

THE ATTITUDES AND CONCEPTIONS OF CERTAIN TUCSON BUSINESSMEN  
TOWARD HIRING CONVICTED OFFENDERS

by

Richard Alan Bogage

---

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the  
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION  
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
For the Degree of  
MASTER OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION  
In the Graduate College  
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

1965

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This thesis has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at The University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this thesis are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the head of the major department or the Dean of the Graduate College when in his judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author.

SIGNED: Richard C. Bogage

APPROVAL BY THESIS DIRECTOR

This thesis has been approved on the date shown below:

R. A. Mulligan  
RAYMOND A. MULLIGAN  
Professor of Public Administration

5 / 6 / 65  
Date

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express his appreciation to Dr. Raymond Mulligan for his invaluable cooperation and supervision of this research project and to Drs. Chester Chiles and Jerry L. L. Miller for the helpful comments and criticisms they offered of the manuscript.

Special thanks are also due to two of my fellow graduate students, Jay Warner and Robert Koenig, for their assistance in interviewing community employers and providing information necessary for the successful completion of the research, and to Miss Dianne Timbers for her help with the statistical data of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	v
THE ABSTRACT . . . . .	vi
CHAPTER	
I THE PROBLEM . . . . .	1
Introduction . . . . .	1
Aims of Present Research Project . . . . .	6
II RELATED STUDIES . . . . .	8
The Gluecks' Study . . . . .	8
The Hurley Study . . . . .	10
The Randon Foundation Study . . . . .	13
The Rogers' Study . . . . .	14
The Martin Study . . . . .	17
Summary . . . . .	21
III METHODOLOGY . . . . .	24
Selection and Description of Sample . . . . .	24
Schedules Used and Hypotheses Tested . . . . .	27
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	31
Pilot Study . . . . .	32
Summary . . . . .	33
IV RESULTS . . . . .	34
Analysis of the Data . . . . .	34
V SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	76
Summary . . . . .	76
Conclusions . . . . .	78
Recommendations . . . . .	79
APPENDIX	
A SCHEDULES . . . . .	81
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	84

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1	Employers Willing and Unwilling to Hire Offenders, by Business Type, in Numbers and Percentages . . . . . 35
2	Difficulty in Filling Job Vacancies, by Business Type, Versus Attitude Toward Hiring Offenders, by Numbers and Percentages . . . . . 40
3	Rate of Turnover, by Business Types, Versus Attitude Toward Hiring Offenders, by Numbers and Percentages . . . . . 42
4	Methods of Recruitment, by Business Type, Versus Attitude Toward Hiring Offenders, by Numbers . . . . . 44
5	Firms Which Recruit Employees Through Other Employees Versus Attitudes Toward Hiring Offenders, by Numbers . . . . . 46
6	Firms Which Recruit Men Coming In Looking for a Job Versus Attitudes Toward Hiring Offenders, by Number . . . . . 47
7	Formal Application Used, by Business Type, Versus Attitude Toward Hiring Offenders, by Numbers and Percentages . . . . . 48
8	Applicants Questioned About Previous Work History, by Business Type, Versus Attitude Toward Hiring Offenders, by Numbers and Percentages . . . . . 52
9	References Required of Job Applicants, by Business Type, Versus Attitude Toward Hiring Offenders, by Numbers and Percentages . . . . . 53
10	References Checked, by Business Type, Versus Attitude Toward Hiring Offenders, by Numbers and Percentages . . . . . 54
11	Applicant Asked If He Has Been In Trouble With Police, by Business Type, Versus Attitude Toward Hiring Offenders, by Numbers and Percentages . . . . . 55
12	Willing Firms That Have Employed An Offender, by Numbers and Percentages . . . . . 59
13	Willing Firms That Now Employ An Offender, by Numbers and Percentages . . . . . 60

LIST OF TABLES -- Continued

Table		Page
14	Differentiation By Willing Employers On the Basis of Type of Crime Committed, by Numbers and Percentages . .	62
15	Employer Acceptance of Specific Types of Offenders When Considering Them for Employment, by Number, and Percentage of Total . . . . .	64
16	Reasons For Not Hiring Offenders, by Numbers . . . . .	70
17	Unwilling Firms That Have Employed An Offender, by Numbers and Percentages . . . . .	72
18	Employers Who Have and Have Not Hired An Offender Versus Attitude Toward Hiring Offenders, by Numbers . . .	73

## ABSTRACT

Correctional administrators have long recognized that released offenders need satisfying and worthwhile employment as an important part of their rehabilitation.

Research studies have not only pointed out the value of employment to released offenders, but also have served to show the amount of discrimination to which offenders have been subject in the past.

A limited research study was performed in an attempt to determine the general degree of acceptance offenders can expect to find in certain lower-level occupations in Tucson, Arizona. The sample included employers of 24 service stations, 20 laundries, 15 large construction firms and 20 restaurants.

The data gathered in the study indicated that the majority of employers interviewed at this level of skill are willing at least to consider hiring offenders. Many employers, however, would do so only in the less responsible jobs in their concerns. The data further showed that offenders have more success in securing employment in lower-level jobs in which employers find it difficult to fill vacant positions and to retain their male help. Other significant findings were that employers willing to consider hiring offenders take into account the nature of the crime committed by the offender in their hiring decision and that employers unwilling to hire offenders seem to base their negative attitudes on personal prejudice, rather than on past experience.

## CHAPTER I

### THE PROBLEM

#### Introduction

One of the ultimate goals of professional workers engaged in the field of corrections today is the rehabilitation and the redirection of offenders' lives. This process of criminal rehabilitation and redirection consists of many varied and highly complex facets, all of which are closely related to one another. The offender himself, the probation and/or parole officer, community resources, prison education programs, institutional personnel on all levels and community attitudes are just a few of the many factors that determine the relative success or failure of the correctional process. The purpose of this thesis is to study one very important and specific facet of rehabilitation: the employment opportunities for known offenders.

Most adult offenders, be they probationers, parolees, unconditionally released prisoners or those who have received a suspended sentence without probation, have at least one thing in common: in order for them to become active and contributing members of our society and to help them avoid possible future difficulties with the law, they need steady and secure employment. The importance of absorbing the convicted offender into the stream of honest and productive employment is one of the most sensitive and vital aspects of rehabilitation. With regard to this point, one author has written: "Correctional administrators have come to recognize, more and more, that vocational



success is a vital part in the maturation necessary for successful, law-abiding citizenship."<sup>1</sup>

This idea that worthwhile and satisfying employment is essential to the offender has long been recognized by correctional personnel.<sup>2</sup> For that matter, we can say that every man needs a satisfying and productive job in order to feel he is a valuable and contributing member of the society in which he lives. In our country, we place a high value on a man's right to earn an honest living for himself and for his family.

It has often been said that the strategic point at which the corrective influence can be mobilized to reverse the direction of an offender's life, to sever his connections with negative influences and to restore him to society is the point at which the offender is granted probation or is released from prison, either on parole or unconditionally, and takes his first job. If the offender is given the opportunity to work and earn a living, then his chances of becoming law-abiding in many cases are significantly enhanced. If, however, employment is not made available to him, the chances that he will revert to crime become greater.<sup>3</sup>

A job is considered so important to the rehabilitation of a prospective parolee that it is almost universally a requirement for

---

<sup>1</sup>Walter Evans, "The Probationer's Job: An Essential Factor in his Rehabilitation," Federal Probation, XXV (June, 1961), p. 31.

<sup>2</sup>Richard E. Cohn, "Wartime Acceptability of Probationers and Parolees for Employment," 1944 Yearbook National Probation Association (New York), p. 249.

<sup>3</sup>Evans, loc. cit.; Leonard Witt, "Parole Release Without Employment," N.P.P.A. Journal, VI (April, 1960), p. 174.

parole from a correctional institution. Although there are exceptions most offenders who are eligible for parole are released from prison only when they have a job on the outside waiting for them.

Arthur Lykke, in his book, Parolees and Payrolls, explains why so much stress is placed on demands that a person have a job before he is paroled. Lykke writes that one very basic reason is that the average prisoner, at the time of his release, is almost entirely without funds.<sup>4</sup> He usually leaves the institution with less than twenty-five dollars, and this certainly cannot last more than a few short days. Thus, Lykke establishes one sound basis for the necessity of having a job waiting for the parolee at the time of his release.

But aside from the fact that a parolee needs to support himself and his family economically, Lykke reasons that the right job can and will help the parolee develop self-respect, high morale, a sense of belonging, security, and a feeling that he is making a contribution to his employer and the community. We all aspire to these goals, but we may assume they are of great significance to a parolee or any released offender. In many cases he has lost his self-respect and feeling of usefulness in prison, and it is essential that he regain these components of a "self-image" in order to adjust to life in society successfully.

Another author, Dr. J. P. Martin, of the Cambridge School of Criminology in England, has pointed out that during the first

---

<sup>4</sup>Arthur Lykke, Parolees and Payrolls (Springfield, Ill.: 1957), pp. 98-101.

six months, just the period when an offender's deterrent or reformatory experiences might be expected to have the greatest effect, is many times the period when the risk of reversion to crime is at its height.<sup>5</sup> Professor Martin believes that it is during this crucial period that half of those destined to become recidivists again fall afoul of the law. Martin concludes that "...ex-offenders must be allowed to get jobs somewhere. No court has sentenced them to perpetual unemployment, indeed to do so would deny them the right to show that they can make good by dint of their own efforts."<sup>6</sup>

Although in their writing, Lykke and Martin are largely concerned with parolees, nevertheless what they say is just as applicable to the other types of rehabilitation. It is of equal importance for the probationer or the person who received a suspended sentence, or the man who has served his full sentence in prison and was then released, to earn an honest living on a decent job.

There can be no doubt that employment is a definite cornerstone without which success in probation and parole is difficult to achieve. It is also true that the very earliest workers in the prison, probation and parole fields recognized the great importance of gainful employment for offenders. "John Augustus, this country's first probation officer [1841], sought jobs as the first step after a home was found for his charges."<sup>7</sup> Man, in general, has always needed to feel

---

<sup>5</sup>J. P. Martin, Offenders as Employees (New York: 1962), p. ix.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 132.

<sup>7</sup>Cohn, op. cit., p. 246.

valuable, as a unique and productive member of society. "Those who have come in conflict with the law and are in correctional institutions or on probation or parole have just as much need for satisfying work. Their adjustment in a vocation....necessarily has profound effect on their lives."<sup>8</sup>

Correctional officials are aware of the appallingly high percentage of discharged prisoners, probationers, and parolees who commit new crimes. Yet they are also equally aware that "...helping them regain their dignity and economic security is the most practical form of crime prevention."<sup>9</sup>

People, in general, think that the only thing the released offender has to do is to stay out of trouble and away from bad influences. What they fail to recognize is that this ideal situation cannot be realized if the offender has no job to go to and no money to live on. If any criminal is to reform, it is a primary consideration that he have a legitimate means of livelihood.

It would be unrealistic to believe that every offender who has his probation or parole revoked, or who returns to prison at one time or another for breaking the law, would have stayed out of further trouble if he had had a job. The important point to remember is that in a large number of cases, job placement could mean and has

---

<sup>8</sup>Morline Anderson, "Vocational Guidance in a Correctional Program," N.P.P.A. Journal, VI (April, 1960), p. 152.

<sup>9</sup>Mort Weisinger, "He Finds Jobs for Ex-Convicts," American Mercury, LXXXII (May, 1956), p. 78.

meant the difference between staying out of trouble or getting back into it. Certainly, we cannot suggest that employment is the solution to the crime problem in our country. There are too many other factors involved to make such a generalization. What we can say, however, is that those who have come in conflict with the law stand a far better chance of "going straight" if they have an honest and respectable way of making a living.

#### Aims of Present Research Project

In the pages that follow the problem of the availability of employment for known offenders will be investigated in detail. Chapter II will discuss and critically evaluate the results and conclusions of interrelated studies dealing with the employment opportunities available for offenders in various communities. After this has been accomplished, the remainder of the thesis will concern itself with the results of empirical research the writer carried out in Tucson, Arizona. It was designed to determine the amount of acceptance certain Tucson employers displayed in considering the employment of offenders in their businesses. The methods, standards, and procedures that were employed in the study will be explained fully in Chapter III.

A systematic survey of employment opportunities for offenders has never been undertaken in the city of Tucson, according to local authorities. It seemed important to carry out a study of this nature here, not merely to ascertain the attitudes of certain employers toward hiring offenders, but also to contribute to a possible general theory of correctional rehabilitation. It must be remembered that

an integral part of any probation or parole officer's job is finding worthwhile and full-time employment for offenders. The more reliable and practical the information he has regarding employers' attitudes toward hiring his clients, the better equipped he will be in accomplishing his goal. This study then, in some small way, might contribute to our knowledge in this important aspect of the correctional process.

This present study differs from similar studies in the field not only because it is being performed in Tucson, but also because its sample was confined to include four types of businesses hitherto investigated only on a limited scale in the field. These are service stations, laundries, restaurants, and construction firms. Although past studies have included these occupations in their samples, they have only comprised a very small percentage of the total sample, and little is known factually about the attitudes of the employers in these occupations toward hiring offenders. The present study, by dealing exclusively with these occupations, will be able to report the attitudes of employers in these businesses toward hiring offenders in Tucson.

CHAPTER II  
RELATED STUDIES

The purpose of the second chapter is to examine in detail some of the published studies carried out in the past in the area under study. The fact that so few studies have been attempted in this field was an important factor in helping the writer decide to make such a study in the Tucson community. This is not to say that writers in the fields of corrections and criminology have not long recognized the significance of research into the hiring of offenders by employers. Rather, it means only that fewer studies have been performed in this area than one would expect.

The Gluecks' Study

In 1930, Drs. Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, well-known criminologists, published a book entitled, 500 Criminal Careers. Their purpose in writing this book was to make a serious effort to find out whether or not reformatories were accomplishing what they were intended to accomplish. They traced the lives of 510 men who left the Massachusetts Reformatory during the years 1911-1922 in order to prove that reformatories were seriously failing in their work. The Gluecks showed that 80.0 per cent of the 510 men were not reformed five to fifteen years after their release from the

Massachusetts Reformatory because they went on committing crimes after their discharges.<sup>1</sup>

The Gluecks included chapters on the industrial history of the 510 young men studied during parole and post-parole periods, and it is in these chapters that their study is relevant to this thesis. The following statement was made in connection with the parole history of ex-inmates:

It is well known that such adjustment in the community presents the most difficult task, in the light of the strong prejudice existing against employing ex-prisoners. Moreover, the young men whose careers we are studying have always found it difficult to obtain employment and their industrial history is characterized by lack of planfulness in the matter of vocation.<sup>2</sup>

The actual employment situation of the parolees, as brought out by the Gluecks, was not encouraging. The first job, required before release, was retained for a month or less by 60.0 per cent of the parolees. The average time of holding the first job on parole was two and a half months. In the jobs held longest during parole, the men stayed only about nine months on the average. The duration of the jobs in the parole period averaged slightly over three months. In 1927, a comparable year, 45.5 per cent of the factory workers in Massachusetts had kept their jobs for five years and over. Three-fourths of the parolees earned less than twenty-five dollars a week as a maximum, even in the war years when wages were high and opportunities numerous. The post-parole industrial history of these men,

---

<sup>1</sup>Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, 500 Criminal Careers (New York: 1930), p. vii.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 170.



as described by the Gluecks, was almost as unsuccessful. Nearly half of the men were industrial failures in the post-parole period.

The Gluecks' study is important in the context of the present thesis for it clearly shows the significant correlation that exists between failure of parole and irregularity of employment and low wages on the part of parolees. This study clearly points out that success on parole is significantly related to regularity of employment and good wages. Furthermore, the Gluecks' study unquestionably bears out the idea that if any criminal is to reform, it is an important consideration that he have a means of livelihood. Depriving an offender of the right to earn an honest living is a serious roadblock to the offender's rehabilitation. Without question, one of the most important factors in an offender's social readjustment is vocational stability.

#### The Hurley Study

In 1938, Sister Helena Angela Hurley completed a study entitled, Vocational Adjustment of Ex-Prisoners in the District of Columbia. This study was submitted as her Ph.D. dissertation at the Catholic University in Washington, D. C. One of the purposes of Sister Hurley's study was to show the attitudes of employers of labor at different levels of skill toward the employment of ex-prisoners.<sup>3</sup> In other words, Sister Hurley was interested in measuring the amount of discrimination employers in the District of Columbia practiced against hiring ex-prisoners.

---

<sup>3</sup>Sister Helena Angela Hurley, Vocational Adjustment of Ex-Prisoners in the District of Columbia (Washington, D.C.:1938), p. 16.

The method used by Sister Hurley was to interview a representative sample of 200 businessmen in Washington, D. C. She divided the employers into groups according to the number of persons they employed. She interviewed 100 firms that employed 50 or fewer people and 100 firms that employed more than 50 personnel. Her sample included a wide range of occupations both in the private and public sectors of the District of Columbia economy, e.g., manufacturing and mechanical industries, trade industries, professional service industries, and domestic and personal service industries. She secured a personal interview with an official in each company who was willing to state the attitude of the firm toward the employment of ex-prisoners.

Sister Hurley's study showed, among other things, that in the sample of employers interviewed, which was a representative group of businessmen in Washington, D. C., at all levels of skill, a majority was unwilling to take any part in assisting in the rehabilitation of released prisoners by opening the door of employment to them.<sup>4</sup>

Sister Hurley writes:

To one third of the two hundred employers, the fact that a man had a penal record was sufficient to exclude him from their organizations. The subtleties of employment procedure might bar an ex-prisoner from securing work in some of the other firms, but in 66 organizations, regardless of previous training, qualifications, evidence of regeneration, or official recommendation, an ex-inmate...was not wanted. Twenty-eight other employers were doubtful as to whether they would employ an ex-prisoner. A total of 94, therefore, nearly half of the employers interviewed, were unwilling to say that, other qualifications being equal, they would disregard a man's record and permit him to

---

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 147.

enter their employ. Twenty-nine small and thirty-seven large firms would not engage an ex-prisoner; 14 in each group were doubtful.<sup>5</sup>

Sister Hurley's study also brought out several other interesting and valuable conclusions, which are worth mentioning here. For example, she found that 162 employers out of the 200 she questioned, or 81.0 per cent, agreed that the ex-prisoner must be employed in order to be rehabilitated. But, as she reports, over 50 of these above-mentioned employers would not employ an ex-prisoner in their own organization. Sister Hurley also states: "When the employers who showed willingness to employ ex-prisoners were asked in what capacity they would engage them, the prospects for employment dropped considerably."<sup>6</sup>

In addition, Sister Hurley found in her interviews that an employer's previous experience with an unstable ex-prisoner was a serious deterrent to many employers' hiring another ex-prisoner. Some felt that they had fulfilled their obligation to society if they had tried just once (and failed) with an offender. Sister Hurley was able to conclude from her study that smaller firms (fewer than fifty employees) were more willing to employ ex-prisoners than concerns with many employees (more than fifty). In summarizing the attitudes of those employers opposed to hiring ex-prisoners, Sister Hurley says:

The attitude of all those opposed to ex-prisoners as employees might be appropriately summarized by saying

---

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 50.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 36.

that 'honesty is the best policy' or 'I cannot afford the risk'.....A large percentage of the employers interviewed assume that crime blackens a man's character irreparably and that imprisonment is merely a negative influence.<sup>7</sup>

The significance of the study to the subject matter of the present thesis is unmistakable. Sister Hurley's study proved that employer discrimination against hiring ex-prisoners was real and prevalent in the District of Columbia in 1938 and that job opportunities for ex-prisoners were severely limited. It also showed that, at best, the public's attitudes toward the ex-prisoner left a great deal to be desired. The inconsistency with which the public viewed the ex-prisoner was clearly brought out when 81.0 per cent of the 200 employers interviewed agreed that ex-prisoners need work, but many of these same employers would not offer an ex-prisoner an employment opportunity under any circumstances. Community assistance in the rehabilitation of offenders was found lacking in many respects in the District of Columbia as reported by Sister Hurley. She set out to find the extent to which discrimination against hiring ex-prisoners prevailed, and she found it to exist on a large scale and reported this to be a serious handicap to the reformation of prisoners in Washington, D. C.

#### The Randen Foundation Study

In 1946, an interesting study of businessmen, as summarized by Barnes and Teeters in New Horizons in Criminology, was made by the Randen Foundation to ascertain how prevalent discrimination was

---

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 50.

against ex-prisoners.<sup>8</sup> Questionnaires were sent to 475 prospective employers in most areas of business in the continental United States. Of this number, 312, or 66.0 per cent, stated unequivocally that they would not hire an ex-prisoner. About 21.0 per cent, or 101 employers, stated that they would hire an ex-prisoner provided the men were qualified for the job. All but one of the 312 further indicated that they would fire a man if they learned of his past record after he had secured work with them.

This study is another example which clearly demonstrates the great amount of hostility that has been present in the past against the hiring of ex-prisoners by employers, regardless of the background of the offender. Many employers do not even consider the skill or trade the offender has to offer their concern. The fact that the ex-prisoner has been convicted of a crime and has served time in prison is enough to bar him from employment.

#### The Rogers' Study

Of the more recent studies that have been performed in this area of employing offenders, Joseph W. Rogers' 1958 mail survey of 408 manufacturing businesses in the United States can be cited.<sup>9</sup> He reports that 80.0 per cent of the 408 respondents stated that they would be willing to consider hiring ex-inmates. These results seem

---

<sup>8</sup>Harry Barnes and Negley Teeters, New Horizons in Criminology (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: 1959), p. 547.

<sup>9</sup>Joseph W. Rogers, "A Study of Employer Attitudes Toward Parolees," (Unpublished thesis abstract, University of Washington, 1958).

to be in direct contrast to the other studies previously mentioned. But when one carefully analyzes Rogers' findings, it is clear that there are many other variables that these willing employers consider before actually hiring an ex-prisoner. Rogers states that at least three-quarters of these willing employers would have nothing to do with narcotic sellers, child molesters or forcible rapists. In addition, well over half would never consider hiring anyone convicted of murder, homosexuality, habitual drunkenness, or using narcotics.

Rogers adds:

As to the level of entry position, at least two-thirds of the manufacturers would consider hiring a parolee only in jobs involving unskilled, semi-skilled, and skilled labor. About one-third would include office positions, but less than one-fourth would include jobs involving foremen, sales, or professional positions. It would seem clear that, by and large, newly paroled ex-offenders must be willing to start at the lower levels of employment.<sup>10</sup>

A closer look at Rogers' study also reveals that of the 326 manufacturers who expressed a willingness to consider hiring an ex-prisoner, only 110, or 34.0 per cent, reported that they have knowingly hired ex-prisoners in the past. The old phrase — actions speak louder than words — seems to apply quite well here. Although Rogers reports that only 68 of the 408 respondents expressed an unwillingness to consider a parolee or ex-prisoner for employment, it would appear that his rather favorable findings are somewhat exaggerated because so few of those he calls willing employers had ever knowingly employed parolees or ex-prisoners in their businesses at the time of this study. Rogers' survey, however, does show more

---

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 3.

understanding and empathy on the part of employers than did the earlier studies of Sister Hurley and the Randen Foundation, but it still demonstrates the degree of discrimination to which many types of offenders (narcotics, rapists, etc.) must be subjected in their search for employment. The fact that only 34.0 per cent of the willing employers had previously hired ex-prisoners cannot be stressed enough. This indicates either that his sample of employers say one thing and do another or that the field of corrections is seriously failing to make needed contacts with the willing employers in the community. To have willing employers in the community who are not being asked to give offenders employment is a serious situation which should not exist. Willing employers are at a premium and their willingness must be known and used by correctional officials.

A sidelight to Rogers' study was that he asked each manufacturing firm whether or not it required information of job applicants concerning history of arrests or the complete prior criminal record. As Rogers reports: "Surprisingly, 82.0 per cent replied that they asked for neither one. Thus, in spite of apparent concern about hiring certain types of offenders, relatively few firms (63) even bother about inquiring whether or not an applicant possessed such a background."<sup>11</sup> Although Rogers does not mention this fact, it would appear from his findings that an offender stands a better chance of securing employment at a business where no questions are asked about his previous criminal record. It is also interesting to note and speculate as to whether, in any other type of business, 82.0 per cent

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., p. 9.

would remark that they do not question an applicant for employment about his previous criminal record, as Rogers found in his sample of 408 manufacturing firms.

#### The Martin Study

One of the most recent inquiries into this area of employment opportunities for offenders was performed in England by J. P. Martin of the University of Cambridge. His book, Offenders as Employees, published in 1962, presents the results of a survey performed in Reading, England, a city of about 118,000 people, located near London. One portion of the survey done by Martin and his associates was aimed at ascertaining the attitudes and practices of a sample of Reading, England, employers toward employing offenders. The researchers wanted to determine what employers' practices were with regard to offenders, what experiences with the problem these employers have had, and what they regard as the factors which they must take into account when faced with a decision about an individual.<sup>12</sup>

The methods used in this study were those of the orthodox social survey. Martin prepared a schedule, and, together with a team of interviewers, questioned a random sample of Reading employers. This random sample consisted of 97 firms, 49 of which employed 20 or more men, and 48 of which employed 19 or fewer men.

The survey showed that although at least two-thirds of the firms questioned in Reading had employed offenders at one time or

---

<sup>12</sup>J. P. Martin, Offenders as Employees (New York: 1962), p. 2.



another, firms which had consciously done so were in a minority. As Martin reports:

...in this sample, about 18 out of 49 larger firms (37%) had knowingly taken on ex-offenders, while 12 (24%) had done so unwittingly. In the smaller firms the higher proportion of ex-offenders taken on in ignorance of their records leads to some spectacular figures....it appears that only some 8 of the 48 firms (17%) were aware that the men they were recruiting had criminal records.<sup>13</sup>

Martin felt that it was important to discover how many firms had some jobs for which men were recruited without being asked questions about their past. Nearly 66.0 per cent of the larger firms and about 40.0 per cent of the smaller firms had sections in which recruitment was conducted on a basis of "no questions asked".<sup>14</sup> Of these, recruitment without question was most common among construction firms, but it was also fairly well widespread for laboring jobs in general. Martin concludes that it would not seem difficult for an offender to get a menial job without questions being asked. On the other hand, however, he is correct to point out that where a man wants something better than an unskilled job, and where he has been convicted of an offense, the situation becomes much more difficult and the prospects for employment decrease considerably. Professional jobs in banks, insurance companies and other related businesses require the full background of the applicant, and these employers do discriminate against hiring people who have violated the law.

Martin's findings seem to be very realistic, and they clearly demonstrate an important fact — offenders stand a good chance of

---

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 48.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., p. 121.

getting employment at low-level jobs simply because, in many cases, no questions are asked about their past work and/or criminal records since they are not applying for positions of trust. When the offender seeks employment in a higher-level job (administrative, professional, technical), however, for which he may be fully qualified, he frequently finds a great deal of resistance and discrimination on the part of employers. This situation leads Martin to write: "While, no doubt, in certain jobs no risks can be taken, one is bound to wonder whether some employers do not carry their caution beyond the limits demanded by reasonable prudence?"<sup>15</sup>

An illustration might help bring out more clearly this unfair and unjust situation. Let us say that an individual has been working for an insurance company as an accountant for fifteen years. During his sixteenth year of employment he begins to pilfer funds from the company and is subsequently caught and convicted of this crime and given a short prison sentence. Upon being paroled, is it too unrealistic to believe that this offender has learned his lesson and can again assume a responsible position in an insurance company? Or is it more realistic to believe that he should no longer be put in a position of trust and that after fifteen years of being an accountant he should become a construction worker? This is indeed what the situation is, and Martin's study substantiates the view that offenders, regardless of their training, experience and education, often times must be relegated to low-level jobs if they are to secure employment.

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., p. 122.

Among Martin's additional findings are several interesting facts which are relevant to our discussion. For example, Martin found that, although the larger firms recruit more offenders in absolute numbers, the smaller firms take on relatively more offenders in relation to the number of their new entrants.<sup>16</sup> With reference to employers' attitudes toward various offenses, there appeared to be a consensus that sex offenses aroused the greatest aversion. A large proportion of employers considered sex offenders unemployable. In general, he found that the offense which the offender committed did have a bearing on his opportunity for employment.

Twenty-nine per cent of ex-offenders employed in the larger firms were rated by their employers as good workers while 37.0 per cent were rated as unsatisfactory. In the smaller firms, 17.0 per cent were rated as good workers and 34.0 per cent were considered unsatisfactory. From the viewpoint of duration of employment, ex-offenders in larger firms had reasonably good records of job stability. Men previously convicted of embezzlement and fraud and sex offenders were among the more successful employees. In contrast, however, they were often the last ones to be hired by an employer because these particular types of crimes are viewed with considerable suspicion and aversion.

Martin's study is more detailed and deals with many more aspects of offenders as employees than would be practical or relevant to discuss here. We have, however, included in our discussion the

---

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 47.

more important aspects of his study which are related to the present thesis.

#### Summary

Thus, a summary of some research projects attempting to discern the availability of employment for offenders and the attitudes of prospective employers toward hiring them has shown that in the past, by and large, employers have discriminated against hiring the various classes of offenders. Although in Chapter I we noted the importance of employment to the offender in his quest for self-reformation, in this chapter, by investigating previous studies, we have seen that offenders often have a difficult time securing decent employment because community attitudes are not sympathetic to their situation.

But can we accept these past studies, performed in the United States and England, as true indications of what we may expect to find today in various parts of our country? Do offenders still face the same amount of employer discrimination and resistance in trying to find suitable employment as, for example, Sister Hurley found in the District of Columbia in 1938?

These questions are very difficult, if not impossible, to answer adequately because few recent research projects in the United States have attempted to investigate these and other related queries. As was mentioned above, Sister Hurley's study was carried out in 1938, and it is reasonable to suggest that her findings may not be applicable today, 27 years later. Rogers' 1958 study dealt only with manufacturing businesses in our country and therefore his findings are limited. Professor Martin's very recent survey (1962) was

performed in Reading, England, and although there are certainly similarities between hiring customs and procedures in England and the United States, it does not seem logical to conclude a priori that his findings are true indications of what we might expect to find existing in Tucson, Arizona, or Detroit, Michigan, or any other city in the United States.

Having surveyed these related studies dealing with employers' attitudes toward hiring offenders, we should be able to see the need for more research in this vital area of corrections. It is impossible to know accurately the extent to which discrimination is being practiced by employers in our country because so few studies have been initiated recently in this area. If discrimination still exists on the same level that Sister Hurley found it to exist in 1938 in Washington, D. C., then correctional administrators should have as much up-to-date and conclusive information as possible on the subject so that they may make significant strides toward alleviating this situation. If, on the other hand, employer discrimination has decreased in the last two decades or so, it is equally important for officials in corrections to maintain good rapport with community employers in order to increase job availabilities for offenders. They can only accomplish this by having complete and reliable data on the subject, obtained through current scientific investigations.

The present study involves the attitudes of certain Tucson employers toward hiring offenders in areas not extensively dealt with in past studies in order to examine the general degree of acceptance offenders might expect to experience in the employment process. As

was mentioned in Chapter I, the present study was confined to a sample of service stations, laundries, construction firms and restaurants. The reasons why these occupational groups were chosen over others and the techniques and methods employed in this study will be examined in detail in the next chapter.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

The method employed throughout this study was that of the social survey. This writer set out to question personally a random sample of certain Tucson business employers in order to learn what their attitudes are toward hiring the various classes of offenders. This random sample finally totaled 79 Tucson employers and the composition of this sample will be explained at this stage.

#### Selection and Description of Sample

After discussing with some correctional officials and others the problem of getting a representative sample of all Tucson employers, it was decided to concentrate the efforts of this study to a random sample of only certain classes of employers within the city limits of Tucson. The reasons for reaching such a decision were many, but they can be best summarized by saying that an undertaking which tried to sample all Tucson employers would be beyond the capacity of just one researcher and, in order to do credit to such a project, a team of experienced researchers would be needed. Since a project of this magnitude was deemed impractical because of the many problems associated with such a study, it was decided to simplify the sampling procedure as much as possible but, at the same time, not at the expense of making the study insignificant.

The sample of employers finally agreed upon and questioned in this study consisted of the following: employers of 24 service

stations, 20 restaurants, 20 laundries, and 15 large construction firms, making a total of 79. Based on approximate figures from the regional office of the United States Employment Service, there are an estimated number of 230 service stations, 235 restaurants, 85 laundries and 95 large construction firms (those which build on a contract basis and do not provide personal services or repairs) within the Tucson city limits.

The rationale for delimiting types of businesses is based on past findings. From previous studies performed in the area of employment opportunities for offenders, discrimination was shown to exist in some levels of employment, but especially in higher-level occupations (technical, professional, administrative, etc.). Those previous studies further showed that in lower-level jobs (semi-skilled or unskilled) although discrimination might exist to some degree, it was not as prevalent. Offenders stand a better chance of acquiring employment at this level, if for no other reason than that employers of lower-level occupations are not as apt to ask questions regarding the applicant's past criminal history as are those employers of higher-level positions.

Taking these factors into consideration, it was felt that if this study concentrated solely on those kinds of occupations in which offenders in general have in the past been most successful in finding work, it would be significant and valuable to see how much discrimination or how much acceptance Tucson employers of these kinds of occupations would demonstrate in considering offenders for employment.

The process used to select the four classes of businesses ultimately adopted for the study started with the interviewing of



experienced local probation and parole officials. They were asked to select the first four occupations in which they thought an offender had the best chance of obtaining employment. In other words, they were asked to list the four occupations they would be most likely to turn to if they had a client in need of employment. Through these officials' recommendations, the writer decided that samples of employers in the fields of service stations, restaurants, laundries, and construction firms would be interviewed in order to gather data for the study.

If the results of this study show discrimination against hiring offenders exists in Tucson in these occupations, which are generally felt to be more favorable in availability to offenders, then this would be an important finding; it would show that even in those jobs usually felt to be open to offenders, discrimination does exist. If, on the other hand, the results of this study indicate that Tucson employers at this level are willing to hire offenders, then this, too, would be an important finding. It would show that these employers are willing to accept offenders as employees and would also substantiate the personal views of many local correctional workers. This study, then, focuses its attention on trying to determine if offenders can generally expect to find acceptance or discrimination in certain lower-level jobs in Tucson.

To term service station workers, restaurant employees, laundry or construction workers as low-level employees in no way indicates that these jobs are unimportant or of no value to society. It means only that in the spectrum of job classifications in our country, these jobs are considered to be of lower status than professional or technical jobs because they do not require the same amount of education or

training these higher-level positions do. Certainly, all of the employees in these four types of occupations perform worthwhile and valuable services in the community, and this thesis is not trying to single out these occupations for any other reason than that they provide a convenient and workable sample of employers.

The sample of employers of 24 service stations, 20 restaurants, 20 laundries, and 15 construction firms to be interviewed was chosen at random with caution taken to make them as representative of the whole city of Tucson as possible. In order to do this, Tucson was divided into four areas with Broadway dividing the city north and south, and Country Club Road dividing it east and west. Wherever possible, an equal number of employers were interviewed from each area.

It must also be noted that all concerns interviewed had to meet one very important criterion — they had to have at least one other male employee besides the manager or owner. Any employer who did not employ at least one other male employee was excluded from this survey. For example, if the interviewer went to a service station and, in questioning the proprietor, found that he ran the station by himself, this individual was not asked to answer any further questions. The same procedure applied to all those interviewed in the various occupations.

#### Schedules Used and Hypotheses Tested

The schedules of questions used in this study are to be found in Appendix A. A few general points regarding them should, however, be discussed here.

First, it should be noted that there are two separate schedules after Question 7. The second page of the schedule to be used in the interview was determined by the employer's response to this question. If the respondent answered Question 7 — Would your firm hire a person who had been convicted of a crime? — with either "yes" or "it would depend on the case", he was then asked the questions on the second page of the schedule, marked Y2 in the Appendix. If, however, the employer answered Question 7 by saying "unequivocally no", he was asked the questions on the third page of the schedule, marked N2 in the Appendix.

Each of the questions comprising the schedules for this survey will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter IV of the thesis when the results of this study are examined. We can state here, however, that Questions 1 and 2 were asked to test the hypothesis that many times male offenders have more success in securing employment in lower-level jobs in which employers find it difficult both to fill vacant positions and to retain their male employees.

Questions 3-6 were included in an attempt to substantiate the hypothesis that many times, in lower-level jobs, applicants are not required to fill out formal application forms, provide references, or answer questions about any possible police record they may have, thereby making it easier for them to secure employment at this level. Question 7, already referred to in this chapter, was asked to ascertain the employers' attitudes regarding the employment of offenders in their businesses.

In preparing the schedule of questions to be used in this study it was deemed necessary to have two separate schedules after the employer indicated his response to Question 7. If an employer answered this question "yes" or "it would depend on the case", he was termed a willing employer because he indicated by his response that he would at least consider an offender for employment. It was next important to find out if he was presently employing or had ever employed an offender in his organization. The best way a willing employer can demonstrate his alleged willingness is by his actions, and it therefore seemed important to determine whether or not willing employers had ever employed or were presently employing offenders. For this reason Questions 8 and 9 were included on the Y2 schedule.

It was also considered significant to find out whether or not willing employers would differentiate between the type of crime committed by the offender in their decision to hire him. For example, would an employer who expressed a voluntariness to hire an offender refuse to hire a person convicted of rape or murder, but yet accept a person convicted of burglary or arson? In order to test the hypothesis that these willing employers do consider the nature of the crime committed by the offender in their decision to hire him, Question 10 was included on the Y2 schedule.

The last question on the Y2 form, Question 11, was asked of these same employers in order to see which type of offender might have the best chance of getting employment and also to test the hypothesis that these employers are unable to distinguish between a probationer, a parolee, and an offender who has served his full sentence

in prison. In order to test this hypothesis, they were asked not only to rank these three classes of offenders in the order they would hire them, but also to explain their answers. Thus, if an employer ranked a probationer first, he was asked on what grounds he justified his choice.

If an employer answered Question 7 "unequivocally no", he was considered unwilling because by his response he indicated that he would not hire an offender under any circumstance. The questions on the N2 form were asked of all unwilling employers in order to learn why they were against hiring offenders in their businesses. Question 8 on the N2 form, for example, — Since it is your policy to refuse employment to convicted offenders, what led you to follow such a policy? — seeks the possible reasons for this unfavorable attitude.

Question 9 on the N2 schedule asks whether or not these unwilling employers have ever hired an offender. It seemed important to ask this question in order to determine if these employers based their unwillingness on experience or just on personal prejudice.

The last question on the N2 form, Question 10, was asked for similar reasons as Question 11 on the Y2 schedule, although it was stated differently. Instead of asking these unwilling employers which type of offender they would be most apt to hire and why (Question 11, Y2 form), they were asked rather to rank the three classes of offenders in terms of seriousness and to explain their rankings. It was felt that by having these employers do this, it would be possible to test the hypothesis that unwilling employers are not able to differentiate between the three classes of offenders listed in this question.

### Limitations of Study

It must be emphasized that this report does not set out to provide an exhaustive discussion of the subject of employment opportunities for offenders in Tucson. Rather, it is meant to be an account of a limited survey which deals with a small aspect of the whole problem. This study is, of necessity, limited with regard to the sample of employers questioned, and it is further limited because it is restricted to opportunities for employment of male offenders only. In a city the size of Tucson, there would be relatively few women offenders, and it is unlikely that employers would have had enough experience with the problem to answer a factual schedule of questions. For these reasons women offenders were excluded altogether.

Specific mention should be made of another limiting fact. Although Tucson has a total population of over 300,000, there is very little industry here and the labor picture is not very bright. Jobs are generally scarce, and unemployment is a serious problem in the community. Under these circumstances, therefore, one might expect to find more discrimination against hiring offenders. There are so many people seeking employment here that it would be relatively easy for an employer, if he so desired, to find an individual with no police record to fill a job vacancy. It is possible that employers in some communities are willing to hire offenders simply because they cannot find anyone else to fill a position but this situation is not likely to exist in Tucson where unemployed labor is plentiful. This situation will have to be considered in analyzing the results of this study in the next chapter.

### Pilot Study

A pilot study consisting of five service stations, five laundries, three restaurants and three construction firms was first performed in order to determine two very important factors: 1) The best method of obtaining interviews from the appropriate employers; and 2) the questions which could be effectively asked and answered in the study.

The principal lessons learned from these preliminary interviews can be summarized as follows. It was found that an appointment was needed in order to interview the employer or personnel manager of construction firms only. In all other occupations, simply calling on the employer unannounced proved quite satisfactory. In all cases in the pilot study and in the actual study, the person interviewed was either the owner, manager, or personnel officer of the firm. The person interviewed had the responsibility of hiring employees in all cases.

With regard to the schedules used in this study, the pilot stage showed them to be adequate, and the data needed for this survey was satisfactorily obtained from them. The pilot study clearly showed that in Question 7 — Would your firm hire a person who had been convicted of a crime? — three, and not two, alternative answers were needed. It was not sufficient to have "yes" or "unequivocally no" as the alternative answers because most interviewees in the pilot study answered this question by saying, "it would depend on the circumstances" or "it would depend on the offense". On the basis of this experience, the third alternative, "it would depend on the case", was included in the schedule as a possible answer to Question 7.

The pilot study also indicated that, by and large, employers in the Tucson community were willing to cooperate. Some resistance was found to exist, especially among service station employers, but not enough to consider eliminating this group from the survey. In general, the pilot study reassured the writer that the procedures being used in this social survey were sound and that the four groups of employers were willing to cooperate and volunteer the necessary information and data for this study.

#### Summary

This, then, is a summary of the methods, procedures and standards employed throughout this study. In review, we should re-emphasize the fact that the sample of Tucson employers to be interviewed in this study included only a very small segment of the total number of employers in the community. This was done in order to make the study practicable and workable. Restricting the sample to include only the four classes of occupations previously discussed in this chapter does place limitations on the study and when the results of this survey are discussed in the next chapter, care will be taken to exercise good judgment in order not to distort or exaggerate the findings of the survey. The feeling of this writer is that a survey of this limited nature is nonetheless valuable and meaningful and it can offer some additional knowledge to the field of corrections.



## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

Now that the methods employed in the present study and the hypotheses to be tested in it have been reviewed and discussed (Chapter III), the data and the results obtained from the study will be the subject of this chapter. In order to analyze the findings of this study, the responses of the sample of employers to each question included in the schedules will be examined and their significance noted.

The responses employers gave to Question 7 — Would your firm hire a person who had been convicted of a crime? — will be considered first in this analysis. The employers were divided into two groups on the basis of their answers. Those who answered "yes" or "it would depend on the case" were considered willing employers; those who answered "unequivocally no" were considered unwilling. The responses to Questions 1-6 will then be examined to see if there is a relationship between the responses to these questions and the employers' attitudes toward hiring offenders (Question 7). Finally, the questions on the Y2 form, asked of willing employers, and the questions on the N2 form, asked of unwilling employers, will be discussed.

#### Analysis of the Data

Table 1 outlines the responses of the 79 employers to Question 7. Twelve employers of those interviewed (15.0 per cent) answered "yes" to this question. Half of the employers who answered affirmatively were

construction firm employers. No employers in service stations and only three in laundries (15.0 per cent) and three in restaurants (15.0 per cent) responded by saying "yes". A "yes" answer to this question indicated that the employer was willing to hire an offender in his business and had no serious reservations about doing so. But, as we can observe from the results of this question, there were relatively few employers (15.0 per cent) comprising the sample of this study who took this position.

TABLE 1

EMPLOYERS WILLING AND UNWILLING TO HIRE OFFENDERS,  
BY BUSINESS TYPE, IN NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES

Business Type	Employers' Answers							
	Yes		No		Depends		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Service Stations	0	0.0	4	17.0	20	83.0	24	100.0
Laundries	3	15.0	11	55.0	6	30.0	20	100.0
Construction Firms	6	40.0	0	0.0	9	60.0	15	100.0
Restaurants	3	15.0	7	35.0	10	50.0	20	100.0
Total	12	15.0	22	28.0	45	57.0	79	100.0

On the other hand, 22 employers of the total sample (28.0 per cent) answered this same question by saying "unequivocally no", indicating that they would not hire an offender in their businesses under any circumstances. Half of the ones who answered this question in this manner were laundry employers. They were the only ones, according to

the data, to have a majority (55.0 per cent) answer "unequivocally no" to this question, thus indicating a tendency to discriminate against hiring offenders. There were no construction firm employers, only 4 service station employers (17.0 per cent) and 7 restaurant employers (35.0 per cent) who responded negatively to this question.

Looking at Table 1, we can also see that there were more employers in the sample who answered this query by saying "unequivocally no" than there were those who responded "yes". In other words, in the sample, the percentage of employers who are not willing to hire offenders in their businesses (28.0 per cent) exceeds the percentage of those who would do so without reservation (15.0 per cent). But, as Table 1 shows, the majority of employers (57.0 per cent) chose to answer this question by saying, "it would depend on the case". This answer was most often given by service station and construction firm employers. When an employer responded to this question by saying, "it would depend on the case", he did not want to commit himself either way.

It is important to note here the various interpretations some employers gave when answering, "it would depend on the case" to Question 7. The way that some of them qualified or explained their answers is of importance to the findings of this study.

Five of the 20 service station employers who responded to Question 7 by saying, "it would depend on the case", explained that they would have to be experiencing difficulties in finding men to fill vacancies in order to hire an offender. Three other service station employers who answered this question in the same way mentioned they would rather not hire a person who has had a police record for two reasons.

One is that employees in service stations have direct contact with the public while on the job, and the possibility exists that if customers found out that a service station has an offender as an employee, they might shy away from doing business with it. Secondly, and of equal importance, is the fact that service station employees usually handle cash, have access to the cash register, and are surrounded by expensive and desirable stock, e.g., tires, general automotive parts, etc. These same employers stated that they cannot be around their stations all the time and have to hire employees who are trustworthy and honest.

The six laundry employers who answered, "it would depend on the case" and even the three who answered "yes" to Question 7 further qualified their answers by stating that certain jobs in their businesses would not be open to offenders. For example, nine of them mentioned that no offender would be hired as a driver or delivery man in their business; several of them gave their reasons for this. First of all, they said that a driver deals directly with customers, when picking up laundry and returning it to the homes, and they believe that customers would not tolerate being serviced by an offender. Secondly, several employers of laundries said that drivers collect money from the customers, and they feel that they cannot trust a man with a criminal record in this type of job. Three of these employers gave the reason that drivers in their concerns are bonded, and bonding companies would not allow them to have offenders as employees in positions of trust.

On the other hand, many of these same nine laundry employers, who expressed some willingness toward hiring offenders in their businesses, said that they would consider hiring offenders as machine

operators, pressers, or as workers on other inside jobs where the offender would not be dealing directly with the public or be handling cash transactions in the laundry.

All fifteen construction firm employers interviewed (Table 1) answered Question 7 by saying "yes" or "it would depend on the case". Four of the nine employers, who answered "it would depend on the case", qualified their answers by saying that an offender would not be considered for an inside job in their businesses. This is probably true in other construction firms as well, but this information was volunteered by four of these employers. Offenders would only be hired to work on outside labor jobs, and in many cases, this would require that the offender be a member of a particular union.

Although Arizona has a right-to-work law which restricts compulsory unionization, many employers, e.g., construction firm employers, enter into contractual agreements with certain unions, thereby restricting themselves to hiring only union members. That is why it is often essential for an offender to be a member of a union before he can hope to be hired by a construction firm to do outside work.

Six of the ten restaurant employers who answered Question 7 by saying "it would depend on the case" (Table 1) also explained their answers. Some said that they would not hire an offender in a position where he had to handle cash, but that certain jobs would be open to him in their businesses, e.g., bus boy, kitchen help, dishwasher, etc.

This sample of community employers generally appears to be against hiring offenders in positions where they either have direct contact with the clientele of the business or are responsible for

handling cash. Although the sample of Tucson employers interviewed does not seem to discriminate against the hiring of offenders in their concerns per se, since only 28.0 per cent of those interviewed said they definitely would not hire offenders, the jobs open to offenders within their organizations seem to be limited and usually confined to the least important ones in the business. Laundry employers would not hire an offender as a driver, but would consider him for a presser's job. The construction firm employers generally would not want an offender in an inside job, but do not mind if he is hired to do outside labor. Restaurant employers frown upon hiring an offender as a cashier, but would consider hiring him to be a cook, bus boy or dishwasher.

Now that we have analyzed the responses given by the sample of employers to Question 7 and divided it on the basis of willingness to hire offenders, we can now turn to a discussion of their responses to Questions 1-6.

The first question asked of this sample of employers was: In general, do you experience any difficulty in filling job vacancies in your business?

Table 2 shows the responses of the willing and unwilling employers in each business type to this first question. From this table, we can see that 56 employers (71.0 per cent) do not find it a problem filling job vacancies in their respective businesses. Only 23 of the 79 employers interviewed (29.0 per cent) said that it is difficult to fill vacant positions. We can further note that one group, willing restaurant employers, is the only one of the eight to have a higher percentage of employers answering "yes" to this question than "no". This indicates

that in general, willing employers of restaurants in the sample do experience difficulty in filling job vacancies. From Table 2 we can also note that service stations and laundries have the least amount of trouble in filling job openings in their respective businesses.

TABLE 2

DIFFICULTY IN FILLING JOB VACANCIES, BY BUSINESS TYPE, VERSUS ATTITUDE TOWARD HIRING OFFENDERS, BY NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES

Business Type <sup>a</sup>	Difficulty in Filling Job Vacancies					
	Yes		No		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Service Stations Willing	3	15.0	17	85.0	20	100.0
Service Stations Unwilling	0	—	4	100.0	4	100.0
Laundries Willing	1	11.0	8	89.0	9	100.0
Laundries Unwilling	1	9.0	10	91.0	11	100.0
Construction Firms Willing	5	33.0	10	67.0	15	100.0
Construction Firms Unwilling <sup>b</sup>	—	—	—	—	0	—
Restaurants Willing	12	92.0	1	8.0	13	100.0
Restaurants Unwilling	1	14.0	6	86.0	7	100.0
Totals	23	29.0	56	71.0	79	100.0

$$X^2 = 5.91, \text{ d.f.} = 1; \text{ p} < 0.02$$

<sup>a</sup>The meaning of willing and unwilling employers was determined by the employers' responses to Question 7. Those who answered "yes" or "it would depend on the case" are considered willing; those who answered "unequivocally no" are considered unwilling. These categories will be maintained throughout the study.

<sup>b</sup>There were no unwilling construction firm employers

The four business types in the sample were combined in order to see more clearly the relationship between employer attitudes toward hiring offenders and the difficulty that these employers experience

in filling job vacancies. It was felt that the attitudes these employers have with regard to hiring offenders might be affected by the degree of difficulty they experience in filling job vacancies.

A Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) was performed on the data represented in Table 2, and it was found to be significant at the .02 level ( $X^2 = 5.91$ , d.f. = 1), showing that there is a relationship between attitudes toward hiring offenders and difficulty in filling jobs. In order to learn the direction of this relationship, a Yule's Q was obtained ( $Q = +.71$ ). This shows that employers' negative attitudes toward hiring offenders are associated with less difficulty in filling job vacancies, and conversely, that favorable attitudes toward hiring offenders are associated with greater difficulty in filling job vacancies. This finding partially confirms the hypothesis, stated in Chapter III, that offenders will have more success in securing employment in lower-level jobs in those cases where employers find it difficult to fill vacant positions and retain their male help.

These employers were then asked whether they experience a high, medium, or low rate of turnover in their concerns. (Question 2)

Table 3 gives the rate of turnover experienced by the willing and unwilling employers in each business type. It indicates that employers as a whole do not feel that retaining their hired help is a serious problem. This is evidenced by the fact that 37 of those questioned (47.0 per cent) felt that they have a low rate of turnover, and 21 (26.5 per cent) felt that they experience a medium rate of turnover with their employees. On the other hand, only 21 (26.5 per cent) indicated a high rate of turnover in their businesses.



TABLE 3

RATE OF TURNOVER, BY BUSINESS TYPE, VERSUS  
ATTITUDE TOWARD HIRING OFFENDERS, BY NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES

Business Type	Rate of Turnover							
	Low		Medium		High		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Service Stations Willing	10	50.0	7	35.0	3	15.0	20	100.0
Service Stations Unwilling	3	75.0	1	25.0	0	—	4	100.0
Laundries Willing	3	33.0	5	56.0	1	11.0	9	100.0
Laundries Unwilling	9	82.0	2	18.0	0	—	11	100.0
Construction Firms Willing	6	40.0	3	20.0	6	40.0	15	100.0
Construction Firms Unwilling	—	—	—	—	—	—	0	—
Restaurants Willing	2	15.0	1	8.0	10	77.0	13	100.0
Restaurants Unwilling	4	57.0	2	29.0	1	14.0	7	100.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>47.0</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>26.5</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>26.5</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>100.0</b>

$$\chi^2 = 10.41, \text{ d.f.} = 2; p < 0.01$$

There seems to be a correlation between the answers to Questions 1 and 2. Where filling job vacancies was considered a problem, a high rate of turnover among employees was indicated (willing restaurant employers); where filling job vacancies was not regarded as a problem, a predominantly low or medium rate of employee turnover existed (service stations and laundries).

The employers' responses to Question 2 were related to those given to Question 7. This was done in an attempt to learn if a relationship exists between labor turnover and the attitudes of the employers toward hiring offenders. It was thought that unfavorable attitudes would

be present more often among those employers having low employee turnover and vice versa.

A Chi-square was performed on the data of Table 3, and it was found to be significant at the .01 level ( $\chi^2 = 10.14$ , d.f. = 2), indicating a definite relationship between these two factors. The direction of this association was determined by obtaining a Yule's Q ( $Q = +.65$ ). This obtained value indicated that negative attitudes tend to be associated with a low rate of turnover, and conversely, favorable attitudes are related to high employee turnover.

This finding offered the additional evidence needed to support the hypothesis that offenders have more success in securing employment in lower-level jobs in which employers find it difficult both to fill vacant positions and to retain their male help.

The third question — From what sources do you normally obtain your male employees? — was included in the schedule in order to find out which methods of recruitment are most often used by the sample of employers.

Table 4 shows that the method of recruitment most often mentioned by the sample of employers was "d", applicants who have heard of the firm through other employees. Fifty-five employers referred to this method of recruitment as a common one in their organizations. Among the other methods frequently used and referred to by employers were "e", men who just come in looking for a job, and "a", private and public employment agencies. Twenty-two employers use vacancy notices placed outside their premises when male help is needed, while only in a few cases (16), do employers in this sample list advertisements in

local newspapers as a means of recruiting male employees for their businesses.

TABLE 4  
METHODS OF RECRUITMENT, BY BUSINESS TYPE,  
VERSUS ATTITUDE TOWARD HIRING OFFENDERS, BY NUMBERS

Business Type	Methods of Recruitment					
	a. Agency <sup>a</sup>	b. Ads <sup>b</sup>	c. Notice <sup>c</sup>	d. Friends	e. Chance	f. Other
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
Service Stations Willing	1	1	11	14	15	0
Service Stations Unwilling	1	0	2	5	2	0
Laundries Willing	7	2	0	7	7	0
Laundries Unwilling	8	2	1	9	2	0
Construction Firms Willing	12	3	0	3	2	10 <sup>d</sup>
Construction Firms Unwilling	—	—	—	—	—	—
Restaurants Willing	3	5	8	12	9	0
Restaurants Unwilling	5	3	0	5	1	0
Total	37	16	22	55	38	10

<sup>a</sup>"Agency" means either public or private employment agencies.

<sup>b</sup>"Ads" means advertisements in newspapers.

<sup>c</sup>"Notice" means vacancy notices placed outside their premises.

<sup>d</sup>Unions.

With regard to construction firms, it is important to note that 10 of the 15 employers interviewed indicated that they usually rely on the local unions to do their recruitment of outside construction workers. These employers stated that, when they receive a contract,

they call the local union and request a certain number of qualified workers for that particular job. The local unions, then, play a major role in the recruiting of men for construction work in Tucson.

This sample of employers, according to the data in Table 4, seems to rely more heavily on what may be called the informal methods of recruitment, e.g., applicants who hear of the firm through friends, or who just come in looking for work, rather than the more formal methods, e.g., advertisements in newspapers, or public and private employment agencies. This may be attributed to the unemployment situation in Tucson, referred to in Chapter III. If there is an opening in a business, under the present economic conditions in Tucson where jobs are at a premium, an employer can be reasonably certain that by using the more informal methods of recruitment, he will be able to hire a qualified individual within a short period of time. This saves him the expense of placing an advertisement in the newspaper and the bother of contacting private and public employment agencies. If the employment situation in Tucson were not so serious a problem, then these employers might be forced into using the more formal methods of recruitment, as we have defined them. Thus, it is quite possible that the unemployment problem has some bearing on the recruitment procedures followed by this sample of employers.

Favorable and unfavorable attitudes toward hiring offenders were compared with all the recruitment methods listed in Table 4 (except method "f"). The obtained Chi-square values were not significant for methods "a", private and public employment agencies, "b", advertisements in newspapers, and "c", vacancy notices placed outside the premises,

indicating that these procedures are not consistently related to employer attitudes. However, for recruitment methods "d", applicants who have heard of the firm through other employees, and "e", men who just come in looking for a job, a significant Chi-square was obtained.

Table 5 compares the responses of the total sample with respect to Question 3, part d, with those given to Question 7. For method "d", applicants who have heard of the firm through other employees, a Chi-square was found to be significant at the .05 level ( $X^2 = 4.03$ , d.f. = 1), indicating a relationship between employer attitudes toward hiring offenders and this form of recruitment. When a Yule's Q was computed to learn the direction of this association ( $Q = +.57$ ), it was found that when employers' attitudes are unfavorable, method "d" is more frequently used.

TABLE 5

FIRMS WHICH RECRUIT EMPLOYEES THROUGH OTHER  
EMPLOYEES VERSUS ATTITUDES TOWARD HIRING OFFENDERS, BY NUMBERS

Attitudes	Method		
	Do Not Use Method "d"	Do Use Method "d"	Total
	No.	No.	No.
Would not Hire Offenders	3	19	22
Would Hire Offenders	21	36	57
Total	24	55	79

Table 6 similarly compares the responses of the total sample with respect to Question 3, part e, with those given to Question 7.

With regard to method "e", men who just come in looking for a job, again a Chi-square was tabulated which was significant at the .01 level of confidence ( $X^2 = 7.86$ , d.f. = 1), showing a relationship between employers' attitudes toward hiring offenders and this form of recruitment. The computation of Yule's Q ( $Q = +.65$ ) indicated that when employers' attitudes are favorable, this method of recruitment is more frequently employed.

TABLE 6

FIRMS WHICH RECRUIT MEN COMING IN LOOKING  
FOR A JOB VERSUS ATTITUDES TOWARD HIRING OFFENDERS, BY NUMBERS

Attitudes	Method		Total No.
	Do Not Use Method "e"	Do Use Method "e"	
	No.	No.	
Would not Hire Offenders	17	5	22
Would Hire Offenders	24	33	57
Total	41	38	79

The point has already been made that the sample of employers seem to rely more on informal methods of recruitment. The data of Tables 5 and 6, then, point out which informal methods unwilling and willing employers tend to use most often in their businesses. Those with attitudes defined as unfavorable toward hiring offenders seem to rely on method "d"; those with favorable attitudes rely on method "e". Possible reasons for these findings will become clearer in the light of an analysis of the responses to Question 4.

Questions 4-6 are even more specific about the hiring procedures of these employers. Table 7 shows the responses of the willing and unwilling employers by business type to the question: Does your firm use a formal application for hiring purposes?

TABLE 7

FORMAL APPLICATION USED, BY BUSINESS TYPE, VERSUS  
ATTITUDE TOWARD HIRING OFFENDERS, BY NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES

Business Type	Formal Application Used					
	Yes		No		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Service Stations Willing	11	55.0	9	45.0	20	100.0
Service Stations Unwilling	0	—	4	100.0	4	100.0
Laundries Willing	8	89.0	1	11.0	9	100.0
Laundries Unwilling	3	27.0	8	73.0	11	100.0
Construction Firms Willing	12	80.0	3	20.0	15	100.0
Construction Firms Unwilling	—	—	—	—	0	—
Restaurants Willing	8	62.0	5	38.0	13	100.0
Restaurants Unwilling	4	57.0	3	43.0	7	100.0
Total	46	58.0	33	42.0	79	100.0

$$\chi^2 = 8.72, \text{ d.f.} = 1; p < 0.01$$

Although these employers are more apt to use informal methods of recruitment, as was pointed out in Table 4, we can see from Table 7 that 46 of them (58.0 per cent) do require job applicants to fill out formal application forms before they are hired. The only groups in which the majority stated that this is not the usual practice were unwilling service station employers and unwilling laundry employers.

The rather high percentage figures found for construction firms (80.0 per cent) and for willing and unwilling restaurant employers (62.0 and 57.0 per cents, respectively) may be slightly exaggerated in view of the remarks several employers in these businesses made. For example, several construction firm employers specified that formal application forms are used predominantly for applicants for clerical, administrative, or managerial positions in their businesses. When outside workers or laborers are needed, the union is largely responsible for recruiting men, and all that the employer requires of these men is that they fill out what one employer called a "cursory" application form, which he further described as "less than formal". These application forms ask the worker to furnish only such items as his name, social security number, address, number of dependents, trade union belonged to, union card number, last two or three employers, and, often, three personal references.

Several restaurant employers also qualified their "yes" answers to this question. They pointed out that they would not usually require a dishwasher or a clean-up man to fill out a formal application. Generally speaking, however, all those applying for other positions, e.g., waiters, bartenders, etc., in these restaurants, would be required to submit a formal application form before they would be considered for employment.

Although 46 of the 79 employers interviewed (58.0 per cent) answered that they do require an applicant to fill out a formal application, there are exceptions to this, as we have noted above. Even taking these exceptions into consideration, it seems as if the majority of employers at this level of skill in these four occupational groups do



require most applicants to submit some type of formal application form in order to be considered for employment.

Just as was done with the previous three questions, the answers employers gave to this fourth question were compared with those given to Question 7 in order to determine if there is a relationship between employers' requiring job applicants to fill out formal application forms and their attitudes toward hiring offenders.

Table 7 contains the data necessary for this analysis. A Chi-square significant at the .01 level was obtained ( $X^2 = 8.72$ , d.f. = 1), indicating a relationship between employers' attitudes toward hiring offenders and their requiring formal application forms. The direction of this association was learned by computing a Yule's Q ( $Q = +.65$ ). This showed that when employer attitudes are favorable, job applicants are usually required to fill out formal application forms, and conversely, when the employer attitudes are not favorable, formal applications are not usually required.

This result is opposite from what was expected, and it raises doubts as to the validity of the hypothesis, stated in Chapter III, that in lower-level occupations, job applicants are not required to fill out formal application forms. It was felt that if formal applications were not required, it would be easier for offenders to secure employment. The data of Table 7 shows however, that not only do the majority of employers interviewed require formal applications, but also that most employers who follow this practice have favorable attitudes toward hiring offenders.

We can only speculate as to the possible reasons for this situation. In Table 5, it was shown that unfavorable attitudes toward hiring offenders are associated with method "d" of recruitment. In other words, unwilling employers often rely on their other employees to tell their friends about job openings in their places of employment. These unwilling employers may trust their employees to recommend only a qualified and honest individual for a job, and therefore, there may not be a need for requiring a formal application form from him.

On the other hand, the fact that so many willing employers recruit their male help from men who just come in looking for a job (Tables 4 and 6) may account for their requiring formal applications from job applicants. These applicants have not been recommended by other employees and therefore it seems logical that they have to be screened more carefully.

The next question asked of this sample of employers, Question 5, was divided into three parts. The responses willing and unwilling employers gave to the first part of this question — Do you ask about the applicant's previous work history? — are summarized by business type in Table 8.

It can be noted in Table 8 that 71 employers (90.0 per cent) answered this question affirmatively, indicating that the great majority do ask job applicants about their previous work history and experience. This holds true in every case except unwilling service station employers, where 50.0 per cent said they question an applicant about his previous work history before he is hired.

TABLE 8

APPLICANTS QUESTIONED ABOUT PREVIOUS WORK HISTORY, BY  
BUSINESS TYPE, VERSUS ATTITUDE TOWARD HIRING  
OFFENDERS, BY NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES

Business Type	Applicant Questioned					
	Yes		No		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Service Stations Willing	17	85.0	3	15.0	20	100.0
Service Stations Unwilling	2	50.0	2	50.0	4	100.0
Laundries Willing	9	100.0	0	—	9	100.0
Laundries Unwilling	9	82.0	2	18.0	11	100.0
Construction Firms Willing	14	93.0	1	7.0	15	100.0
Construction Firms Unwilling	—	—	—	—	0	—
Restaurants Willing	13	100.0	0	—	13	100.0
Restaurants Unwilling	7	100.0	0	—	7	100.0
Total	71	90.0	8	10.0	79	100.0

The second part of this question asked whether or not a job applicant is required to furnish references. Referring to Table 9, it can be seen that 52 employers (66.0 per cent) normally require job applicants to furnish references as part of their hiring procedure. This was most common among restaurant and construction firm employers, but even the majority of all laundry employers and willing service station employers stated that they also require references from their applicants.

TABLE 9

REFERENCES REQUIRED OF JOB APPLICANTS, BY BUSINESS TYPE, VERSUS  
ATTITUDE TOWARD HIRING OFFENDERS, BY NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES

Business Type	References Required					
	Yes		No		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Service Station Willing	13	65.0	7	35.0	20	100.0
Service Station Unwilling	0	—	4	100.0	4	100.0
Laundries Willing	5	56.0	4	44.0	9	100.0
Laundries Unwilling	6	55.0	5	45.0	11	100.0
Construction Firms Willing	12	80.0	3	20.0	15	100.0
Construction Firms Unwilling	—	—	—	—	0	—
Restaurants Willing	10	77.0	3	23.0	13	100.0
Restaurants Unwilling	6	86.0	1	14.0	7	100.0
Total	52	66.0	27	34.0	79	100.0

The 52 employers who answered the second part of Question 5 (Are references required?) by saying "yes", were then asked if these references are followed through.

Table 10 indicates that only 26 employers of the 52 who require an applicant to furnish references (50.0 per cent) actually go to the trouble to follow them through. It would appear then, on the basis of this data, that references generally do not play a significant role in the hiring procedures of this sample of employers. This is evidenced by the fact that 34.0 per cent of them do not require references in the first place (Table 9) and also by the fact that of the 66.0 per cent who do require them, 50.0 per cent do not even bother to check them.

TABLE 10

REFERENCES CHECKED, BY BUSINESS TYPE, VERSUS ATTITUDE  
TOWARD HIRING OFFENDERS, BY NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES<sup>a</sup>

Business Type	References Checked					
	Yes		No		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Service Stations Willing	2	15.0	11	85.0	13	100.0
Service Stations Unwilling	0	—	0	—	0	—
Laundries Willing	3	60.0	2	40.0	5	100.0
Laundries Unwilling	4	67.0	2	33.0	6	100.0
Construction Firms Willing	7	58.0	5	42.0	12	100.0
Construction Firms Unwilling	—	—	—	—	0	—
Restaurants Willing	6	60.0	4	40.0	10	100.0
Restaurants Unwilling	3	50.0	3	50.0	6	100.0
Total	26	50.0	26	50.0	52	100.0

<sup>a</sup>This question was asked only of the 52 employers who answered "yes" to Question 5, part 2 (Table 9).

Favorable and unfavorable attitudes toward hiring offenders (Question 7) were compared with the responses given to the parts of Question 5. In each case, the obtained Chi-square was not significant, indicating that these procedures are not consistently related to employer attitudes. It was thought that favorable attitudes would be associated with an employer's not requiring an applicant to provide references and vice versa, but the obtained data does not support this hypothesis.

The next question that the 79 employers were requested to answer was Question 6 — Is an applicant normally asked if he has been in trouble with the police?

Table 11 outlines the responses given to this question by the willing and unwilling employers in each business type. It shows that 46 employers (58.0 per cent) do ask an applicant about any possible criminal record. This practice was most often followed by service station and restaurant employers.

TABLE 11

APPLICANT ASKED IF HE HAS BEEN IN TROUBLE WITH POLICE,  
BY BUSINESS TYPE, VERSUS ATTITUDE TOWARD HIRING  
OFFENDERS, BY NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES

Business Type	Police Record Questioned					
	Yes		No		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Service Stations Willing	12	60.0	8	40.0	20	100.0
Service Stations Unwilling	4	100.0	0	—	4	100.0
Laundries Willing	5	56.0	4	44.0	9	100.0
Laundries Unwilling	6	55.0	5	45.0	11	100.0
Construction Firms Willing	6	40.0	9	60.0	15	100.0
Construction Firms Unwilling	—	—	—	—	0	—
Restaurants Willing	9	69.0	4	31.0	13	100.0
Restaurants Unwilling	4	57.0	3	43.0	7	100.0
Total	46	58.0	33	42.0	79	100.0

The data contained in Table 11 also points out that this procedure was not usually followed by construction firm employers only.

The data contained in this table can be compared to data gathered from similar questions asked in two of the related studies, which were discussed in Chapter II. Rogers, in his 1958 study of 408 manufacturing businesses in the United States, found that 82.0 per cent of those employers responding to his questionnaire stated that they do not require job applicants to furnish them with information concerning their histories of arrests. Professor Martin, in his 1962 study performed in Reading, England, found that 66.0 per cent of the larger firms and about 40.0 per cent of the smaller firms, comprising his sample, recruited employees on a no-questions-asked basis as far as their past criminal records were concerned. He found this recruitment without question to be most common among construction firms, and the data gathered from the present study seems to be in accord with this. But of more importance is the fact that the data in Table 11 of the present study indicates that the sample of certain Tucson employers seems to be more selective about choosing their employees than were the employers in Rogers' and Martin's studies, since a majority of them (58.0 per cent) do request details from their applicants about past criminal records.

We can refer to the unemployment problem in Tucson again as one possible reason for Tucson employers tending to be more selective in their hiring procedures than were the employers in the other two studies mentioned. If there were a shortage of labor in this city, employers, especially at this level of skill, would probably not be so inclined to use a formal application form or ask an applicant if he has been in trouble with the police.

When a Chi-square test was performed on the data of Table 11, it was found to be non-significant, thus indicating no consistent relationship between favorable and unfavorable attitudes toward hiring offenders and employers asking an applicant if he has been in trouble with the police. It was believed that favorable attitudes would be associated with employers not asking applicants to answer questions about any possible police record they may have and vice versa. On the basis of the data collected from Questions 4, 5, and 6, the hypothesis — that often, in lower-level occupations, job applicants are not required to fill out formal application forms, furnish references, or answer questions about any possible criminal record they may have, thereby making it easier for them to secure employment at this level — has to be rejected. First, there is no consistent relationship between these two latter items and favorable or unfavorable attitudes, and second, favorable attitudes have been shown to be associated with employers requiring formal application forms of applicants, a finding which is opposite to that hypothesized.

In Chapter III, it was noted that after Question 7 there are two separate schedules of questions. The one which each employer was asked was determined by his response to Question 7. If the employer answered this question either "yes" or "it would depend on the case", he was then asked to answer the questions on the second page of the schedule marked Y2 in Appendix A. On the other hand, if the employer answered "unequivocally no", he was asked the questions on the third page of the schedule, marked N2 in Appendix A. The purpose of this was to ask employers questions more in accord with their responses to this question



and to ascertain some of their attitudes and conceptions toward offenders. The questions appearing on the Y2 schedule will be discussed next.

The first question on the Y2 schedule, Question 8, asked of the 57 employers who answered Question 7 "yes" or "it would depend on the case" was: Have you ever employed persons known to you to have been convicted of a crime?

Table 12 indicates the responses to this query, and from it, we can see that 40 of the 57 willing employers (70.0 per cent) replied that they have employed persons known to them to have been convicted of a crime. This was most common in construction firms and restaurants, where 93.0 per cent and 92.0 per cent, respectively, of the employers in these businesses indicated that they have employed offenders in their organizations. In laundries, 6 of the 9 willing employers (67.0 per cent) fell into this category, while in service stations, only 8 of the 20 willing employers (40.0 per cent) answered that they have employed offenders. The majority of the total of 57 willing employers (70.0 per cent), however, had employed offenders in their firms; only 30.0 per cent of them had not.

The results obtained from Question 8 are important for several reasons, and they can be contrasted to the results obtained by Rogers from similar questions in his study, as discussed in Chapter II. In the Rogers study, a clear majority of manufacturing firm employers responding to his questionnaire indicated that they would be willing to hire ex-inmates as employees. But, as we mentioned and stressed, at the time of Rogers' study in 1958, only 34.0 per cent of these employers reported that they had knowingly done so. Although such a high percentage (80.0%)

of the 408 respondents in his study expressed a willingness to consider hiring ex-inmates, relatively few of them (34.0 per cent) had knowingly hired them in their businesses. The sincerity of these respondents was then open to question because so few of those who answered they were willing to hire ex-inmates had actually done so.

TABLE 12  
WILLING FIRMS THAT HAVE EMPLOYED AN OFFENDER,  
BY NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES

Business Type	Have Employed an Offender					
	Yes		No		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Service Stations	8	40.0	12	60.0	20	100.0
Laundries	6	67.0	3	33.0	9	100.0
Construction Firms	14	93.0	1	7.0	15	100.0
Restaurants	12	92.0	1	8.0	13	100.0
Total	40	70.0	17	30.0	57	100.0

In the present study, on the basis of the data, gathered and reported in Table 12, it would appear, however, that this sample of Tucson employers is more sincere about their willingness to accept offenders in their businesses. A clear majority of the 57 employers (70.0 per cent) who, by their responses to Question 7, expressed a willingness to consider hiring offenders, answered that they have knowingly done this in the past. Thus, most of the willing employers in this sample have not only expressed their willingness, but also have proven it by actually hiring offenders in their businesses.

The 57 willing employers were then asked if they now have in their employ persons known to have been convicted of a crime (Question 9, Y2 form).

Looking at Table 13, we see that 22 employers of the 57 interviewed (39.0 per cent) answered that they presently have offenders as employees. Although the figure of 39.0 per cent is somewhat depressed from the 70.0 per cent one (percentage of willing employers who answered that they have previously hired an offender), it shows nonetheless that there are willing employers in this sample who are presently employing offenders in their concerns.

TABLE 13  
WILLING FIRMS THAT NOW EMPLOY AN OFFENDER,  
BY NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES

Business Type	Now Employ an Offender <sup>a</sup>					
	Yes		No		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Service Stations	0	—	20	100.0	20	100.0
Laundries	4	44.0	5	56.0	9	100.0
Construction Firms	12	80.0	3	20.0	15	100.0
Restaurants	6	46.0	7	54.0	13	100.0
Total	22	39.0	35	61.0	57	100.0

<sup>a</sup>Records were all known at time offender initially hired.

Table 13 shows that construction businesses employ more offenders at the present time than do the other businesses represented in this sample. Twelve of the 15 construction firms (80.0 per cent) presently

have offenders as employees. From this table, we can also see that the only employers who indicated that they do not knowingly employ persons who have been convicted of a crime at the present time were service station employers. Even though the majority of the 57 willing employers comprising this sample (61.0 per cent) do not now employ offenders, all of them, from their responses to Question 7 (Table 1) are at least willing to consider hiring offenders as employees.

Construction firm employers seem to be the most willing of the four groups to accept offenders as employees. None responded "unequivocally no" to Question 7 (Table 1) and of the 15 willing employers in this group, 14 (93.0 per cent) have employed offenders at one time or another (Table 12), while 12 of the 15 (80.0 per cent) now employ them in their firms (Table 13). In this occupation, then, most employers are not only willing to hire offenders, but also are presently doing so.

A possible explanation for construction firm employers being more willing to hire offenders than the other three groups in this sample is that, generally speaking, their firms employ many more male employees than do service stations, laundries, and restaurants. They therefore have a need for a larger labor supply and may employ up to several hundred men on outside labor jobs alone. This may account, in part, for construction firm employers being willing to hire offenders as employees in their businesses. The fact that construction laborers neither work face to face with the public nor have the opportunity to handle cash, and the fact that they can be closely supervised by the foreman in their work may also account for the willingness on the part of those employers.

The 57 willing employers were then asked Question 10 on the Y2 schedule. The first part of this question read: Do you differentiate between the type of crime committed by the offender in your decision to hire him? This question was included in the schedule in order to test the hypothesis that the type of crime committed by an offender does have an influence on a willing employer's decision to hire him.

The responses of these 57 willing employers to this query are summarized in Table 14. As evidenced by this table, the clear majority of willing employers in the sample (84.0 per cent) answered this question affirmatively, indicating they do take into account the nature of the crime committed by the offender when considering him for employment.

TABLE 14

DIFFERENTIATION BY WILLING EMPLOYERS ON THE BASIS OF TYPE OF CRIME COMMITTED, BY NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES

Business Type	Differentiation					
	Yes		No		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Service Stations	20	100.0	0	—	20	100.0
Laundries	7	78.0	2	22.0	9	100.0
Construction Firms	9	60.0	6	40.0	15	100.0
Restaurants	12	92.0	1	8.0	13	100.0
Total	48	84.0	9	16.0	57	100.0

The data in Table 14 confirms the hypothesis, and, secondarily, the results of this question add another variable to the problem of finding work for offenders. There is now the element of willing employers

differentiating between the type of crime committed by the offender, in addition to the other variables previously discussed, e.g., the fact that only certain jobs are open to offenders and that offenders must often belong to a union before they can be hired by construction firms.

Willing employers might have certain jobs in their businesses for which an offender may be hired, but according to the data in Table 14, not any offender. Most of these employers want to know the type of crime the offender committed and will take this into account in their decision to hire him.

After establishing the fact that the majority of the 57 employers classified as willing do differentiate between the type of crime committed by the offender in their hiring decision, it was next important to learn which types of crimes employers were most prejudiced against. For this reason, parts b, c, and d of Question 10 were included on the Y2 schedule.

Table 15 shows the number of employers in the four occupational groups who are willing to hire the various types of offenders listed. The nine employers, who stated that they do not differentiate between the type of crime committed by the offender in their decision to hire him (Table 14), were not asked to complete parts b, c, and d of Question 10. It was assumed, from their responses to this first part of Question 10 that they would consider an offender for employment regardless of the type of crime committed.

It is apparent from Table 15 that the types of offenders mentioned in the question do not constitute an exhaustive list. There are other types of offenders, to be sure, but, for the purposes of this study, it was felt to be sufficient to include only the more common types.

TABLE 15

EMPLOYER ACCEPTANCE OF SPECIFIC TYPES OF OFFENDERS WHEN CONSIDERING THEM FOR EMPLOYMENT, BY NUMBERS, AND PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL.

Types of Offenders	Employer Acceptance				Total	Percent of Total
	Service Station Employers	Laundry Employers	Construction Firm Employers	Restaurant Employers		
	Out of 20	Out of 9	Out of 15	Out of 13		
	Willing To Hire	Willing To Hire	Willing To Hire	Willing To Hire		
	No.	No.	No.	No.	%	
Burglars	7	6	11	11	35	61.0
Thieves	6	5	11	11	33	58.0
Forgers	3	5	7	2	17	30.0
Fences	6	8	9	6	29	51.0
Murderers	3	2	6	1	12	21.0
Rapists	1	2	6	1	10	17.5
Assaulters	12	2	8	11	33	58.0
Robbers	1	2	6	6	15	26.0
Perjurers	2	5	9	6	22	39.0
Sex Offenders	1	3	7	2	13	23.0
Narcotics	1	4	6	2	13	23.0
Alcoholics	3	6	9	6	24	42.0
Gamblers	5	6	9	8	28	49.0
Arsonists	1	3	7	0	11	19.0
Deserters	12	3	7	11	33	58.0
Traffic Offenders	20	9	15	13	57	100.0

The majority of offenders seeking employment would most likely fall into one of these categories.

Table 15 clearly shows that traffic offenders are acceptable to all 57 willing employers. A total of 35 employers (61.0 per cent) said that they would be willing to hire burglars in their businesses. Next were thieves, deserters and assaulters, where 33 employers (58.0 per cent) said that they would hire them. The only other type of offender acceptable to at least half of those willing employers answering these parts of Question 10 was the fence, where 29 employers (51.0 per cent) stated they would hire this type of offender. Twenty-eight employers (49.0 per cent) would hire gamblers; 24 employers (42.0 per cent) would hire alcoholics; and 22 employers (39.0 per cent) would hire perjurers.

Rapists, arsonists, murderers, sex offenders, narcotic violators, robbers, and forgers were the least desirable types of offenders to this sample of employers. Only 10 employers (17.5 per cent) would hire a rapist; only 11 (19.0 per cent) would hire an arsonist; and only 12 employers (21.0 per cent) would hire a convicted murderer as an employee. Thirteen employers (23.0 per cent) would accept men convicted of sex offenses (other than rape) and narcotic violations as employees in their organizations.

We can thus see that offenders who have been convicted of rape, arson, murder, sex offenses (other than rape), and narcotic violations would find it very difficult to find employment in any of the businesses represented by this sample. Robbers and forgers would find it almost as difficult since only 15 employers (26.0 per cent) would hire a



robber, and only 17 employers (30.0 per cent) would accept a forger as an employee (Table 15). Employers do take into account the type of crime committed by an offender when faced with considering one for employment. Certain offenders, e.g., rapists, arsonists, murderers, would generally find it more difficult to secure employment than would others, e.g., thieves, burglars, assaulters, according to the data gathered in the present study. Thus, it is clear that this variable — the type of crime committed by the offender — does have considerable bearing on the offender's chances for being accepted for employment by this sample of employers (Tables 14 and 15).

The final question asked of these same 57 employers was Question 11 on the Y2 form. In this question — Which of the following types of offenders would you be most apt to hire and why? — three classes of offenders were listed. These employers were asked to rank the classes in the order that they would prefer to employ them, and they were further asked to explain their answers.

This question was asked for two reasons: first, to learn which class of offender might have the best chance of getting employment, and, second, to have some basis for determining whether or not this sample of employers is able to distinguish between a probationer, a parolee, and an offender who has served his full sentence in prison.

From our discussion of the data gathered in the present study, we have already seen that the majority of willing employers do consider the type of crime committed by the offender in their decision to hire him. By asking these same employers Question 11, we can try to determine if they also consider the class of offender in their hiring procedures.

Forty-six of the 57 employers (81.0 per cent) who were asked this question, stated that they would be more apt to hire a probationer than the other two classes of offenders. They ranked the probationer first, and the reasons and explanations they gave for this choice indicated a general awareness of the meaning of the term, "probation". The comments of one employer, who ranked a probationer first, can be cited as a good example of the general comments of the 45 other employers. He explained: "I would be most apt to hire a probationer because, according to my understanding, he is usually a first offender, and in the eyes of the judge, he is a pretty fair risk. The judge feels he deserves another chance to make it on the outside before being sent to prison and puts him on probation." Many of the other explanations followed this employer's, and, in most cases, the reasons the other employers gave for ranking a probationer first were also logical and intelligent.

Forty-one employers (72.0 per cent) indicated that their second choice would be a parolee in the community. Again, we can use the comments of one employer to represent some of the others. One restaurant owner remarked: "My second choice would have to be a parolee. He spent time in prison, but he was released before his full sentence expired, probably because of good behavior, and the authorities think he can make it on the outside now." The reasons that most of these 41 employers gave for making a parolee their second choice gave the writer the impression that they not only understand the basic procedures of parole, but also that they know the difference between probation and parole. By and large, these employers understood that a probationer serves his sentence in the community under supervision, and that a parolee is

released, after having served part of his sentence in prison, to serve the remainder of it under the supervision of a parole officer.

A total of 5 employers (9.0 per cent) specified that they would never hire a parolee as an employee. The reason they gave was that they would not want to hire a man who had spent time in prison and would only accept a probationer as an employee.

According to further data tabulated from this question, the offender who served his full sentence in prison and was then released, was the least apt to be hired. This was evidenced by the fact that 18 employers (32.0 per cent) said they would never hire such an offender because, as one employer put it: "He was never considered worthy or eligible to be granted parole, and this indicates to me that he has not learned his lesson." Another 30 employers (53.0 per cent) ranked this offender as the one they would be least apt to hire because, in general, they felt that he is probably the most dangerous. One restaurant employer said: "Today parole is granted to so many prisoners and if a convict is not allowed to go free on parole before his full sentence is up, he is probably a tough guy, and I wouldn't want him in my business." In many cases, then, employers are the most apprehensive about hiring the offender who has served his full sentence in prison.

A record was kept of the employers who had to have the terms, "probationer" or "parolee", explained to them before they could answer this question. Only 12 of them (21.0 per cent) asked the interviewer to define probationer and/or parolee. The other 45 employers were able to answer this question on the basis of their own knowledge without any help from the interviewer.

The data has thus shown that this sample of willing employers would prefer to hire a probationer first, a parolee second, and a person who has served his full sentence in prison third or last. No employers said that they would never hire a probationer, whereas 5 said they would not hire a parolee, and 18 stated they would not hire a person who has served his full sentence in prison and then was released. The manner in which the majority of these employers ranked the three classes of offenders and explained the rankings indicates that they are able to distinguish between a probationer, a parolee, and a man who has served his full sentence in prison. Thus, the hypothesis stated in Chapter III that these employers are unable to distinguish between the three classes of offenders has to be rejected.

The remainder of this chapter will deal with the questions asked of the 22 employers who answered Question 7 "unequivocally no". The questions asked of these employers, Questions 8-10 on the N2 form in Appendix A, were designed to learn, in part, why they would refuse to hire offenders in their organizations.

Table 16 outlines the reasons given by these 22 employers in response to the question: Since it is your policy to refuse employment to convicted offenders, what led you to follow such a policy? From this table, we can see that there are three main reasons why these employers refuse to hire offenders in their businesses. The reasons are summarized by the headings — "Bad Experience", "Untrustworthy People", and "Cannot Take the Chance".

A bad experience with an offender in the past was mentioned by four employers as the reason why they would refuse to hire an offender.

Two service station employers and two restaurant employers recalled that they had hired an offender once and were either dissatisfied with his work or had reason to question his honesty. In each case, the employer said that he would never hire an offender again. One service station employer described his experience with an offender whom he hired because he felt sorry for him and wanted to give him a chance to reform. The offender worked well for two weeks and then left without giving the employer any notice. This employer added: "This experience was enough to show me that they (offenders) are an unstable lot." A restaurant owner put it this way: "I hired some guy with a record two years ago, and two weeks later, \$65 was missing from the cash box, and there was no sign of the guy."

TABLE 16

## REASONS FOR NOT HIRING OFFENDERS, BY NUMBERS

Business Types	Reasons			Total
	Bad Experience	Untrustworthy People	Cannot Take Chance	
	No.	No.	No.	
Service Stations	2	2	0	4
Laundries	0	6	5	11
Construction Firms <sup>a</sup>	—	—	—	—
Restaurants	2	4	1	7
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>22</b>

<sup>a</sup>No construction firms answered "no" to Question 7.

When an employer has had a bad experience with an offender, it can prove to be a serious deterrent to that employer's ever hiring another. It would appear that an offender represents more than just himself on the job; he represents all offenders, in the sense that if he performs well, his employer may be willing to hire other offenders in the future. On the other hand, if he proves to be an unstable or dishonest employee, he may force the employer to refuse to hire another offender in his business.

Twelve employers (55.0 per cent) referred to offenders as untrustworthy individuals, incapable of reform and not worthy of their consideration. One owner of a small restaurant in a lower-class neighborhood in Tucson expressed his feelings this way: "It's a tough life for everyone, and I have tried to make an honest living, working hard and long hours. These guys who steal, cheat and kill aren't worth a second look. I wouldn't trust them." These employers felt that offenders could not be trusted and would never make good employees.

The other most common reason employers gave for their unwillingness to hire an offender was that they could not afford to take the chance. Six employers (27.0 per cent) answered the question this way. Some further explained that they were fearful of their images in the community and afraid that their other employees would resent working with offenders.

When these same 22 employers were asked if they had ever employed persons known to them to have been convicted of a crime (Question 9 on the N2 form), it can be seen from Table 17 that only four of them (18.0 per cent) responded that they have. These were the same four employers, who in the previous question said that they had hired at least one offender before, but had had a bad experience with him and would never

hire one again. The other 18 employers, according to their answers to this question, have never employed an offender before. They have never experimented with an offender as an employee and would not do so. The only reasons they could give to justify their negative attitudes were that they believe offenders to be untrustworthy, and they cannot afford the risk associated with hiring them.

TABLE 17

UNWILLING FIRMS THAT HAVE EMPLOYED AN OFFENDER,  
BY NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES

Business Type	Have Employed an Offender					
	Yes		No		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Service Stations	2	50.0	2	50.0	4	100.0
Laundries	0	—	11	100.0	11	100.0
Construction Firms	—	—	—	—	0	—
Restaurants	2	28.0	5	72.0	7	100.0
Total	4	18.0	18	82.0	22	100.0

It will be remembered that this same question — Have you ever employed persons known to you to have been convicted of a crime? — was also answered by the 57 willing employers (Question 8, Y2 schedule). We can compare the responses of both the willing and unwilling employers to this query (Tables 17 and 12) in relation to their attitudes toward hiring offenders.

Table 18 contains the data gathered from Tables 12 and 17, needed to carry out this comparison. A Chi-square was performed on the data

represented in this Table, and it was found to be highly significant:  $p < 0.001$  ( $\chi^2 = 17.37$ , d.f. = 1), thus indicating a definite relationship between attitudes toward hiring offenders and employers having done so or not previously having done so in their businesses. The direction of this association was learned by obtaining a Yule's Q ( $Q = +.83$ ). This value showed that unfavorable attitudes are associated with lack of experience in hiring offenders and also that the more experiences employers have with hiring offenders, the more favorable are their attitudes. It would appear then that the most difficult task is to get unwilling employers to hire offenders, because once they do this, the experience is a positive factor in making for favorable attitudes. So long as employers are not willing to hire offenders in their concerns, little or nothing can be done to change their attitudes. Experience with offenders as employees seems to be a key factor in creating favorable employer attitudes.

TABLE 18

EMPLOYERS WHO HAVE AND HAVE NOT HIRED AN OFFENDER VERSUS  
ATTITUDE TOWARD HIRING OFFENDERS, BY NUMBERS

Attitudes	Employed Offenders		
	Have Never Employed Offender	Have Employed Offender	Total
	No.	No.	No.
Would Not Hire Offenders	18	4	22
Would Hire Offenders	17	40	57
Total	35	44	79



The final question asked of the 22 unwilling employers, Question 10 on the N2 form, was similar to the last question included on the Y2 form asked of the 57 willing employers. The question: Which of the following do you think is the most serious type of offender and why? — asked the employers to rank the three types of offenders listed in terms of seriousness and also to explain their rankings.

A man on probation in the community was ranked as the least serious type of offender by 17 employers of the 22 asked to complete this question (77.0 per cent). In explaining their answers, many said that they associate probation with first offenders who have committed less serious offenses. Some employers mentioned that a probationer does not have to go to prison and serves his sentence in the community under a probation officer. On the basis of these points, they felt him to be the least serious type of offender.

Sixteen employers (73.0 per cent) listed the parolee as their choice for the second most serious type of offender. Their explanations generally showed that they understand the meaning of the term, "parolee". They realized that he is released from prison before his full sentence expires, because of good behavior and that he is supervised by a parole officer in the community.

Twenty of the 22 employers (91.0 per cent) ranked the man who has served his full sentence in prison as the most serious type of offender. Their explanations for this choice were also in the main logical and correct. As one employer said: "The longer a man is forced to remain locked up, the more serious he is to society when he is set free. The

parole board never granted him an early release, and I feel his chances of breaking the law again are greater than the other types of offenders."

Six of these 22 employers (27.0 per cent) asked to have the terms, "probation" and "parole", explained to them before they gave their answers to this question. The other 16 employers were able to answer this question on the basis of their own knowledge.

The results obtained from asking these 22 employers this question were similar to those obtained from asking the 57 willing employers Question 11 on the Y2 schedule. The majority of these 22 employers were able to distinguish between the three classes of offenders listed, and most were also able to explain their answers intelligently. The same was true for the other 57 employers, as we have previously discussed. Only a minority in both cases had to have the terms, "probation" and "parole", explained before they could answer the question. The hypothesis, stated in Chapter III, that these unwilling employers are not able to differentiate between the three classes of offenders must be rejected on the basis of the data obtained from this question.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Summary

The importance and availability of employment for released offenders has been the subject of this thesis. In Chapter I, the point was made that if a criminal is to reform, it is a primary consideration that he have a means of livelihood. Offenders need satisfying and worthwhile employment if the correctional process is to realize its goal of rehabilitation.

Through an analysis of related studies in Chapter II, the value of employment to released offenders was observed, and the amount of discrimination that they have been subject to in the past in various communities was discussed. It was noted in some of these past studies that in certain areas of employment, e.g., administrative, technical, professional, etc., employer discrimination against hiring offenders was prevalent. Other studies showed that some employers were willing to hire offenders in their businesses, but only in the less important jobs regardless of the offender's background and experience.

The remainder of the thesis was concerned with a description and analysis of a research study the writer performed recently in Tucson. This study was initiated in an attempt to discover the general degree of acceptance offenders can expect to find in certain lower-level occupations in Tucson. The sample of this study included employers of 24 service stations, 20 laundries, 15 large construction firms and 20

restaurants. The reasons why these occupations were chosen over others, and the methods and procedures followed in this study were explained in detail in Chapter III.

The prospects for offenders finding employment in the above mentioned occupations were of concern in this study. A schedule of questions was prepared and used in order to learn details about characteristics and hiring practices of the four occupational groups and to ascertain the attitudes of the sample of employers toward hiring offenders. The employers were grouped into two categories — willing and unwilling — on the basis of their attitudes toward hiring offenders, and then a separate schedule (Y2 and N2 forms) was asked of each group in order to learn more about their attitudes.

Statistical techniques, Chi-square and Yule's Q, were performed on some of the relevant data obtained in this study to see if there were any relationships between employers' attitudes toward hiring offenders, i.e., willingness or unwillingness, and certain characteristics of their businesses, e.g., difficulty in finding male help, labor turnover, requiring of formal application forms, etc.

The following hypotheses were considered and tested in this study:

1. Many times male offenders have more success in securing employment in lower-level jobs in which employers find it difficult both to fill vacant positions and to retain their male help.
2. Many times in lower-level jobs, applicants are not required to fill out formal application forms, provide references or answer

questions about any possible police record they may have, thereby making it easier for them to secure employment at this level.

3. Those employers who are willing to consider hiring offenders do consider the nature of the crime committed by the offender in their decision to hire him.

4. Willing and unwilling employers are unable to distinguish between a probationer, a parolee, and a man who served his full sentence in prison.

#### Conclusions

The data of this study, discussed and analyzed in Chapter IV, appear to warrant the following conclusions:

1. The majority of employers interviewed at this level of skill are willing at least to consider hiring offenders in their businesses.

2. Although the majority of employers interviewed are willing to consider hiring offenders, many would consider them only for the less responsible jobs in their businesses.

3. According to the data of this study, offenders do have more success in securing employment in lower-level jobs in which employers find it difficult to fill vacant positions and to retain their male help.

4. In these lower-level jobs, applicants are usually required to fill out formal application forms, furnish references, and answer questions about any possible police record they may have.

5. Willing employers do consider the nature of the crime committed by the offender in their decision to hire him. Employers are

least prejudiced against hiring traffic offenders, burglars, thieves, deserters, assaulters, and fences, and they are most prejudiced against hiring rapists, arsonists, murderers, sex offenders, narcotic violators, robbers, and forgers.

6. Willing and unwilling employers are able to distinguish between a probationer, a parolee, and a man who served his full sentence in prison. A probationer in the community was viewed as the one most likely to be hired by willing employers and as the least serious class of offender by unwilling employers. The man who served his full sentence in prison was viewed as the one least apt to be hired by willing employers and as the most serious class of offender by unwilling employers.

7. Willing employers seem to be sincere about hiring offenders as evidenced by the fact that the majority have employed them in the past and some are presently doing so.

8. Employers who are unwilling to consider hiring offenders seem to base their negative attitudes primarily on personal prejudice, rather than on experience.

#### Recommendations

This thesis has been an account of a limited research project carried out in an attempt to learn more about a topic of importance to correctional administrators. There are other aspects related to this topic which were not included in the present research study and which could be the subject of future research.

1. The present study dealt only with a sample of employers in blue-collar occupations in Tucson. A future research project should

include employers of white-collar occupations in order to determine their attitudes toward hiring offenders.

2. Although the sample of employers in the present study was generally able to distinguish between a probationer, a parolee, and a man who served his full sentence in prison, a future study could investigate the public's knowledge and understanding of the field of corrections in more detail.

3. The present study did not attempt to learn if offenders make successful employees, and a study which dealt with this subject would be worthwhile.

It is hoped that these suggestions, together with the present study, will encourage future students of corrections to perform empirical studies in the field.

APPENDIX A

SCHEDULES

Informant's Position in Firm \_\_\_\_\_  
Number of Male Employees \_\_\_\_\_ (not including owner/manager)  
Nature of Business \_\_\_\_\_

1. In general, do you experience any difficulties in filling job vacancies in your business?    yes \_\_\_\_\_    no \_\_\_\_\_

2. Do you experience a \_\_\_\_\_ low                      rate of turnover in  
                                 \_\_\_\_\_ medium                      your business?  
                                 \_\_\_\_\_ high

3. From what sources do you normally obtain your male employees?

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. private and public employment agencies.
- \_\_\_\_\_ b. advertisements in newspapers.
- \_\_\_\_\_ c. vacancy notices placed outside the premises.
- \_\_\_\_\_ d. applicants who have heard of the firm through other employees.
- \_\_\_\_\_ e. other \_\_\_\_\_

4. Does your firm use a formal application for hiring purposes?

5. Do you ask about the applicant's previous work history?

Are references required?

If yes, are they followed through?

6. Is an applicant normally asked if he has been in trouble with the police? (Trouble defined as being convicted of a crime for which the individual received a suspended sentence, probation or was sent to prison.)

7. Would your firm hire a person who had been convicted of a crime?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_; unequivocally no \_\_\_\_\_; it would depend on the case \_\_\_\_\_.



Y2

8. Have you ever employed persons known to you to have been convicted of a crime?
9. Have you now in your employ persons known to you to have been convicted of a crime? How many?

Was this record known at the time the person was initially hired?

10. a. Do you differentiate between the type of crime committed by the offender in your decision to hire him?

\_\_\_\_\_ yes                      \_\_\_\_\_ no

- b. Would you hire persons convicted of crimes of acquisitiveness as:

1. burglars	3. forgers
2. thieves	4. fences

- c. Would you employ persons convicted of crimes of violence as:

1. murderers	3. assaulters
2. rapists	4. robbers

- d. Would you employ persons convicted of crimes against public order and the public good as:

1. perjurers	5. gamblers
2. sex offenders	6. arsonists
3. narcotics	7. deserters
4. alcoholics	8. traffic offenders

11. Which of the following types of offenders would you be most apt to hire and why? (Rank 1-3)

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. a man on probation in the community.
- \_\_\_\_\_ b. a man who has served his full sentence in prison.
- \_\_\_\_\_ c. a man on parole in the community.

112

8. Since it is your policy to refuse employment to convicted offenders, what led you to follow such a policy?
9. Have you ever employed persons known to you to have been convicted of a crime?
10. Which of the following do you think is the most serious type of offender and why? (Rank 1-3)
- a. a man on probation in the community.
  - b. a man who has served his full sentence in prison.
  - c. a man on parole in the community.

#### SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, Morline. "Vocational Guidance in a Correctional Program," N.P.P.A. Journal, VI (April, 1960), 152-158.
- Barnes, Harry E. and Negley K. Teeters. New Horizons in Criminology. 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.
- Bechtol, C. R. "Responsibility of Business and Industry for Employing Offenders," N.P.P.A. Journal, VI (April, 1960), 129-135.
- Bloch, Herbert A. Crime in America. New York: Philosophical Library, 1961.
- Clevenger, Stanley and John M. Stanton. "Should an Inmate Have a Job Before Being Released on Parole?" N.P.P.A. Journal, VI (April, 1960), 159-169.
- Cohn, Richard E. "Wartime Acceptability of Probationers and Parolees for Employment," 1944 Yearbook. New York: National Probation Association, 1944, 245-254.
- Evans, Walter. "The Probationer's Job: An Essential Factor In His Rehabilitation," Federal Probation, XXV (June, 1961), 30-33.
- Garrett, Henry E. Statistics in Psychology and Education. 5th ed. New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1958.
- Giardini, G. J. "Who Shall Find Jobs for Parolees?" N.P.P.A. Journal, VI (April, 1960), 181-184.
- Glaser, Daniel. The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1964.
- Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor. 500 Criminal Careers. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1930.
- Hannum, Robert R. "Employment Impediments for Offenders and Public Safety Regulations," Federal Probation, XXVII (March, 1963), 28-33.
- Head, Jerry. "Job Finding for Prisoners," Federal Probation, XVI (March, 1952), 20-25.

- Heyns, Garrett. "What the Public Should Know About Adult Corrections," Federal Probation, XXVIII (March, 1964), 11-15.
- Hurley, Sister Helena Angela. Vocational Adjustment of Ex-Prisoners in the District of Columbia. Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America, 1938.
- Lykke, Arthur F. "Attitude of Bonding Companies Toward Probationers and Parolees," Federal Probation, XXI (December, 1957), 36-38.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Parolees and Payrolls. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas Co., 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Probation Officer's Role in Job-Finding," Federal Probation, XVII (December, 1953), 38-43.
- McSally, Bernard F. "Help Wanted: Parolees May Apply," American Journal of Correction, XXII (March-April, 1960), 14.
- Martin, J. P. Offenders As Employees. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc., 1962.
- Melichercik, John. "Employment Problems of Former Offenders," N.P.P.A. Journal, II (January, 1956), 43-50.
- Odell, Charles E. "Job Adjustment for Probationers and Parolees," Federal Probation, XV (June, 1951), 12-15.
- Perlis, Leo. "Labor's Position on the Employment of Offenders," N.P.P.A. Journal, VI (April, 1960), 138-145.
- Rodli, Gilbert. "Revolution in Prison Industries," N.P.P.A. Journal, VI (April, 1960), 146-151.
- Rogers, Joseph W. "A Study of Employer Attitudes Toward Parolees," Abstract, Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Washington, 1958.
- Rudensky, Morris. "After the Stretch," Harper's Magazine, CCXXVIII (April, 1964), 180-182.
- Stone, Patrick T. "The Public Is Very Much in the Dark About Probation and Parole," Federal Probation, XII (December, 1948), 7-9.
- Tappan, Paul W. Crime, Justice and Correction. New York: McGraw-Hill Co., Inc., 1960.
- Weisinger, Mort. "He Finds Jobs for Ex-Convicts," American Mercury, LXXXIII (May, 1956), 77-82.

Wise, Randolph E. "Public Employment of Persons with a Criminal Record," N.P.P.A. Journal, VI (April, 1960), 197-201.

Witt, Leonard. "Parole Release Without Employment," N.P.P.A. Journal, VI (April, 1960), 170-174.