

VERA INSTITUTE  
LIBRARY  
2023

EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS OF EX-  
ADDICTS: IMPACT OF SUPPORTED  
WORK ON LONG-TERM  
EMPLOYMENT

Vera Institute of Justice  
New York, New York  
April 1976

Reproduction of any material contained herein is  
prohibited without express permission of the Vera  
Institute of Justice.

Employment Patterns of Ex-addicts: Impact  
of Supported Work on Long-Term  
Employment

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Employment during the first two year.....	4
A. Type and Salary.....	5
B. Job Sources.....	9
C. Job Retention.....	11
D. Terminations.....	12
E. Summary.....	14
III. Correlates of Employment.....	16
A. Demographic Differences.....	17
B. Employment and Job Performance.....	19
C. Crime, Drug and Alcohol Use.....	25
D. Summary.....	30
IV. Impact of Steady Employment.....	33
A. Long Term Involvement with Wildcat.....	34
B. Successful Post-Wildcat Experimentals vs. Successful Controls.....	40
V. Conclusions.....	46
References.....	49
Appendices.....	51

## I. Introduction

This report focuses on employment data covering the first two years of the Manhattan supported work controlled study.

The analysis of the impact of supported work (Wildcat) on its participants, especially in terms of long-term employment, must be placed in the context of the general employment picture for ex-addicts. Employment is an important rehabilitative tool for the ex-addict in treatment (1), who faces many obstacles in obtaining employment. Normally closed off to many jobs because of addiction, criminal, and sporadic employment history, the problem for the ex-addict becomes even more acute in a job market greatly reduced by recession.

Previous studies on employment among ex-addicts have focused on methadone patients: Gearing (1) has found that about 50% of MMTP patients who entered treatment in 1971-2 were "socially productive"\* two years later. An evaluation of the ARTC methadone program (2) found that 47% of the patients were employed during the first year of treatment.

Although the employment rates for the Manhattan control group appeared to be similar (50% worked at all the first year after entry, 48% the second), they had already been in treatment for an average of about one year

---

\*Includes employed, in school, or homemaker.

upon entering the sample, and thus are not strictly comparable to ex-addicts in the other samples. The supported work sample represents neither the most stable/employable nor the more unstable not-job-ready ex-addicts. As such the employment data for the control group should provide a valuable picture of employment success for ex-addicts who could work but may need additional support and assistance to find and maintain employment.

Since few studies have dealt with the type and quality of employment obtained by ex-addicts, a focus of this report will be the type of jobs obtained by ex-addicts, how the jobs were obtained, average salaries, and job retention. Further, a comparison is made between the jobs obtained by controls and those by experimentals after leaving supported work, as an assessment of Wildcat's long-term impact on employment: Are supported work participants able to obtain better, higher paying jobs than would otherwise be available? Comparisons are made by type of job, salaries, how jobs were obtained, and retention.

An analysis of controls and experimentals able to secure and maintain good jobs is also included to determine if a sub-group of ex-addicts can be identified for whom supported work is not necessary. What are the characteristics of successful ex-addicts, and how does successful employment interact with other rehabilitative variables?

Conversely, some supported work participants have employment difficulties, and are terminated within a short period of time; these are persons on whom supported work may not have an impact. The impact of supported work may increase with time at Wildcat, and the resources invested in these persons are more substantial. Therefore experimentals who worked at least three months were selected out and compared to controls who worked steadily for at least three months (to control for the effects of a steady job and income).

The data in this report cover the first two years after entry into the sample, and include the first group of 369 sample members (64% of the total) whose second annual follow-up interviews were on computer file as of November 1975.

Since the employment data are self-reported some distortions might have occurred: participants may over-report employment (by saying there were working when they were not, or by inflating salaries and/or time on the job) in an effort to present a more favorable image to the interviewer. Therefore, attempts were made to verify employment for random samples of respondents through direct contact with employers. It proved difficult to verify employment in every case because 1) some employers were not listed in telephone directories (as their names were recorded on the interview) 2) many respondents asked Vera not to contact their employers because their addiction history was not known, and 3) some employers did not

maintain employee records.

The preliminary results suggested that over-reporting was more prevalent among controls: A range between 52% and 84% of control jobs could be confirmed, compared to a range of 77% to 95% for post-Wildcat experimental jobs. Details on these projected verified employment rates are presented in Appendix 1. Because of the difficulties in verifying employment data, and the fact that in most cases no details on the employment could be obtained, the self-reported data are presented in this report without adjustments, with the possibility acknowledged that at least some of the participants may have over-reported employment.

These differences in verified employment rates suggest that the employment differences between experimentals and controls described in the following section may be even more substantial.

## II. Employment during the first two years

In general experimentals worked more weeks and earned more money in the first two years than did controls. However, the employment differences between experimentals and controls narrowed over time.

While about half the controls found work each of the first two years, the mean number of weeks worked and annual earnings increased in the second year.

Table 1

First, Second, and Combined Years Earnings,  
% Worked, and Weeks Worked\*

	First Year		Second Year		Years 1 and 2	
	Exp.	Control	Exp.	Control	Exp.	Control
Mean Earnings**	\$5014 (N=115)	\$1060 (N=135)	\$4441 (N=132)	\$1827 (N=165)	--	--
% Worked at all	92	50	75	48	95	64
Mean Weeks Worked**	39	12	32	17	71	29

\*Experimentals N=166; controls N=203. N's for the earnings data are lower because of missing salary data.

\*\*Includes those who did not work at all (averaged in as 0 weeks worked, \$0 earnings).

Cumulatively, 129 controls (64%) worked some time during the first two years, in 149 jobs. In contrast, 64 of the 110 (58%) experimentals who left supported work for any reason during the first two years worked at 76 post-Wildcat jobs.

A. Type and Salary (Table 2)\*

The 192\*\* controls in the 2-year sample found a total of 149 jobs during their first two years. Almost all were

---

\*Appendix 2 contains a detailed listing of jobs held by type. Jobs were classified as follows: Skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled occupations are those blue-collar, manual labor jobs requiring use of the hands or the body and the wearing of rough clothing. Skilled jobs are those which require specialized training or ability; semi-skilled jobs require some but not as much proficiency as needed on skilled jobs, and unskilled jobs refer to those jobs which require no training or skills at all. The differences lie mainly in the degree of education and training needed. Clerical occupations refer to those non-manual jobs which involve working in an office or store with papers and/or people, requiring a degree of formality in dress but not extensive skills or training.

\*\*Controls who only worked in the WREP program are not included here -- see p. 15.

entry-level clerical, blue collar unskilled, or blue collar semi-skilled. Only six percent of the jobs were blue collar skilled or professional/managerial. The experimentals worked in a total of 76 post-Wildcat jobs: The proportions of job types were similar to controls, except that experimentals found a higher proportion of professional/managerial jobs. This latter category included staff jobs at Wildcat. The data indicate that ex-addicts are unlikely to obtain skilled blue collar or professional/managerial jobs, a finding which is not surprising.

The following table shows the average weekly salaries earned by experimentals and controls for each of five job categories:

Table 2

Types of Jobs and Average Salaries  
(N=number of jobs)

	<u>Experimentals (N=76)</u>			<u>Controls (N=149)</u>		
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Weekly Salary</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Weekly Salary</u>
Clerical	(15)	20	\$113	(40)	27	\$105
Unskilled	(24)	31	\$130	(56)	38	\$ 90
Semi-Skilled	(25)	32	\$130	(45)	30	\$111
Skilled	(2)	3	\$174	(5)	3	\$185
Professional/ Managerial	(10)	13	\$165	(5)	3	\$135
Average Salary			\$132			\$106



For controls, salary levels generally followed skill levels, with blue collar unskilled jobs paying the lowest and skilled jobs the highest.

For post-Wildcat experimentals, clerical jobs paid the lowest salaries, with unskilled and semi-skilled jobs paying the next highest wages. In each category, except skilled work (where the number of jobs was very small) the post-Wildcat experimentals earned higher weekly salaries than did the controls working in the same type of job; on the average experimental jobs paid much higher salaries than control jobs (\$132 vs. \$106). While a control earned an average \$105 per week in a clerical job, an experimental earned \$113. Unskilled controls averaged \$90 per week, while their experimental counterparts in unskilled jobs earned \$130. Semi-skilled jobs found by the controls paid an average of \$111 a week, but experimentals in the same category earned \$19 more each week -- \$130. The same difference existed in professional/managerial jobs--experimentals earned an average of \$165 a week, while the controls had jobs that earned them \$135 a week.

The differences in weekly salary in the unskilled and professional categories are due in part to Wildcat's promotion policies and the effects of Wildcat job development and placement. For instance, five of the 24 experimentals in the unskilled category were placed by Wildcat's job development office as maintenance men in Rockefeller Center earning an average of \$179 a week, working the midnight to 8 A.M. shift. Within the professional/managerial area, four of the ten experimentals had been promoted to staff positions within Wildcat and earned average weekly salaries of \$194. These high salaries increased the average salaries of the experimentals in the unskilled and professional areas.

However, the experimentals who found post-Wildcat jobs without Wildcat assistance also had on the average higher salaries than controls in similar job categories: 18 experimentals found unskilled jobs averaging \$113 a week, 21 experimentals found semi-skilled jobs paying \$127 per week, and 6 experimentals found professional/managerial jobs averaging \$145. In each category, these salaries are higher than the salaries earned by the controls.\* Since most jobs at Wildcat are clerical,

---

\*The 10 experimentals who found clerical jobs without Wildcat assistance earned the same as controls--\$107 per week.

semi-skilled and unskilled, it may be that the experience at Wildcat enables the experimentals to compete for and get the higher-paying jobs in their job area.

Only in the skilled area did controls find higher paying jobs, but the total numbers here are so low, representing only 3% of the total jobs found by experimentals and controls (seven jobs total), that no substantive conclusions can be drawn.

B. Job Sources (Table 3)

Sources of jobs were reported by 60 experimentals and 105 controls. The following table analyzes job sources by two categories: jobs found by the workers themselves or with the help of family or friends, and jobs found with the assistance of public or private agencies (e.g., V.A., drug programs, Wildcat, NYSES).\*

---

\*See Appendix 3 for a more complete listing of agency job sources.

Table 3

Sources of Jobs, by Job Type

	<u>Experimentals</u>			<u>Controls</u>		
	<u>N</u>	<u>On Own</u>	<u>With Agency</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>On Own</u>	<u>With Agency</u>
Clerical	13	46%	54%	29	41%	59%
Unskilled	15	40%	60%	39	64%	36%
Semi-Skilled	22	50%	50%	30	67%	33%
Skilled	1	--	100%	5	100%	--
Professional/ Managerial	<u>9</u>	<u>45%</u>	<u>55%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>50%</u>	<u>50%</u>
Total	60	45%	55%	105	60%	40%

The data indicate that controls (60%) more than experimentals (45%) used family, friends or their own resources to find a job. Interestingly, the five controls who found skilled jobs (averaging \$185 weekly), did so with the help of friends or families.

Within the control group, the lowest paying jobs (blue collar unskilled and semi-skilled) were found most often through family and friends or by self-referral, while clerical jobs were located more often through agencies. In general, experimental job sources were evenly distributed; however, unskilled jobs were most often obtained through agencies.

C. Job Retention (Table 4)

Table 4 shows the average number of weeks worked during the first two years by type of job.

Experimentals who found post-Wildcat jobs had been employed in Wildcat for an average of 36 weeks. Thus, although the number of weeks worked in non-Wildcat jobs was the same (29 weeks) for experimentals and controls, on the average experimentals were employed for 43% of the time outside of Wildcat (29/68 weeks) whereas controls who found jobs were employed for only 28% of their time on the job market (29/104 weeks) in the first two years. Since the experimental sample includes many who were negatively terminated, these data suggest that Wildcat has improved the employment prospects for many of its participants.

Table 4

Average Total Length of Time on Job by Type, First Two Years

<u>Job Type</u>	<u>Experimentals with Post-Wildcat Jobs</u>	<u>Controls</u>
Clerical	26 weeks	30 weeks
Unskilled	26	26
Semi-Skilled	28	34
Skilled	31	49
Profess./Manag.	<u>42</u>	<u>24</u>
Overall (at Wildcat = 36 + <u>29</u> = 65 week total)		29

While the five controls who held skilled blue-collar jobs worked longer on the average (47% of the two-year period) than the controls who worked in other areas, generally there were only small differences within controls in terms of job retention by job type.

The number of weeks worked in post-Wildcat jobs did not differ by job type, except in the professional/managerial category. Experimentals (N=10) held these jobs for an average of 42 weeks after leaving Wildcat. This includes four men who were rolled over to Wildcat staff after working an average of 35 weeks as crewmembers or foremen.

D. Terminations (Table 5)

Table 5 shows self-reported reasons for leaving or losing a job. Positive reasons include quitting for a better job or to attend school; negative terminations include incarceration, being fired for arguing with supervisors; and neutral reasons include loss of job due to circumstances beyond the worker's perceived control; e.g. illness, being laid off, or a temporary job.\*

---

\*See Appendix 4 for a full list of reasons given for leaving jobs. Among other reasons given for leaving jobs were:

Negative: fired--drinking, fired--jail record discovered, quit--"mind wandered"  
Neutral: quit--no future

Table 5

Reported Reasons for Terminations by Group:

<u>Reasons</u>	<u>Experimentals with Post-Wildcat Jobs</u>	<u>Controls</u>
	<u>% of all jobs*</u> (N=76)	<u>% of all jobs</u> (N=149)
Positive	--	3
Negative	7	14
Neutral	20	24
Unknown	<u>17</u>	<u>20</u>
% of Jobs Lost	44%	62%
% of Jobs Retained	<u>56%</u>	<u>38%</u>

None of the experimentals and only 3% of the controls reported leaving their jobs for positive reasons. Controls were more likely to leave jobs for negative reasons. Most often job loss was reported as being due to neutral reasons. It may be that the post-Wildcat workers and controls tend to report more socially desirable, neutral reasons for job loss rather than reasons that may reflect negatively on themselves.

Overall, controls were significantly more likely to have left their jobs by the end of the second year ( $p < .01$ ) than experimentals with post-Wildcat jobs.

For both controls and post-Wildcat experimentals no relation was found between reason for termination, and type of job or length of time on the job.

---

\*Post-Wildcat only.

The termination data point up an apparent lack of upward mobility on the job market for ex-addicts; if employees do not remain at one job, they tend to be fired or laid off, and very few move directly from one job to a better job. This could reflect either the poor state of the New York City job market for ex-addicts, or the ex-addict's lack of previous employment experience and related difficulty in holding onto a job.

E. Summary

The job type data suggest:

• As would be expected, ex-addicts who find work (and only half the controls work at all each year) generally do not obtain good jobs; 94% of the jobs were clerical, blue-collar unskilled, or blue-collar semi-skilled with the average pay ranging from \$90 to \$111 per week. The jobs usually were entry level, with high turnover and little advancement or career opportunity. Without additional training or job placement assistance, these ex-addicts may remain at the lower levels of the employment market.

• Job turnover was high; over half the controls were fired or left their jobs during the two years. The turnover rate was lower for experimentals in their post-Wildcat jobs, but since they worked at Wildcat for a time there was a shorter time period for a job loss to occur.



e The supported work experience appears to be enabling experimentals to get higher paying jobs. Within most job categories, experimentals received higher salaries in post-Wildcat jobs than did controls. Although this was in part a function of Wildcat job placement assistance, those experimentals who found jobs without Wildcat assistance also averaged higher salaries than controls with similar jobs, except in the clerical category. Overall, post-Wildcat experimentals obtained higher paying jobs than controls.

e Experimentals who worked at post-Wildcat jobs were employed for a larger proportion of the time on the job market than were controls who worked. This suggests that Wildcat is preparing participants to secure and maintain employment more successfully than would be expected without supported work. Fifty-eight per cent of experimentals who left Wildcat obtained other jobs, including 32% of those who had negatively terminated.

e If, as the verification data suggest, controls are over-reporting employment more than experimentals, then the employment differences between controls and post-Wildcat experimentals may be more substantial than indicated in this section.

III. Correlates of Employment

This section will be concerned with differences in demographic, alcohol, drug, crime, employment and work performance between successful, moderately successful and unsuccessful employment groups, as defined by the number of weeks worked during the first two years in the sample.

Manhattan sample experimentals and controls with first and second annuals were sub-divided into three groups based on the number of weeks worked in the first two years. This permitted comparison between the most successfully employed group (C), moderately successful group (B), and the least successful group (A).

Table 6

Experimentals and Control Samples  
Grouped by Weeks Worked Years 1 + 2

	Experimentals*		Controls*	
	N	%	N	%
Group A (0 - 13 weeks)	20	12	97	54
Group B (14 - 51 weeks)	26	16	28	16
Group C (52+ weeks)	<u>116</u>	72	<u>54</u>	30
	N= 162		N=179	

---

\*The N's for these groups are somewhat smaller than the number of experimentals and controls that have first and second annuals. This is due to missing information and a special group of controls (N=14) whose work is public service and whose pay is 100% diverted welfare funds (WREP). They were omitted from the analysis since their WREP work was required in order to receive welfare; it does not represent voluntary employment.

Experimentals were much more likely than controls to have worked 52 weeks or more (Table 6), while controls were much more likely to have worked little if at all as compared to experimentals. Thus, 54% of the controls as compared to 12% of the experimentals have been chronically unemployed, and 72% of the experimentals as compared to 30% of the controls have achieved successful long-term employment. The proportion of both samples in the middle category (14-51 weeks) was the same.

A. Demographic Differences

In general, experimentals and controls (because of random sampling) do not significantly differ demographically.

Within employment subgroups, no significant differences were found in terms of age, race, marital status at intake, and mean monthly rent at first and second year. Sex proved to be a significant predictor of weeks worked in the first two years: Males in both experimental and control groups were more likely to have worked steadily in the first two years than females.

Table 7  
Sex Differences Between Sub-Groups

	Experimentals (%)		Controls (%)	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Group A (0-13 weeks)	12	23	53	78
Group B (14-51 weeks)	15	31	14	22
Group C (52+ weeks)	<u>74</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>--</u>
Combined groups	92% (N=147)	8% (N=13)	92% (N=163)	8% (N=14)

Table 7 reveals that 74% of male experimentals and 33% of male controls were members of the most successful employment group compared to 46% of female experimentals and 0% of the female controls who were found to belong to this same group. These findings indicate that female ex-addicts have greater problems in finding employment and holding onto a job than do males.

The number of people supported in the first two years was found to be significantly related to the number of weeks worked for the same period.

Table 8

Mean Number of People Supported First and Second Year

	First Year		Second Year	
	<u>Experimentals</u>	<u>Controls</u>	<u>Experimentals</u>	<u>Controls</u>
Group A (0-13)	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.4
Group B (14-51)	2.6	2.7	2.3	2.7
Group C (52+)	3.4	2.5	3.0	2.8

While only marginally significant differences were found between unsuccessful and moderately successful employment sub-groups, significant differences were found for experimentals (at first and second year) between the successfully employed sub-group and the other sub-groups. For the controls, in the second year (during which most of their employment took place), a similar difference occurred between the least successful group A and the most successful group C. As can be seen from Table 8, the overall effect is more distinct within experimentals ( $p < .01$ ) as compared

to controls ( $p < .05$ ). Also, an overall statistically significant finding ( $p < .001$ ) indicated that for both experimentals and controls the larger the number of people being supported, the greater the number of weeks worked in year 1, year 2, and year 1 + 2. Thus, from a motivational perspective, either larger family responsibilities mean an individual is more successful at holding a job, or that once an individual has a full-time job he/she is able and willing to take on additional family responsibilities.

B. Employment and Job Performance

Intake data indicate that there were no significant differences between sub-groups for experimentals and controls, in terms of number of months worked in the six months prior to intake.\* However, for experimentals ( $r=.195$ ,  $p < .05$ ) and controls ( $r=.156$ ,  $p < .05$ ) in general, the longer a person had held a job any time prior to intake, the greater number of weeks worked during the first two years. This confirms prior studies of ex-addict employment.\*\*

With respect to first and second year data, both experimentals and controls had higher mean weekly salaries and larger gross annual incomes the more weeks they worked

---

\*It was also revealed that previous formal skills training made no difference in terms of number of weeks worked in the first two years.

\*\*Elizabeth Kaestner (ODAS), personal communication, 1975.

during the first two years (Table 9). Thus, successfully employed experimentals and controls not only have higher income, as expected, but also have better paying jobs.

Table 9

Mean Weekly Salary First and Second Year (\$)

	First Year		Second Year	
	Experimentals	Controls	Experimentals	Controls
Group A (0-13)	86	81	54	75
Group B (14-51)	98	83	89	105
Group C (52+)	112	117	129	121

Table 10

Mean Total Annual Income First and Second Year\*

	First Year		Second Year	
	Experimentals	Controls	Experimentals	Controls
Group A (0 -13)	\$2022	\$2144	\$2431	\$2173
Group B (14-51)	2713	1889	1341	2485
Group C (52+)	4822	3539	5346	4945

For experimentals and controls mean weekly salary was not significantly different between unsuccessful and moderately successful employment sub-groups A and B. However, sub-group C earned significantly higher salaries than sub-groups A and B ( $p < .01$ ). In addition, an overall analysis of variance (for experimentals and controls) of all three sub-groups indicated a significant difference in terms of

\*For experimentals and controls, total annual income includes direct welfare payments and job earnings. In addition, experimentals total annual income includes any diverted welfare monies which comprised a portion of their salaries while at Wildcat.

total annual income ( $p < .001$ ): those who worked a greater number of weeks earned more money, even with direct welfare funds included in the total. Also a smaller but significant difference was found between subgroups of experimentals and controls, such that greater number of weeks worked was positively associated with larger mean weekly salaries.

Because total annual income figures include monies earned on the job plus those received from direct welfare payments, the issue of how much each sub-group receives annually from direct welfare payments is important. Presumably the more successful employment groups will receive less direct welfare monies. It should be noted that for experimental sub-groups annual earnings from Wildcat jobs include diverted welfare income paid to Wildcat. After they had left Wildcat (61% of the experimentals had left or been terminated from their Wildcat jobs after one year) they would again be eligible for direct welfare payments. However, it should also be noted that there was no delineation of diverted welfare payments and salaries within Wildcat employee paychecks. Thus, from the perspective of the individual Wildcat worker, all Wildcat earnings can be considered as salary, rather than a form of welfare.

Table 11

Mean Annual Direct Welfare Payments First and Second Year

	First Year		Second Year	
	<u>Experimentals</u>	<u>Controls</u>	<u>Experimentals</u>	<u>Controls</u>
Group A (0-13)	\$1671	\$2140	\$2364	\$2171
Group B (14-51)	634	1572	1166	1630
Group C (52+)	146	1283	379	849

Generally, one can see from Table 11 the steady decline of direct welfare payments received from sub-group A to sub-group C, for both experimentals and controls. A comparison of Table 11 with Table 10, indicates that, for the unsuccessful employment sub-group A total annual income is mostly direct welfare funds, but that for moderately successful and successful employment sub-groups B and C there is a steady drop in the percentage of direct welfare monies contributing to total annual income. It should be noted that the general increase in direct welfare payments received from first to second year for experimentals, reflects the fact that more of their weeks worked fell within the first year. Conversely for the successful control employment sub-group C, the decline in welfare monies received from first to second year indicates that the bulk of their collective weeks worked fell within the second year. While it should be obvious that direct annual welfare payments received is going to be negatively correlated with weeks worked in the same year, it was also discovered that first annual direct welfare income



is negatively correlated with weeks worked in the second year. Thus for experimentals ( $r = -.485, p < .001$ ) and controls ( $r = -.336, p < .001$ ) higher direct welfare payments received in the first year are predictive of fewer weeks worked in the second. This may indicate that a major impact of employment in general is to break the dependence on welfare monies and make work a more realistic economic alternative than welfare for the ex-addict.

Job Performance at Wildcat:

Another important area of interest is the relationship between job performance at Wildcat and weeks worked in and out of Wildcat for experimentals. Those promoted within Wildcat worked a significantly greater number of weeks in both years than did those promoted out of Wildcat. This may indicate the difficulty than an ex-addict experiences in maintaining a position in outside employment. Those promoted early in their first year work a significantly greater number of weeks in the second year than those who are promoted later in the first year. This is significant for both those promoted within Wildcat ( $t = -3.27, p < .01$ ) and those promoted out ( $t = -3.19, p < .01$ ). Thus it seems that those who fail to be promoted early on, are less likely to succeed in holding onto jobs of greater responsibility within or outside of Wildcat. This may point to an optimum time period of supported work involvement. On the other hand, another explanation is

that those who are promoted early in their Wildcat careers are better candidates for long term successful employment to begin with, and are simply recognized as such. No relation was found between number of transfers during the first year and weeks worked during the first two years.

Reasons for leaving Wildcat were examined. While no relation was found between being suspended and number of weeks worked in the first two years combined, those terminated with cause, separated, or resigned in the first year, worked significantly less in the second year than those who had not been negatively terminated (i.e. promoted or no status change).

Finally, behavioral performance measures in the first year were also predictive of long term employment for experimentals. Mean bonus rate\* during the first year was a positive predictor of weeks worked in year 1, year 2, and the two combined. The higher the first annual bonus rate, the greater the number of weeks worked in the first two years. Overall absenteeism rates were also strong predictors of weeks worked in the first two years. However, because weeks worked in the second year represents an

---

\*Based on absenteeism and punctuality within a prescribed bonus period.

important follow-up on performance differences in the first year, especially for those having left Wildcat, an additional analysis was made of second year weeks worked, eliminating those experimentals who worked at Wildcat in the second year. Overall absenteeism rates proved to be the lone significant predictor of weeks worked in the second year for Wildcat experimentals ( $r = -.597$ ,  $p < .001$ ).# Thus, successful employment outside of Wildcat in the second year was highly correlated with low absenteeism rates in the first year. This finding also held true for employment within Wildcat, but in addition first annual bonus rates were also highly correlated with successful employment within Wildcat in the second year. Punctuality was not found to be significantly related to weeks worked in the first two years (above and beyond the variance accounted for by the other two variables).

C. Crime, Drug and Alcohol Use

Turning to the issue of criminal history and its relationship to weeks worked in and out of Wildcat, no significant differences were found for experimentals and controls between unsuccessful, moderately successful, and successful employment sub-groups in terms of total number of self-reported convictions prior to intake and age at first arrest. In addition, no significant overall relationship was found between self-reported number of

---

\*It should be noted that absenteeism, punctuality and bonus rate are highly correlated with each other.

arrests prior to intake, or age at first conviction and number of weeks worked in the first two years.

This lack of relationship changed upon inspection of verified arrest data. Specifically, in relation to verified arrests prior to intake, controls with fewer verified arrests prior to intake were found to have worked significantly more weeks in year 1 ( $r = -.219, p < .01$ ) and the first two years combined ( $r = -.172, p < .05$ ) (but not year 2 alone). No such relationship was found within the experimental group.

Table 12

Mean Number of Verified Arrests Prior to Entry

	<u>Experimentals</u>	<u>Controls</u>
Group A (0-13)	8.8	10.0
Group B (14-51)	6.4	6.7
Group C (52+)	8.9	6.5

As can be seen from Table 12, control sub-group A had significantly more arrests prior to intake than the other two sub-groups ( $p < .05$ ), which were similar. While no such difference exists within the experimental sample (possibly due to the fact that supported work performance should not be prejudicially affected by prior criminal history) the findings within the control sample indicate that the length of an individual's criminal history may be related to chronic unemployment. It is unclear at this time what the overall relationship between length of criminal history is with respect to

long term employment. There was no overall significant relationship between verified arrests in the first year after entry and weeks worked in the first two years.

With respect to alcohol use no significant differences were found among employment sub-groups in terms of self-reported frequency of alcohol consumption at first year and second year. In addition, no significant relationship was found between self-reported frequency of liquor, wine, or beer consumption at intake, and weeks worked during the first two years. Drug history and drug use presented a somewhat different picture: for controls, no significant differences were found between sub-groups in terms of longest period off heroin prior to intake and age first addicted. No significant differences were found in terms of self-reported general drug use, heroin use during the first and second year, and time spent in a treatment program. The only significant finding within the control sample was that a small relationship was found between self-reported first annual cocaine use and weeks worked during the first two years: controls working a greater number of weeks in the first two years were less likely to report cocaine use in the first year.

With respect to the experimental sample, the situation again proved somewhat different. As with controls, no

significant differences were found between sub-groups in terms of longest period off heroin, and age first addicted. An interesting relationship occurred between the time spent in a drug program prior to intake and weeks worked in the first two years. The less time an individual had spent in his/her drug program prior to intake, the more weeks they worked in year 1, year 2, and the two years combined. While this result was somewhat unexpected, it may indicate that length of time within a drug program is not necessarily related to degree of successful rehabilitation (especially from an employment perspective). Thus it may be that an individual with a longer time in a program who is referred to Wildcat may also have had a longer history of employment failure (from previous program referrals) compared to those in a program for a shorter time. Given the fact that the finding only occurred within the experimental sample, this may also indicate an interaction effect between supported work (as opposed to control employment) and shorter time spent within one's drug program. Those who respond well to drug treatment may also respond well to supported work.

Experimentals who reported heroin abuse during the first year worked fewer weeks over the two year period, than those who did not report heroin abuse ( $r = -.183$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Experimentals, but not controls, also had significant differences in overall drug use among employment sub-groups for first and second year.

Table 13  
% Reporting Drug Abuse,\* Within Sub-Group, First and Second Year

	First Year		Second Year	
	Experimentals	Controls	Experimentals	Controls
Group A (0-13) weeks	18	31	45	30
Group B (14-51)	38	17	46	39
Group C (52+)	13	17	29	22

Table 13 reveals that the highest rate of self-reported drug abuse among experimentals falls within the moderately successful employment group B. Also noteworthy is the general increase in self-reported drug abuse from first to second year. Small sub-group sizes and the possibility that self-reported drug use may be an indicator of reporting behavior rather than drug abuse, make it somewhat difficult to analyse these results. In general it seems that the most successful experimentals, in terms of employment, report lower abuse of drugs than other sub-groups in both first and second years.\*\* It may well be that the overall relationship between many of the crime, drug and alcohol variables, and weeks worked in the first two years is not a linear one (for example see Tables 12 and 13).

---

\*Use of any illicit drug, excluding marijuana.

\*\*Among controls, the most successful employment group also reported less drug abuse than other controls.

D. Summary

The following findings emerged:

• In terms of the percentage of experimentals and controls in the unsuccessful, moderately successful, and successful employment sub-groups, it seems that Wildcat's major impact is on providing jobs to unemployed ex-addicts and in so doing increasing the likelihood that such ex-addicts will maintain stable employment for the first two years.

• With the exception of sex, demographic differences were not predictive of weeks worked in the first two years. Female ex-addicts worked on the average fewer weeks than males, for both experimentals and controls. Also, experimentals in the first and second year and controls in the second year, reported a higher number of people supported the more weeks they worked during the period.

• With respect to socio-economic differences, successfully employed experimentals and controls were found to not only have higher annual income, as expected, but also better paying jobs. Perhaps the most significant finding was the expected reduction in direct welfare payments received by successfully employed experimentals and controls. This was especially significant for experimentals in the first year, and remained significant

---



in the second year. From a systems perspective the fact that experimentals received diverted welfare funds while working at Wildcat would seem to vitiate the importance of this finding. However, from the perspective of the individual experimental, who had to work to obtain these funds, the importance of reducing direct welfare payments is made clear in that lower direct welfare payments received in the first year was predictive of more weeks worked in the second year. Thus employment in general reduces the direct welfare dependence and increases the likelihood of socio-economic dependence on stable employment.

• Job performance data from Wildcat indicate that first year absenteeism rates are negatively correlated with weeks worked in the second year both in and out of Wildcat. First year bonus rates were also independently predictive of weeks worked in the second year for those who remained within Wildcat. Those negatively terminated in the first year tended to work less in the second year.

• Finally, with respect to rehabilitative data, the least successful control sub-group (group A working 0-13 weeks in the first two years) had a significantly higher number of verified arrests prior to entry than the more successful control sub-groups. This may indicate that the number of prior arrests is predictive of success in the general employment market. However, no such pattern was found among the experimentals, suggesting

that supported work may help overcome the stigma of a long arrest history.

• No significant differences between sub-groups were found in terms of follow-up criminal behavior and alcohol consumption. Both experimentals and controls showed an increase in drug use from first to second year. However, both successfully employed experimental and control sub-groups had somewhat lower rates of drug use in the first and second year, indicating that general employment in ex-addicts (as opposed to supported work in particular) may reduce drug use. In general the long term impact of supported work does not seem to affect criminal, alcohol, or drug use behavior above and beyond the impact of employment.

#### IV. IMPACT OF STEADY EMPLOYMENT

Data from previous studies on arrest rates and drug use suggest that the longer a participant spent within the Wildcat supported work setting, the greater the long term impact on rehabilitation. It might be expected that persons terminated from Wildcat within the first three months, when termination rates are highest, will receive fewer benefits from the employment experience than those that remain longer; supported work may not be a viable intervention for those that terminate early. Because a more substantial investment has been made in those who remain for at least three months, it is important to understand differences in the impact of Wildcat on these persons and early terminees.

Thus, experimentals who worked continuously at Wildcat three months or more were compared to controls who worked steadily for at least three months on one job during the first two years (to control for the effects of a steady job and income).

The data for this section are based on four subsamples drawn from those Manhattan experimentals and controls with first and second annuals: A) A group of 64 controls (33%) who had worked steadily for three months or more in the first two years were compared to the 133 experimentals (80%) who had worked 3 months or more at Wildcat. B) A group of 19 controls who had

worked consistently at relatively well-paying positions were compared to a group of 26 post-Wildcat experimentals who had done the same. The sizes of these sub-samples are different from previously defined moderately successful (sub-group B) and highly successful (sub-group C) sub-groups because additional employment criteria were used to select the samples.

A. Long Term Involvement With Wildcat

With respect to the "worked 3 months or more" subgroupings, intake data revealed few differences between experimentals and controls. No differences were found in terms of sex or marital status. A slightly, but significantly higher percentage of the controls were white as compared to the experimentals (13% of the controls and 2% of the experimentals,  $\chi^2=9.37$ ,  $p=.01$ ) which in turn had a higher percentage of blacks. Experimentals were also found to be slightly older on the average than controls ( $t= - 1.85$ ,  $p < .07$ ), with the mean age of experimentals being 30.5 and that of controls being 28.4. In terms of drug and criminal history no differences were found in terms of age first addicted, longest period off heroin, age at first arrest, and total number of convictions prior to entry. Controls had significantly fewer verified arrests prior to entry than experimentals (6.5 for controls versus 8.7 for experimentals,  $t= - 2.24$ ,  $p < .05$ ) and this was also substantially lower than the

mean number of verified arrests prior to entry for controls in general (8.6). This again reflected the previously reported finding that the least successful controls (not included in this sample) had significantly higher prior arrest rates than the moderately and highly successful control groups. Also, controls who worked at least 3 months were somewhat younger than controls in general. Finally, with respect to employment history, no significant differences were found between experimentals and controls in terms of longest time held job and number of months worked in the six months prior to intake.

With the exception of age and number of prior arrests for controls, the 3-month groups were demographically similar to the overall experimental and control groups.

Turning to follow-up information from first and second annuals, socio-economic and employment data do seem to indicate that involvement with Wildcat for three months or more had some effect in the first year. However, with one exception these differences between experimentals and controls all but disappear in the second year. Experimentals were more open to their non-Wildcat employers about their drug histories in the second year than controls (67% of experimentals saying employers knew about drug histories as compared to 39% of the controls), and both groups were less open in the second year than in

the first.\* This may be a cumulative reaction to the possible discriminative policies against ex-addicts among outside employers. However, it may also be the case (especially for controls) that respondents are lying about their being employed and using the "no employer knowledge of drug history" as a tactic to prevent employment verification.

Table 14

Income and Rent Data for Experimentals and Controls Working 3 or More Months at Wildcat or on a Job Respectively

	First Year		Second Year	
	Experimentals (N=133)	Controls (N=64)	Experimentals (N=133)	Controls (N=64)
Mean Weekly Salary	\$ 110	\$ 115	\$ 127	\$ 127
Mean Direct Welfare** Payments	\$ 170	\$ 1201	\$ 530	\$ 887
Mean Annual Income***	\$ 4413	\$ 3003	\$ 4529	\$ 4315
Mean Monthly Rent	\$ 106	\$ 91	\$ 103	\$ 109

\*For experimentals, first year employment was almost exclusively Wildcat employment - thus 100% of experimentals would have revealed their drug history to Wildcat.

\*\*As previously reported (p. 21 ) experimental mean direct welfare payments increase from first to second year because the bulk of the weeks worked are within the first year; control direct welfare payments decrease from first to second year because the bulk of their weeks worked are in the second year.

\*\*\*Includes direct welfare payments and job earnings.

As can be seen from Table 14 experimentals who worked at Wildcat 3 months or more had on the average significantly lower annual direct welfare payments ( $t=8.40$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and larger total annual income ( $t=3.67$ ,  $p < .001$ ). No significant difference was found between experimentals and controls in terms of mean weekly salary, thus indicating that experimental-control differences in terms of gross annual income is a function of the number of weeks worked (above and beyond the first 3 months). Second annual data reveal that only mean direct welfare payments for experimentals is significantly different from the controls ( $t=2.06$ ,  $p < .05$ ), and that this difference has diminished considerably from the first year. One interesting finding was that while experimental second annual mean weekly salary was comparable to general experimental mean weekly salaries, controls who worked three months or more at one job had a higher mean weekly salary than controls in general in the second year.

The data point to one conclusion that the long-term socio-economic impact of working at Wildcat for 3 months or more helps to reduce the expected amount of direct annual welfare payments after leaving Wildcat.

Given the previously reported finding that, for both experimentals and controls, the amount of direct welfare payment in the first year is negatively predictive of weeks worked in the second year, it is also suggested that Wildcat may help to break the long term dependence on welfare as a source of income by simply providing a job, and by so doing increase the probability of long-term involvement in the employment market as an alternate source of income. However, the fact that mean direct welfare payments decreased the second year for controls and increased for experimentals may indicate a trend toward similar welfare income, since experimentals work fewer weeks in the second year than in the first and controls work more weeks in the second year than in the first.

Finally, it was found that, in the first year, experimentals reported on the average a significantly larger number of people supported (3.2) than did the controls (2.6;  $t = -3.43$ ,  $p < .001$ ). This difference disappeared in the second year with both experimentals and controls reporting an average of 2.8 people being supported (including self). Both first and second year data indicate that these experimental and control subgroups report supporting a larger number of people than experimentals (2.6 at first year, 1.9 at second) and controls (1.6 first year, 1.7 at second) in general.



With no exception, rehabilitative data indicate that there were no differences between experimentals working at Wildcat for 3 months or more and controls working 3 months or more in terms of drug use, alcohol consumption and verified arrest after entry. The only significant finding was that 2% of the experimental group reported having used heroin during the first year as compared to 9% of the controls ( $\chi^2=4.99$ ,  $p < .05$ ). However this difference disappeared in the second year and is similar to overall experimental/control differences. In addition, both experimental and control groups had a higher incidence of drug use in the second year than in the first. However this may reflect a change in reporting behavior from first to second year, rather than an increase in drug use.

Discussion:

In summary, data from the first two years indicate that experimentals remaining in supported work for 3 months or more show both lower direct welfare payments in the second year and higher job earnings than controls who worked for 3 months. Rehabilitative variables were not substantially affected by supported work as against 3 months of regular work. Further, drug use was similar for the 3 month groups and the overall samples. Although verified arrest rates after entry were similar for the 3-month experimentals and all experimentals, the 3-

month controls had a lower arrest rate than the overall control group. Since they also had fewer prior arrests, there is an indication that criminal activity is related to employment for ex-addicts, but does not interact with the impact of supported work.

B. Successful Post-Wildcat Experimentals vs. Successful Controls

A second issue was that of identifying, characterizing, and comparing successfully employed controls with successfully employed (post-Wildcat) experimentals. The characteristics of successfully employed ex-addicts were delineated and evaluated along with other rehabilitative variables. These successfully employed controls represent a sub-group for whom supported work does not seem to be necessary.

Twenty-six successful post-Wildcat experimentals and 19 successful controls were selected from the previously discussed sub-groups C, limited to those who had worked 78 weeks or more. For experimentals an additional selection criterion was that they had consistently worked in positions outside of Wildcat. For controls, three additional people not included in Section III are included in this sub-group because additional information was subsequently obtained.

Intake data revealed no significant demographic differences between groups (Table 15):

Table 15

Summary of Basic Demographic Data for Successfully Employed Post-Wildcat Experimentals and Controls

	<u>Experimentals (N=26)</u>	<u>Controls (N=19)</u>
<u>Mean Age</u>	30.2	28.2
<u>Sex</u> - Male (%)	96	90
Female (%)	4	10
<u>Race</u> - Black (%)	69	67
White (%)	8	11
Puerto Rican (%)	23	22
<u>Married</u> - Yes	35	27
No	65	73

These data are similar to the Manhattan experimental and control groups as a whole, except that successful controls are somewhat younger than the average control (mean age of controls at intake was 30.6).

With respect to drug history no significant differences were found between groups in terms of age first addicted, longest period off heroin, and type of program referral. These variables did not substantially differ from the groups as a whole. Reviewing criminal history data, no significant differences were found in terms of age at first arrest and total number of convictions between successful experimentals and successful controls. One unexpected finding was that the successful experimentals had, on the average, a higher number of verified arrests

prior to entry (10.8 as compared to 5.9 for controls). However, the estimate of the mean for the experimental group had a higher standard deviation than the estimate of the control mean (7.29 as compared to 5.07 for the controls). This reflects a greater variability within experimental verified prior arrests, and extreme values within this group combined with the small sample size probably account for the significant difference between the successful experimentals and successful controls on this variable ( $t = -2.43$ ,  $p < .05$ ). The successful controls had fewer prior arrests than all controls, while the successful experimentals had more prior arrests than other experimentals. Finally, no significant differences were found between groups in terms of longest time held job and number of months worked six months prior to intake.\*

Follow-up data again indicate only a few significant socio-economic differences between the two groups and these were for the most part limited to the first year. No significant differences were found between experimentals and controls in terms of the percentage of each group reporting that their employer knew about their drug problem at first or second year. Once again there

---

\*While small sample sizes make statistical significance difficult to achieve, absolute differences were not large.

was a decline in the percentage who said their employer did know from first to second year and this was especially true for the controls (67% of controls said employers knew about drug history at first year while 38% said employers knew at second year, for experimentals 68% said employers knew at second year).

Table 16

Income and Rent Data, First and Second Year, for Successfully Employed Post-Wildcat Experimentals and Controls

	First Year		Second Year	
	Experimentals	Controls	Experimentals	Controls
Mean Weekly Salary	\$ 121	\$ 122	\$ 157	\$ 144
Mean Annual Direct Welfare Payments	\$ 142	\$ 348	\$ 119	\$ 225
Mean Total Annual Income	\$ 5086	\$ 4886	\$ 7681	\$ 6754
Mean Monthly Rent	\$ 121	\$ 72	\$ 121	\$ 93

The lone significant difference between the two successful groups was for mean monthly rent first year ( $t = -4.59, p < .001$ ). Also mean monthly rent differences in the second year were marginally significant ( $t = -1.70, p < .10$ ) which may be suggestive of a long term difference on this dimension between the two groups.\* However, what is much more salient for successful experimentals and controls are the changes from first to second year

---

\*It is interesting that despite substantially higher income than the rest of the controls, the successful controls paid somewhat lower rents the first two years. This may reflect the influence of the welfare system which may encourage higher rents for some unemployed controls. Successful experimentals pay higher rents than other experimentals, however.

in terms of increased weekly salaries, increased total annual incomes, and reduced direct welfare payments. These indices all point to the conclusion that successfully employed ex-addicts continue to improve their socio-economic status over time as a function of their steady employment. These total income increases from first to second year for both the experimental and control sub-groups are in contrast to the decrease in annual earnings first to second year that experimentals and controls, in general, experience. Finally, successful experimentals, as previously reported for other groups, report a larger mean number of people supported (3.2) in the first year than do successful controls (2.6,  $t = - 2.24$ ,  $p < .05$ ). This difference was again limited to the first year. Both sub-groups report higher mean number of people supported in the first and second year than do experimentals and controls in general.

Follow-up rehabilitative data indicated no significant differences between successful experimentals and successful controls in terms of drug and alcohol use or criminal activity in the first and second year. Previously reported trends, in terms of increased drug use in the second year, were also much less apparent for these groups. These two most successful employment groups had generally

a somewhat smaller percentage of people reporting drug use both first and second year than the previously reported moderately successful groups.

Discussion:

In comparison to experimentals and controls in general, a) successful experimentals had lower first-year arrest rates than other experimentals, b) reported cocaine use was lower for both successful experimental and control groups in the first year, c) overall drug use was lower for successful experimentals the first year and for successful controls the second year. Because the successful group sample sizes were fairly small, these differences may be due to chance. However, the trend of the data does indicate that those ex-addicts who are able to hold good jobs for extended periods of time also show some reduction in crime and drug use.\* It is not clear whether those who are able to maintain steady, well-paying jobs (a small percentage of the overall groups) also tend to reduce drug use and crime, or whether steady employment results in decreases in these indicators. In other words, there seems to be some relationship, but no cause and effect is implied.

---

\*For a general discussion of the interactions among employment, crime, and drug use, see NIDA report dated 1/13/76.

V. Conclusions

The control group data confirm that ex-addicts are on the lower rungs of the employment ladder. Those that are able to obtain jobs generally find jobs with little future and low salaries; even the most successful controls had an average annual income of less than \$7,000. Turnover rates were generally high, and few controls left a job for positive reasons.

In this context, it appears that their supported work experience enables experimentals to obtain better-paying jobs within most of the job categories. This is generally true even for those who find post-Wildcat jobs on their own. In addition, experimentals worked a greater proportion of their time on the job market than did controls.

The 9% of controls who were able to obtain and hold well-paying jobs form a distinct sub-group of ex-addicts apparently able to do well without supported work. However, a detailed analysis of this group indicated that it would be difficult to identify them a priori. Successful controls were slightly younger and had fewer arrests prior to entry; otherwise they were demographically similar to other controls. For both experimentals and controls, the trend is for job retention and salary to be correlated. That is, those who work most also have the highest paying jobs.



In general, demographic variables were not strong predictors of employment success or failure for either experimentals or controls, with the following exceptions:

- 1) Females in both groups worked less during the two years than males. Discussions with drug program personnel seem to indicate that female ex-addicts are not particularly encouraged by the counselling staff to find work, so this finding was not surprising.
- 2) Among controls, the more successful sub-groups tend to be slightly younger and have fewer prior arrests. However, among experimentals, neither age nor prior arrests are associated with post-entry employment.
- 3) As would be expected, the longest time held a job prior to intake was positively correlated with weeks worked during the first two years.

For experimentals, job performance data in Wildcat during the first year after entry generally predicts employment patterns during the second year, when most experimentals had already left Wildcat. Negative termination during the first year was associated with fewer weeks worked the second year, while low absenteeism rate, high bonus rate, and promoting within or out were all associated with a greater number of weeks worked the second year. Thus it seems that those who fail in supported work also have general employment problems, whereas those that do well also have a better chance of doing well in post-Wildcat employment.

The findings were inconclusive in relation to the impact of employment on drug and alcohol use and arrest rates. These were similar for experimentals and controls who worked at least 3 months on a job. Drug use was similar for the 3-month groups compared to the overall samples, suggesting that supported work does not have a substantial overall impact on drug use, even for those who remain at least 3 months; this is also true of arrest rates. Controls who worked for at least 3 months did have lower arrest rates than the overall control group, however. Since these controls also had fewer prior arrests, there does appear to be some relationship between employment and criminal activity, but the nature of this relationship is not clear. The most successful experimentals had lower arrest rates than other experimentals.

Rehabilitative data for the most successful groups did indicate that, for both experimentals and controls, steady employment tended to be associated with lower rates of drug use, although this does not occur consistently in the first two years. The main point to be gathered from the arrest and drug use data is that although employment seems to be associated with lower drug use and arrest rates, the effect is neither large nor consistent: not even for the most successful employment groups does criminal activity or drug use disappear, and the unemployed controls do not have significantly higher rates of drug use than employed controls.

REFERENCES

1. Gearing, F. R. Methadone maintenance treatment for heroin addiction in New York City - An eight year prospective overview. Paper presented at Treatment Evaluation and Outcome Studies in Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Conference, Seattle, Washington, July 1974.
2. Rothenberg, P. B. and Kleinman, P. H. Addiction and employment: A study of the employment status of a cohort of methadone maintenance patients. Center for Socio-Cultural Studies on Drug Use, Columbia University School of Social Work, New York City, June 1975.

Appendix 1

Efforts were made to verify the employment of a random sample of 50 controls and 22 post-Wildcat experimentals who reported having jobs, in order to assess the extent of overreporting and differences between experimentals and controls. Verifications were made by telephone.

The results were not conclusive but suggested that controls over-reported employment to a greater extent than post-Wildcat experimentals. The main problems was that a number of employers were not listed in telephone directories or the information operator. Thus it was not possible to say whether the respondents made up the name of an employer, or the interviewer transcribed insufficient or erroneous employer information.

Therefore a range of true employment rates (based on the % employed data given in Section II) was calculated: assuming all those whose employers could not be located actually did work, the maximum verified employment rate for the second year is projected at 40% for controls (84% of jobs verified) and 46% for post-Wildcat experimentals (95% of jobs verified). The minimum projected rate, assuming all those whose employers were not located actually did not work, was 25% for controls (52% of jobs verified), and 37% for post-Wildcat experimentals (77% of jobs verified).

Under either assumption, experimentals had a higher proportion of jobs verified, indicating more over-reporting by controls. Taking a straight average of the maximum and minimum verified employment rates, it is estimated that 68% of control and 86% of experimental jobs were verified. Additional employment verification studies are currently under way to refine these estimates of employment over-reporting.

Appendix 2A - List of Jobs Held by Controls

Clerical - 40

Clerk - 21  
Sales Clerk 6  
Inventory Clerk - 2  
Mail Clerk - 2  
Key Puncher - 1  
Bank Clerk - 1  
Teletype Operator - 1  
Travel Agency Clerk - 1  
HRA Technical Clerk - 1  
Shipping Clerk - 4

Unskilled - 56

Trucker's Helper - 9  
Janitor - 8  
Exterminator - 7  
Cook - 5  
Messenger - 4  
Furniture Mover - 4  
Guard - 4  
Odd Jobs - 3  
Packer - 2  
Countermen - 2  
Kennel Cleaner - 1  
Vacuum Operator - 1  
Bathroom Attendant - 1  
Factory Worker - 1  
Disco Dancer - 1  
Car Parker - 1  
Lauderer - 1

Semi-skilled - 45

Cab Driver - 7  
Painter - 6  
Machine Operator - 6  
Construction Laborer - 3  
Welder - 2  
Dress Cutter - 2  
Repairman - 2  
Waiter - 2  
Tailor Trainee - 1  
Plumber Trainee - 1  
Carpenter Trainee - 1  
Machine Shop Worker - 1  
Brushmaker - 1  
Jeweler - 1  
Engraver - 1  
Drawer - 1  
Lineman's Helper - 1  
Food Supplier - Driver - 1  
Sheet Metal Apprentice - 1  
Assistant Building Manager - 1  
Floor Scraper - 1  
Sound Studio Assistant - 1  
Printing Press Operator - 1

Skilled - 3

Snip Rigger - 2  
Mechanic - 1

Professional/Managerial - 5

Counselor - 2  
Accountant - 1  
Administrative Assistant - 1  
Teacher's Assistant - 1

Appendix 2B - List of Jobs Held by Post-Wildcat Experimentals

Clerical - 15

clerk - 8  
stock clerk - 3  
mail clerk - 1  
xerox operator - 1  
typist - 1  
Wildcat intake clerk - 1

Unskilled - 24

janitor - 13  
handyman - 4  
guard - 2  
odd jobs - 2  
doorman - 1  
usher - 1  
kitchen helper - 1

Semi-skilled - 25

painters - 7  
machine operator - 3  
masonry cleaner - 3  
construction laborer - 2  
factory worker - 2  
film assistant - 1  
assistant lab technician - 1  
superintendent - 2  
landscaper - 1  
community health aide - 1  
corrections aid - 1  
mechanic trainee - 1

Skilled - 2

mechanic - 1  
computer programmer - 1

Professional/Managerial - 10

counselor - 3  
Wildcat supervisor - 3  
Wildcat interviewer - 1  
therapy assistant - 1  
activity aid - 1  
teacher's aid - 1

Appendix 3

Agency Sources for Jobs,  
Controls and Post-Wildcat Experimentals\*

Drug program

New York State Employment

Private employment agency

Newspaper ad

Manpower program

Union

Community organization

VA

New York City government agency

Fortune Society

Parole

School

---

\* In order of frequency reported. WREP jobs not included.  
In addition, 22 experimental jobs (29%) were obtained  
through Wildcat.