

# **PACE**

## **POLICY ANALYSIS FOR CALIFORNIA EDUCATION**

**Policy Paper No. PP88-5-6**

### **“Jobs for the Disadvantaged” Graduate Follow-up Survey**

**Charles Dayton**

**May 1988**

#### **Directors**

**James W. Guthrie  
University of California  
Berkeley**

**Michael W. Kirst  
Stanford University**

Additional copies of this paper, PP88-5-6 are available by sending \$4.00 per copy to:

**PACE**  
**School of Education**  
**University of California**  
**Berkeley, California 94720**

**CHECKS PAYABLE TO THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**  
*(California residents add appropriate sales tax.)*

*Policy Paper No. PP88-5-6*  
*Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE)*  
*Berkeley, California*  
*May 1988*

**Policy Paper No. PP88-5-6**

**“Jobs for the Disadvantaged”  
Graduate Follow-up Survey**

**Charles Dayton**

**May 1988**

Charles Dayton is a policy analyst with PACE.

This paper was sponsored and published by Policy Analysis for California Education, PACE. PACE is funded by the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation and directed jointly by James W. Guthrie and Michael W. Kirst. The analyses and conclusions in this paper are those of the author and are not necessarily endorsed by the Hewlett Foundation.

*This report was funded in part by a special grant from the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation.*

Additional copies of this paper, PP88-5-6 are available by sending \$4.00 per copy to:

**PACE  
School of Education  
University of California  
Berkeley, California 94720**

**CHECKS PAYABLE TO THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
(California residents add appropriate sales tax.)**

***Policy Paper No. PP88-5-6  
Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE)  
Berkeley, California  
May 1988***

## Executive Summary

The first class of participants in four of the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation's "Jobs for the Disadvantaged" programs graduated in June 1987. The telephone interview survey described in this report gathered information on the educational and work status of these graduates six months later, along with similar information for a matched comparison group of nonparticipants in each site.

There were relatively small numbers of graduates in these four sites: 74 program and 45 comparison-group members. While response rates were high—94 percent among program participants and 88 percent among comparison-group members—the small numbers make it hard to draw firm conclusions. A significantly higher percentage of program participants graduated on time (95 percent) than was true of comparison-group members (76 percent), however.

About half of each group—participant and comparison—were in some form of postgraduate schooling. However, 38 percent of participant graduates were working, compared with 18 percent of comparison-group members, while 21 percent of comparison-group graduates were neither in school nor working, something true of only 7 percent of program graduates. About 15 percent of both groups were in military service.

Among those graduates in school, few differences were found between program and comparison-group graduates. Slightly more program graduates were in two- and four-year degree programs than was true of comparison-group graduates, and program graduates had slightly higher educational goals; neither of these differences was statistically significant, however. For both groups, about 80 percent were in school full-time, and about 90 percent were receiving some form of financial aid.

Of those graduates working, about twice as many program graduates had secured work through school—31 percent versus 14 percent—while comparison-group graduates had relied far more on relatives and friends—58 percent versus 31 percent. While comparison-group graduates had somewhat higher wages, this seems primarily due to two or three individuals who exerted a heavy influence on the small data set.

# Contents

Executive Summary	iii
Policy Analysis for California Education	vii
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
The Programs	1
Nature of the Survey	2
Response Rate	2
<b>2 Survey Results</b>	<b>4</b>
Status of Graduates	4
Graduates in School	5
Graduates Working	8
Program Ratings	11
<b>3 Conclusions</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Appendix: Graduate Interview Guide</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Related Reports</b>	<b>21</b>

# Policy Analysis for California Education

Policy Analysis for California Education, PACE, is a university-based research center focusing on issues of state educational policy and practice. PACE is located in the Schools of Education at the University of California, Berkeley and Stanford University. It is funded by the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation and directed jointly by James W. Guthrie and Michael W. Kirst. PACE operates satellite centers in Sacramento and Southern California. These are directed by Gerald C. Hayward (Sacramento) and Allan R. Odden (University of Southern California).

PACE efforts center on five tasks: (1) collecting and distributing objective information about the conditions of education in California, (2) analyzing state educational policy issues and the policy environment, (3) evaluating school reforms and state educational practices, (4) providing technical support to policy makers, and (5) facilitating discussion of educational issues.

The PACE research agenda is developed in consultation with public officials and staff. In this way, PACE endeavors to address policy issues of immediate concern and to fill the short-term needs of decision makers for information and analysis.

PACE publications include Policy Papers, which report research findings; the Policy Forum, which presents views of notable individuals; and Update, an annotated list of all PACE papers completed and in progress.

## Advisory Board

Mario Camara  
Partner  
Cox, Castle & Nicholson

Constance Carroll  
President, Saddleback  
Community College

Gerald Foster  
Region Vice President  
Pacific Bell

Robert Maynard  
Editor and President  
*The Oakland Tribune*

A. Alan Post  
California Legislative Analyst,  
Retired

Sharon Schuster  
Executive Vice President  
American Association of University Women

Eugene Webb  
Professor, Graduate School of Business  
Stanford University

Aaron Wildavsky  
Professor of Political Science  
University of California, Berkeley

## section 1

# Introduction

### **The Programs**

In the fall of 1984, the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation launched demonstration programs in a number of cities around the country, including Chicago, Denver, Pittsburgh, and Portland. These programs were designed to provide at-risk youth in one or more high schools in each city with a mixture of academic, vocational, and job preparation training. They were based on school-business partnerships, bringing private-sector support to the schools and programs. Their purpose was to improve participants' motivation and academic performance, keep them in school until graduation, and help them to make the transition from school to work.

In Chicago, two high schools were involved, Dunbar and Farragut, although only the first of these had program graduates in June 1987. Dunbar is a predominantly black magnet vocational school. Students enter at grade 10 and are provided a three-year program focused largely on vocational education.

Two high schools were involved in Denver, North and West, although only West had program graduates in June 1987. This school is predominantly Hispanic. The program here begins and operates primarily in grade 10. In both schools there is a mixture of academic and job preparation work. Some limited efforts are made to provide services in grades 11 and 12.

In Pittsburgh and Portland, the programs operate in just one high school. In Pittsburgh, this is Westinghouse High School, the city's only all-black high school. In Portland, it is Jefferson High School, an ethnically mixed school. Both cities operate academy programs, which provide a mixture of academic, vocational, and job preparation training in grades 10-12.

The careers of students in each city were tracked through high school using a number of performance indicators: retention, attendance, credits, grades, and standardized test scores. Further, a matched comparison group was identified for each class, comprised of students in the same high school and grade level who were not in the program. The match was made on the basis of gender, ethnicity, and pre-program academic performance. The performance of the two groups was then compared each year to see whether the program was having a measurable impact on these indicators of performance. A yearly report was issued in each of the past three years presenting the results of these evaluations.

## **Nature of the Survey**

While this evaluation design provided evidence of the programs' impact on students while they were in school, the ultimate objective was to improve students' postgraduate performance. Would students obtain more jobs or earn higher wages as a result of participating in the program? Would more of them attend some form of college or hold higher educational ambitions?

To address these questions, the Clark Foundation sponsored a follow-up survey of the June 1987 graduates from the programs and comparison groups in Chicago, Denver, Pittsburgh, and Portland. In November and December 1987, the graduates were contacted by telephone, or in person if they could not be reached by telephone, and asked to complete a brief interview. The interview was structured into sections pertaining to college, work, or military service, as well as perceptions about their high school and post-high school experiences. The full Interview Guide used in the survey is presented in the Appendix.

The number of graduates from the program and comparison groups was small. Across the four sites, just 78 program and 57 comparison-group students who participated in grade 10 continued to be enrolled in grade 12, and some of these failed to graduate. This was due in part to the fact that these were the initial classes in each setting, program start-up problems were common, these classes served in a sense as "guinea pigs" for the programs, and attrition was relatively high. Students were selected for the programs because they were at-risk, and most were minority and poor. In Chicago and Denver, only one of the two program schools had graduates by June 1987. All these factors limited the numbers available for this follow-up survey.

## **Response Rate**

Table 1 provides a picture of the survey group that was interviewed in each site and across sites. It shows the survey response rate achieved among expected graduates, the number of students who failed to graduate, and the number thus available as graduates for the subsequent analysis.

It is difficult to locate students after they graduate and to secure their cooperation for such a survey. Extensive efforts were made to reach these graduates. Interviewers of the same race as the majority of interviewees were used. The homes of graduates were visited when they could not be reached by telephone. In a number of cases, several visits were required before interviews could be completed. As a result, the final response rate achieved is high for such a survey. Thus, while the actual numbers are small, the data do reflect well the experiences of this first class of graduates.

There is one possible source of bias that should be understood in interpreting these results. The analysis uses data only from program and comparison-group graduates. In the sites surveyed, the programs appear to have improved the school retention and graduation rates of their participants.<sup>1</sup> Thus, while the program and comparison groups were well matched at the programs' beginning, in grade 10, they may no longer be as well matched. The higher retention rate among program students may have caused a bias in favor of the comparison-group graduates, who represent a smaller and presumably higher-achieving proportion of the original matched groups than is true of the program graduates.

**TABLE 1 Response and Graduation Rates Among Participants**

Site	Initial N <sup>†</sup>	Response Rate	% Did Not Graduate <sup>††</sup>	N Used In Analysis
<b>Chicago</b>				
Program	23	91% (21)	5% (1)	20
Comparison Group	18	89% (16)	31% (5)	11
<b>Denver</b>				
Program	7	86% (6)	17% (1)	5
Comparison Group	17	77% (13)	39% (5)	8
<b>Pittsburgh</b>				
Program	38	95% (36)	6% (2)	34
Comparison Group	16	94% (15)	7% (1)	14
<b>Portland</b>				
Program	10	100% (10)	0% (0)	10
Comparison Group	6	100% (6)	17% (1)	5
<b>Total</b>				
Program	78	94% (73)	5% (4)*	69
Comparison Group	57	88% (50)	24% (12)*	38

† "N" stands for the number of participants. The "Initial N" is those students who were seniors the previous year.

†† Of those students located, this column reports the number who had failed to graduate as expected. These nongraduates are subtracted from the analysis.

\* Difference is significant at the .05 level of probability.

<sup>1</sup> Charles Dayton and Alan Weisberg, *School to Work and Academy Demonstration Programs: 1986-87 Evaluation Report* (Berkeley, CA: Policy Analysis for California Education, PACE, School of Education, University of California at Berkeley, November 1987).

## section 2

# Survey Results

### Status of Graduates

What do the data from the survey show? What are graduates doing six months after graduation? How do those students who participated in the program compare with those who did not? There are four categories into which graduates can fall in this respect: "going to school," "working," "in the military," and "neither in school nor working." Table 2 shows the status of the graduates with respect to these four categories, both by site and across the four sites.

**TABLE 2 Status of Graduates<sup>†</sup>**

Site (N)	Going to School	Working	In the Military	Neither School nor Working
<b>Chicago</b>				
Program (20)	60%	55%	10%	0%*
Comparison Group (11)	55%	18%	27%	27%*
<b>Denver</b>				
Program (5)	40%	60%	0%	20%
Comparison Group (8)	50%	25%	0%	25%
<b>Pittsburgh</b>				
Program (34)	44%	32%	21%	3%
Comparison Group (14)	57%	14%	21%	7%
<b>Portland</b>				
Program (10)	50%	10%	10%	30%
Comparison Group (5)	40%	20%	0%	40%
<b>Total</b>				
Program (69)	49%	38%*	14%	7%*
Comparison Group (38)	53%	18%*	16%	21%*

<sup>†</sup> Rows do not necessarily add to 100 percent; students may be in school *and* working.

\* Difference is significant at the .1 level of probability.

The cross-site figures show that program and comparison-group students are in school at about the same rate; just about half of the graduates from each group fall into this category. About the same proportion from both groups are also in the military, approximately 15 percent. However, a larger proportion of program graduates are working (38 percent) than are comparison-group members (18 percent), while fewer program graduates are "neither in school nor working" (7 percent versus 21 percent).

### **Graduates In School**

One subset of questions pertained to the graduates enrolled in some form of postgraduate education. There are many forms of schooling available, from one- or two-year vocational programs to enrollment in full four-year colleges or universities leading to a bachelor's degree. Table 3 shows the breakout of students in each category of schooling, while Table 4 shows the ambitions and eventual educational goals graduates hold for their postgraduate education.

The program and comparison students had similar patterns of enrollment. About half of each group that was in school had chosen a four-year college, with the other half choosing something short of this. While there were no statistically significant differences between the two groups, a greater proportion of program students had selected two-year college programs, while more comparison-group members had selected vocational or business programs. A greater proportion of the academy program graduates (Pittsburgh and Portland) had chosen four-year college programs than was true of the other two sites (Chicago and Denver). However, the greatest discrepancy between program and comparison groups occurred in Chicago, where a greater proportion of program students had chosen two- or four-year colleges than was true of the comparison groups.

**TABLE 3 Type of School Attended**

Site	Adult Night	Vocational/ Business	Junior College	Four- Year
<b>Chicago</b>				
Program (12)	0	0	58%	42%
Comparison Group (6)	0	33%	33%	33%
<b>Denver</b>				
Program (2)	0	100%	0	0
Comparison Group (4)	25%	50%	0	25%
<b>Pittsburgh</b>				
Program (15)	0	20%	13%	67%
Comparison Group (8)	0	25%	0	75%
<b>Portland</b>				
Program (5)	0	20%	20%	60%
Comparison Group (2)	0	0	50%	50%
<b>Total</b>				
Program (34)	0	18%	29%	53%
Comparison Group (20)	5%	30%	15%	50%

**TABLE 4 Educational Goals of Those in School**

Site	Vocational Certificate	Two-year Degree	Four-year Degree	Graduate Degree
<b>Chicago</b>				
Program (12)	0	8%	58%	33%
Comparison Group (6)	0	20%	80%	0%
<b>Denver</b>				
Program (2)	100%	0	0	0
Comparison Group (4)	75%	0	0	25%
<b>Pittsburgh</b>				
Program (15)	20%	13%	53%	13%
Comparison Group (8)	29%	0	43%	29%
<b>Portland</b>				
Program (5)	0	0	75%	25%
Comparison Group (2)	0	0	100%	0
<b>Total</b>				
Program (34)	15%	9%	55%	21%
Comparison Group (20)	28%	6%	56%	11%

Other distinctions among those graduates enrolled in school include whether they are full- or part-time and whether they are receiving financial aid. Table 5 provides a picture of the graduates in these respects. As the table shows, the pattern of program and comparison groups is again similar. Approximately four of five students are full-time. The mean number of hours spent in class each week is about 13. The vast majority of both program and comparison-group graduates (about 90 percent) receive some form of financial aid.

**TABLE 5 Time in School, Financial Aid**

Site	Percentage Full-time	Mean Hours/Week in School	Receiving Financial Aid
<b>Chicago</b>			
Program (12)	92%	12.5	92%
Comparison Group (6)	67%	13.0	83%
<b>Denver</b>			
Program (2)	50%	12.5	50%
Comparison Group (4)	50%	14.0	67%
<b>Pittsburgh</b>			
Program (15)	93%	16.8	100%
Comparison Group (8)	100%	NA	100%
<b>Portland</b>			
Program (5)	50%	12.7	100%
Comparison Group (2)	100%	13.5	100%
<b>Total</b>			
Program (34)	82%	13.0	94%
Comparison Group (20)	80%	13.4	87%

### Graduates Working

What kinds of jobs did working graduates have? The seven employed comparison-group graduates had the following positions: retail store clerk (2), baggage agent, truck loader, file copier, stock clerk, and printing press operator. The 26 program graduates had the following jobs: retail store clerk (9), food preparer (5), store manager (2, video store and fitness center), long-distance operator (2), telephone clerk (2), stock person, assistant purchaser, mechanic, loan application clerk, janitor, and laborer. All but two of the above jobs were in the private sector.

There are many avenues through which students secure jobs, ranging from school programs to public or private employment agencies, direct applications to employers, or help of relatives and friends. Table 6 shows the means by which graduates in this survey gained their employment. While program and comparison groups show similar patterns,

one difference is the greater number of comparison-group students who obtained work through a relative or friend (58 percent versus 31 percent), as opposed to the greater number of program students who found work through a school program (31 percent versus 14 percent).

**TABLE 6 Means by Which Employment Was Obtained**

Site	School	Publ./Pri. Agency	Employer Directly	Relative/ Friend
<b>Chicago</b>				
Program (11)	55%	9%	9%	27%
Comparison Group (2)	0%	0%	50%	50%
<b>Denver</b>				
Program (3)	0%	0%	33%	67%
Comparison Group (2)	50%	0%	0%	50%
<b>Pittsburgh</b>				
Program (11)	18%	9%	45%	27%
Comparison Group (2)	0%	0%	0%	100%
<b>Portland</b>				
Program (1)	0%	0%	100%	0%
Comparison Group (1)	0%	0%	100%	0%
<b>Total</b>				
Program (26)	31%	8%	31%	31%
Comparison Group (7)	14%	0%	29%	58%

The number of hours per week graduates were working, and their starting and current wages, were also examined. These figures are presented in Table 7. Students in the program and comparison groups were working about the same number of hours per week, about three-quarters time in terms of a 40-hour week. The mean wage of comparison-group graduates was significantly higher than that of program graduates, both initially and currently. However, most of this difference is accounted for by two highly paid members of the comparison group. The number of working comparison-group graduates is so small (7), that when these two cases are dropped from the analysis most of the difference disappears.

**TABLE 7 Mean Hours Worked Per Week, Hourly Wages**

Site	Mean Hours Worked	Mean Starting Wages	Mean Current Wages
<b>Chicago</b>			
Program (11) <sup>†</sup>	27.7	\$4.13	\$4.50
Comparison Group (2) <sup>††</sup>	18.2	\$5.86	\$6.13
<b>Denver</b>			
Program (3) <sup>†††</sup>	28.7	\$3.45	\$3.67
Comparison Group (2)	40.0	\$4.80	\$4.80
<b>Pittsburgh</b>			
Program (11)	35.1	\$3.83	\$3.83
Comparison Group (2)	28.8	\$3.75	\$3.73
<b>Portland</b>			
Program (1)	40.0	\$4.75	\$4.75
Comparison Group (1)	40.0	\$7.10	\$7.10
<b>Total</b>			
Program (26)	31.1	\$3.96*	\$4.10*
Comparison Group (7)	30.5	\$5.37*	\$5.45*
<sup>†</sup> Five of these graduates were also in school. <sup>††</sup> Both of these graduates were also in school. <sup>†††</sup> One of these graduates was also in school. * These differences are significant at the .05 level of probability.			

The final question asked of working graduates was whether there were skills they wished they had acquired in high school that would help them in their job. Only about a quarter of the respondents offered examples. And among those, only two examples were listed: typing and business accounting.

### Program Ratings

At the end of the interview, respondents were asked to reflect on their high school experience and assess how well their courses prepared them for the work or schooling in which they were now engaged. They were also asked to rate how well they were doing since graduation. Finally, they were asked if there was any advice they would like to give to current high school students.

Table 8 summarizes responses related to the first two questions. As this table shows, patterns of response are similar between program and comparison-group students in all sites, with no statistically significant differences. The ratings are generally favorable, averaging about a 2.0, indicating graduates are "fairly well" satisfied with both their high school preparation and achievements since graduation.

**TABLE 8 Graduates Ratings of "How Well Prepared" and "How Well Doing"**  
(1=extremely well; 5=very poorly)

Site	How Well Prepared	How Well Doing
Chicago		
Program (20)	1.75	1.75
Comparison group (11)	1.73	1.55
Denver		
Program (5)	2.20	2.20
Comparison group (8)	2.00	2.00
Pittsburgh		
Program (34)	1.80	1.96
Comparison group (16)	1.90	2.00
Portland		
Program (10)	2.67	2.44
Comparison group (6)	3.20	2.80
Total		
Program (69)	1.95	1.98
Comparison group (57)	2.06	1.97

There was one open-ended item at the end of the interview, asking respondents: "If there is one message you would like to give current high school students, what would it be?" Responses to this question fell into several categories. The most frequent comment, received from about half the graduates, related to the value of working hard in school. This took various forms, from "don't drop out" to "don't fool around in school" to "get good grades." Other comments had a "generally inspirational" theme, such as "strive to be the best you can" and "now is the time to get serious about life." A few program graduates urged enrolling in the program.

## section 3

# Conclusions

It is difficult to draw any clear conclusions from a survey of so few graduates. Particularly in Chicago and Denver, where only one of two program schools even had graduates by June 1987, this is a problem. As a result, the findings reported here must be viewed as tentative.

One benefit of the survey was that it led to a procedure for following up graduates that worked well and is available for future use. The Graduate Interview Guide, developed after review of similar forms used elsewhere, proved to be an efficient and useful instrument, and the unusually high response rate in the survey was encouraging.

Perhaps the most significant finding of the follow-up survey is that fewer program students dropped out of high school their senior year than did comparison-group students (5 percent versus 24 percent). Unfortunately, this fact, along with higher attrition among the comparison group prior to the senior year, may bias the findings of the survey against the program graduates.

Most of the questions examined showed no significant differences between program and comparison-group graduates. Exceptions to this include the fact that more program students were working (38 percent versus 18 percent) and fewer were "neither in school nor working" (7 percent versus 21 percent). About 15 percent of both groups were in military service.

The most common form of activity among graduates is going to school, which about half do. Among those in school, about half are in four-year colleges, with the other half in a vocational or two-year program. Approximately half also intend to earn a bachelor's degree, although about one in five plans to earn a graduate degree. About 80 percent of those in school are enrolled full-time, and about 90 percent receive some form of financial aid.

While a greater proportion of program graduates are working, on average their mean wages are \$4.10 versus \$5.45 among comparison-group graduates. However, most of this difference is accounted for by two highly paid members of the comparison group. A greater proportion of program graduates secured their work through school than did comparison-group members (31 percent versus 14 percent). The latter group relied heavily on relatives and friends (58 percent, versus 31 percent for program graduates).

Graduates of both groups are generally "fairly well" satisfied with both their high school preparation and achievements since graduation. They feel that taking school seriously and doing well there are the most important objectives on which their younger counterparts can focus.

**APPENDIX**

**Graduate  
Interview Guide**

## GRADUATE INTERVIEW GUIDE

City: \_\_\_\_\_ Program Student \_\_\_\_\_ Comparison Group

Graduate's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Street, city, state, zip code)

Telephone #: \_\_\_\_\_ Date & Time: \_\_\_\_\_

Hello, may I speak with (name of graduate)? This is (name of interviewer) from (name of high school). I am conducting a survey of last year's graduates to find out what they are doing now. The questions should take about five minutes. Is now a good time to do this? (If this is not a good time, set up another time to call. If this is the wrong telephone number, try to obtain a current one).

1. Is this telephone number and address still the best way to reach you?  
\_\_\_\_ 1. Yes      \_\_\_\_ 2. No      If "no," write in the new ones:

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Phone #: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Did you receive your high school diploma or a GED certificate? (Check one)

\_\_\_\_ 1. Diploma      \_\_\_\_ 2. GED certificate      \_\_\_\_ 3. Neither

3. What are you doing now? Are you: (Read list; check all that apply)

1. Going to school?      \_\_\_\_ Yes      \_\_\_\_ No      If yes, complete Section A.

2. Working?      \_\_\_\_ Yes      \_\_\_\_ No      If yes, complete Section B.

3. In the military?      \_\_\_\_ Yes      \_\_\_\_ No      If yes, complete Section C.

4. Not working or in school?      \_\_\_\_ Yes      \_\_\_\_ No      If yes, complete Section D.

5. Other? (describe):  
\_\_\_\_\_

**COMPLETE ALL APPLICABLE SECTIONS FOR EACH RESPONDENT  
COMPLETE SECTION E FOR ALL RESPONDENTS**

**SECTION A  
GOING TO SCHOOL**

4. What is the name of the school you are currently attending? (Write in)

---

5. What kind of school is this? (Check one)

- 1. Adult or night school program
  - 2. Vocational, trade, business or other career training school
  - 3. Junior or community college (2-year)
  - 4. College or university (4 years or more)
  - 5. Other (write in): \_\_\_\_\_
- 

6. Are you planning to receive a degree or are you taking courses not related to any degree program? (Check one)

1. Degree                       2. Courses not related to a degree

7. As things stand now, how far in school do you think you will get? (Check one. If unsure, check the respondent's one best guess)

- 1. High school graduation only
- 2. Less than two years of vocational, trade, or business school
- 3. Two years or more of vocational, trade, or business school
- 4. Less than two years of college
- 5. Two or more years of college (including two-year degree)
- 6. Finish college (four- or five-year degree)
- 7. Master's degree or equivalent
- 8. Ph.D, M.D., or other advanced professional degree

8. During the last month, were you classified as a full-time student? (Check one)

1. Yes                       2. No                       3. Don't Know

9. During the last month, about how many hours a week were your classes scheduled to meet? (Include lectures, shop, lab time, etc. Write in total.)

Hours per week: \_\_\_\_\_

10. Are you currently receiving financial aid? (Check one)

1. Yes     2. No    If "yes," in what form: \_\_\_\_\_

**SECTION B  
WORKING**

11. What kind of job or occupation do you have? (e.g., teller, clerk, etc.)

Write in: \_\_\_\_\_

12. What kind of business or industry is this job in? (e.g., bank, retail store)

Write in: \_\_\_\_\_

13. What are your main activities or duties on this job? (e.g., filing, typing)

Write in: \_\_\_\_\_

14. On this job are you: (check one)

- 1. An employee of a private company
- 2. A government employee (federal, state, local)
- 3. Self-employed in your own business
- 4. Working without pay in a family business
- 5. Working without pay in a volunteer job

15. When did you start this job? \_\_\_\_\_  
(month/day/year)

16. How did you find this job? (Check the main method used)

- 1. School placement service (Specify: \_\_\_\_\_)
- 2. Public employment service
- 3. Private employment agency
- 4. Newspaper advertisement
- 5. Checked with employer directly
- 6. Through a relative
- 7. Through a friend
- 8. Civil Service application
- 9. Union Registration
- 10. Other (Write in: \_\_\_\_\_)

17. How many hours a week do you usually work in this job? \_\_\_\_\_

18. What was your gross starting hourly salary before any deductions on this job?  
Average in any tips or commission. Estimate if not sure. \$\_\_\_\_\_/hr.

19. What is your gross hourly salary now? \$\_\_\_\_\_/hr.

20. Is your current job the sort you were planning for in high school?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Had no plans in high school

21. Are there skills you wish you had acquired in high school, that would help you in your job?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No If "yes," what are they: \_\_\_\_\_

**SECTION C**  
**MILITARY**  
(O.K. to obtain this information from relative)

22. What branch of the service are you in? (Check one)

- |                                       |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Army      | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Coast Guard |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Navy      | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Marines     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Air Force |   |

23. Are you on active duty or reserve status? (Check one)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Active duty | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Reserve Status |
|---|--|

24. If on active duty, when did you begin this: \_\_\_\_\_  
(month, year)

25. When will you be discharged: \_\_\_\_\_  
(month, year)

**SECTION D**  
**NOT WORKING OR IN SCHOOL**

26. What is the main reason you are not working or in school now?

---

---

---

27. Are you looking for work? (Check one)

- |  |
|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes, I am looking for full-time work |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Yes, I am looking for part-time work |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. No, I am not looking for work        |

If "yes," what kind of job are you seeking: \_\_\_\_\_

28. When you were in high school, did you plan to go to college?

- |                                 |                                |  |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No | If "yes," why did you decide not to go to college: |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|

---

---

**SECTION E  
FINAL QUESTIONS**

29. As you look back over your high school experience, how well do you think your courses prepared you for the work or schooling you are now doing? (Check one)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Extremely well | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Not very well |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Fairly well    | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Very poorly   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. So-so          |   |

30. How would you rate yourself on how well you are doing since graduation? (Check one)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Very well   | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Not very well |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Fairly well | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Very poorly   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. So-so       |   |

31. If there is one message you would like to give to current high school students, what would it be?

---

---

Thank you for your participation.  
I have enjoyed talking with you.

## **Related Reports**

Dayton, C.W. and A. Weisberg. *School-to-Work and Academy Demonstration Programs: 1986-87 Evaluation Report*. Berkeley, CA: Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE), School of Education, University of California at Berkeley, November 1987.

Dayton, C.W. *Looking Back: Program Successes and Evaluations Under "Jobs for the Disadvantaged."* Berkeley, CA: Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE), School of Education, University of California at Berkeley, March 1988.

Reller, D.J. *A Longitudinal Study of the Graduates of the Peninsula Academies*. Palo Alto, CA: The American Institutes for Research, 1987.