3 Survey Questionnaire A

Purpose of Vocational Education Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Skill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare for a job</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN</strong></td>
<td>2.040</td>
<td>Std err</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODE</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>Std dev</td>
<td>1.306</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>1.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KURTOSIS</strong></td>
<td>-1.237</td>
<td>S.E. Kurt</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S.E. SKEW</strong></td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAXIMUM</strong></td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>51.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question number 8 Survey Questionnaire A

Recidivism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question number 9 Survey Questionnaire A

**Completed Vocational Training**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 30 100.0 100.0

**MEAN** 2.800  **Std err** 0.246  **Median** 2.000
Variance 1.821
Skewness .029
Minimum 1.000

Valid Cum
Percent Percent
40.0 40.0
13.3 53.3
43.3 96.7
3.3 100.0
100.0

Median 2.000
Variance 2.185
Skewness .067
KURTOSIS -1.561
S.E. Kurt .833
S.E. SKEW .427
Range 4.000
Minimum 1.000
MAXIMUM 5.000
Sum 84.000

Question number 12 Survey Questionnaire A

Revision Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN 2.567
Std err .270
Median 2.000

MODE 4.000
Std dev 1.478
Variance 2.185
KURTOSIS -1.892
S.E. Kurt .833
Skewness .067
S.E. SKEW .427
Range 4.000
Minimum 1.000
MAXIMUM 5.000
Sum 77.000
FIGURE 1
RESPONDENTS BY GENDER

Female 20%
Male 80%
FIGURE 2
RESPONDENTS BY EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND/GRADE LEVEL

- Some College: 12%
- G.E.D.: 12%
- High School Graduate: 24%
- Other 5-8: 4%
- 9-11: 44%
FIGURE 3
RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF PROGRAM QUALITY

- Good Quality: 50.0%
- Strong Quality: 6.7%
- Unknown: 40.0%
- Other: 3.3%
FIGURE 4
RESPONDENTS WHO VALUE CDC VOCATIONAL TRAINING

No 12%
Unknown 8%
Yes 80%
FIGURE 5
RESPONDENTS' SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

- **Unknown**: 17%
- **Other**: 7%
- **Yes**: 13%
- **No**: 13%
- **Not Applicable**: 50%
FIGURE 6

RESPONDENTS' ETHNIC BACKGROUND

- Caucasian: 48%
- African-American: 20%
- Hispanics: 20%
- Native American: 8%
- Other: 4%
FIGURE 7
RESPONDENTS' SALARIES

- $4.50 - 5.50: 20%
- $6.50 - 7.50: 4%
- $8.50 - 9.50: 12%
- $10.50 - 11.50: 16%
- $12.50 - 13.50
- $18.50 - 19.50
- Other: 24%

Legend:
- $4.50 - 5.50
- $6.50 - 7.50
- $8.50 - 9.50
- $10.50 - 11.50
- $12.50 - 13.50
- $18.50 - 19.50
- Other
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