



Wisconsin Works Leavers Survey
Those Who Left W-2 Cash Assistance
April 1998 through December 1998
Final Report

State of Wisconsin
Department of Workforce Development
Issue Date: November 2001



Wisconsin Works Leavers Survey
Those Who Left W-2 Cash Assistance
April 1998 through December 1998

Final Report

Partial funding provided by:
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation
(Grant number 98ASPE310A)

For more information about this report, contact:
Mary Rowin
Division of Workforce Solutions
Department of Workforce Development
201 East Washington Avenue, P.O. Box 7935
Madison, WI 53707-7935
(608) 267-9022

CONTENTS

List of Tables	i
Executive Summary	v
CHAPTER 1 WISCONSIN WORKS (W-2) AND THE 1998 LEAVERS SURVEY	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Methodology.....	2
1.2.1 Survey population	2
1.2.2 Survey sample	3
1.2.3 Survey response rate	3
1.2.4 Bias and weighting	4
1.2.5 Survey structure.....	5
1.2.6 Significance testing.....	6
1.3 Additional analysis.....	6
CHAPTER 2 OVERVIEW OF THE LEAVER POPULATION	9
2.1 Leaver Demographics.....	10
2.1.1 Respondents' ages	10
2.1.2 Respondents' ages, by age group	10
2.1.3 Respondents' gender.....	11
2.1.4 Respondents' race/ethnicity	12
2.1.5 Respondents' marital status	13
2.1.6 Respondents' formal education	14
2.1.7 Respondents' place of residence (Milwaukee vs. non-Milwaukee)	15
2.2 Leavers' Households	16
2.2.1 Size of respondents' households.....	16
2.2.2 Composition of respondents' households	17
2.2.3 Respondents living either with their spouse or the co-parent of a child.....	18
2.2.4 Educational characteristics of respondents' households	18
2.2.5 Employment status of respondents' households	20
2.3 Leavers' Child Demographics	21
2.3.1 Respondents' households with at least one child in various age groups.....	21
2.3.2 Average/median age of respondents' children.....	22
2.3.3 Average number of children in respondents' households, by age group	22
2.3.4 Number of children in respondents' households, by age group	23
CHAPTER 3 EMPLOYMENT, EARNINGS, AND HEALTH COVERAGE	27
3.1 Current Employment Status	28
3.1.1 Respondents employed at time of interview.....	28
3.1.2 Unemployed respondents looking for work.....	29
3.1.3 Unemployed respondents who had worked since leaving W-2.....	29
3.1.4 Unemployed respondents' main reasons for not working	30
3.2 Leavers' Jobs and Work Histories	31
3.2.1 Respondents' industries of primary employment	31
3.2.2 Types of jobs respondents have held.....	34
3.2.3 Number of jobs respondents held simultaneously	37
3.2.4 Duration of respondents' employment	40

3.3 Leavers' Hours, Wages, and Earnings	42
3.3.1 Respondents' hours of work	42
3.3.2 Respondents' hourly wages.....	44
3.3.3 Respondents' weekly earnings.....	47
3.4 Leavers' Health Coverage	49
3.4.1 Respondents' health insurance coverage and sources.....	50
3.4.2 Respondents' families with at least one child insured.....	53
CHAPTER 4 JOB ADVANCEMENT, TRAINING, AND TRANSPORTATION	57
4.1 Advancement and Training	57
4.1.1 Respondents receiving pay increases in their current or most recent job.....	58
4.1.2 Respondents whose pay increases were associated with new job duties.....	60
4.1.3 Respondents whose new job duties entailed additional training.....	62
4.1.4 Source of training for respondents whose new job duties required it.....	63
4.2 Leavers' Transportation to Work	64
4.2.1 Respondents' means of transportation to work.....	64
4.2.2 Respondents' travel time to work.....	67
4.2.3 Respondents' problems with transportation to work.....	69
4.2.4 Nature of respondents' work transportation problems	71
CHAPTER 5 CONTINUING PROGRAM PARTICIPATION & RELIANCE ON SUPPORT SERVICES 73	
5.1 W-2 Cash Assistance	74
5.2 W-2 Leavers and Other Cash Benefit Programs	75
5.2.1 Supplemental Security Income.....	75
5.2.2 Social Security Disability Income	75
5.2.3 Unemployment Insurance	75
5.2.4 Kinship Care payments	75
5.2.5 Caretaker Supplement	75
5.2.6 Foster Care payments.....	76
5.2.7 Worker's Compensation	76
5.2.8 Tribal payments.....	76
5.2.9 Retirement fund or pension	76
5.3 Non-cash Assistance Received by Leavers	78
5.3.1 Medicaid.....	78
5.3.2 Food Stamp program	78
5.3.3 School lunch program	78
5.3.4 School breakfast program	78
5.3.5 Women, Infants and Children (WIC) program.....	79
5.3.6 Energy assistance.....	79
5.3.7 Rent assistance.....	79
5.3.8 Charity food	79
5.3.9 Summer food programs	79
5.3.10 Mental health services	79
5.3.11 Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse services	79
5.4 Leavers' Awareness of Post-W-2 Assistance Eligibility	81
CHAPTER 6 OTHER SUPPORTS FOR LEAVERS AND THEIR FAMILIES	83
6.1 Child Support	84
6.1.1 Respondents receiving child support payments.....	84

6.2 Leavers with a Working Spouse or Co-parent	84
6.2.1 Respondents living with a spouse or co-parent who works for pay.....	85
6.2.2 Respondents living with a spouse or co-parent holding more than one job.....	85
6.2.3 Types of jobs held by spouses or co-parents in respondents' households.....	86
6.2.4 Hours worked by spouses or co-parents in respondents' households.....	86
6.2.5 Earnings of working spouses or co-parents in respondents' households.....	87
6.2.6 Job tenure of working spouses or co-parents in respondents' households.....	88
6.3 Tax Credits for Working Leavers	89
6.3.1 Respondents aware of the federal Earned Income Tax Credit.....	89
6.3.2 Respondents aware of the state Earned Income Tax Credit.....	90
6.3.3 Respondents receiving either state or federal Earned Income Tax Credits.....	90
6.3.4 Respondents aware of and receiving the Wisconsin Homestead Tax Credit.....	92
6.4 Other Family Supports	94
6.4.1 Respondents receiving housing or bill-paying help from relatives and friends.....	94
6.4.2 Miscellaneous supports.....	94
CHAPTER 7 FAMILY NEEDS AND INDIVIDUAL WELL-BEING	97
7.1 Family Needs Faced by W-2 Leavers	97
7.1.1 Reasons respondents lacked health coverage.....	98
7.1.2 Respondents unable to afford medical care for an ill member of their household.....	99
7.1.3 Respondents who lost a vehicle because unable to keep up with payments.....	100
7.1.4 Respondents who fell behind on their rent or other housing payment.....	101
7.1.5 Respondents forced to move because unable to make housing payments.....	102
7.1.6 Respondents who fell behind on a utility bill or bills.....	103
7.1.7 Respondents experiencing episodes without electricity in their homes.....	104
7.1.8 Respondents experiencing episodes without heat in their homes.....	105
7.1.9 Respondents whose telephone service was cut off.....	106
7.1.10 Respondents who stayed in a homeless shelter.....	107
7.1.11 Respondents who moved in with others to share expenses.....	108
7.1.12 Respondents who had others move in with them to share expenses.....	109
7.1.13 Respondents with no way to buy food.....	110
7.1.14 Respondents who sent children to live elsewhere when unable to care for them.....	111
7.1.15 Respondents unable to find a baby-sitter needed in order to work.....	112
7.1.16 Respondents unable to pay for a baby-sitter needed in order to work.....	113
7.2 Leavers' Sense of Well-being	114
7.2.1 Respondents' assessments of their goal-setting skills since leaving W-2.....	114
7.2.2 Respondents' assessments of their money worries since leaving W-2.....	115
7.2.3 Respondents' as of their decision-making skills since leaving W-2.....	115
7.2.4 Respondents' assessments of their attitude toward work since leaving W-2.....	116
7.2.5 Respondents' assessments of their life-management capabilities since leaving W-2.....	116
7.2.6 Respondents' feelings about themselves since leaving W-2.....	117
7.2.7 Respondents' assessments of their money-handing skills since leaving W-2.....	117
7.2.8 Respondents' assessments of their family worries since leaving W-2.....	118
7.2.9 Respondents' assessments of their level of stress since leaving W-2.....	118
7.2.10 Respondents' satisfaction with their lives since leaving W-2.....	119
CHAPTER 8 LEAVERS' CHILD CARE AND CHILD WELL-BEING	121
8.1 Leavers' Access to and Problems with Child care	122
8.1.1 Respondents with children under 13 and some child-care arrangements.....	122
8.1.2 Respondents with child-care arrangements and applying for child-care assistance.....	123

8.1.3 Respondents receiving child-care assistance for which they applied.....	123
8.1.4 Respondents lacking child care for at least one child under 13.....	124
8.1.5 Respondents whose child-care problems interfered with work	125
8.1.6 Respondents whose child-care problems interfered with work: lacked infant care	126
8.1.7 Respondents whose child-care problems interfered with work: not hired	126
8.1.8 Respondents whose child-care problems interfered with work: couldn't work full-time	127
8.1.9 Respondents whose child-care problems interfered with work: had to quit.....	127
8.1.10 Respondents having difficulty with transportation to child care.....	128
8.2 Well-being of Leavers' Children.....	129
8.2.1 Respondents' assessments of changes in child's grades.....	129
8.2.2 Respondents' assessments of changes in child's school attendance	129
8.2.3 Respondents' assessments of changes in child's interaction with teachers.....	130
8.2.4 Respondents' assessments of changes in their child's health.....	130
CHAPTER 9 LEAVERS' EXPERIENCES AND EVALUATIONS OF THE W-2 PROGRAM.....	131
9.1 Leavers' participation in, perceptions of particular W-2 program elements	132
9.1.1 Respondents' participation in W-2 English reading/writing training.....	133
9.1.2 Respondents' participation in W-2 GED/HSED instruction.....	134
9.1.3 Respondents' participation in job skills training	135
9.1.4 Respondents' participation in W-2 job preparation and life skills workshops.....	136
9.1.5 Respondents' use of Job Access Loans	137
9.1.6 Respondents' participation in Trial Jobs	138
9.1.7 Respondents' participation in and views on Community Service Jobs	140
9.1.8 Respondents' participation in, views on W-2 Transitions	141
9.2 Leavers' assessments of the W-2 program	143
9.2.1 Respondents' assessments of W-2 agency staff.....	143
9.2.2 Respondents' overall comparison of W-2 with AFDC.....	144
9.2.3 Respondents' views about the clarity of the W-2 rules	144
9.2.4 Respondents' assessments of their job-readiness before participating in W-2	145
9.2.5 Respondents' overall assessment of W-2's effectiveness in finding them a job	145
9.2.6 Respondents' participation in training programs outside of W-2	146
9.3 Why Leavers Left—and Why Some Returned.....	147
9.3.1 Respondents' main reasons for leaving W-2.....	147
9.3.2 Respondents' predictions of likelihood of returning to W-2	148
9.3.3 Main reasons respondents reapplied for W-2 cash assistance	151
APPENDIX A: ADMINISTRATIVE DATA	153

List of Tables

Table 2.1.1 Mean and median ages of respondents.....	10
Table 2.1.2 Respondents' ages, by age group.....	10
Table 2.1.3 Respondents' gender.....	11
Table 2.1.4 Respondents' race/ethnicity.....	12
Table 2.1.5 Respondents' marital status.....	13
Table 2.1.6.1 Mean years of schooling attained by respondents.....	14
Table 2.1.6.2 Respondents' level of education.....	14
Table 2.1.7 Respondents' place of residence (Milwaukee vs. non-Milwaukee).....	15
Table 2.2.1 Size of respondents' households.....	16
Table 2.2.2 Composition of respondents' households.....	17
Table 2.2.3 Respondents living with spouse or co-parent.....	18
Table 2.2.4.1 Respondent households in which all adults had less than a high school education.....	18
Table 2.2.4.2 Respondent households in which no adult had less than a high school education.....	19
Table 2.2.4.3 Respondent households in which at least one adult had more than a high school education.....	19
Table 2.2.5 Employed adults in respondents' households.....	20
Table 2.3.1 Households with at least one child (by age group).....	21
Table 2.3.2 Mean and median age of respondents' children.....	22
Table 2.3.3 Average number of children per household (by age group).....	23
Table 2.3.4.1 Number of children under age 13 per household.....	23
Table 2.3.4.2 Number of children under age 5 per household.....	24
Table 2.3.4.3 Number of children age 5 to 12 per household.....	25
Table 2.3.4.4 Number of children age 13 to 18 per household.....	25
Table 3.1.1 Respondents employed at time of interview.....	28
Table 3.1.2 Unemployed respondents looking for work.....	29
Table 3.1.3 Unemployed respondents who had worked at any time since leaving W-2.....	29
Table 3.1.4 Unemployed respondents' main reasons for not working.....	30
Table 3.2.1.1 Respondents' industries of primary employment (employed when interviewed).....	32
Table 3.2.1.2 Main industry of employment (unemployed but had worked).....	33
Table 3.2.2.1 Types of jobs respondents have held (all who were working or had worked).....	34
Table 3.2.2.2 Types of jobs respondents have held (employed when interviewed).....	35
Table 3.2.2.3 Types of jobs respondents have held (unemployed but had worked).....	36
Table 3.2.3.1 Number of jobs respondents have held simultaneously (all who have worked).....	37
Table 3.2.3.2 Number of jobs held simultaneously (employed when interviewed).....	38
Table 3.2.3.3 Number of jobs held simultaneously (unemployed but have worked).....	39
Table 3.2.4.1 Duration of respondents' employment (employed when interviewed).....	40
Table 3.2.4.2 Duration of respondents' employment (unemployed but had worked).....	41
Table 3.3.1.1 Mean and median weekly hours of work (employed when interviewed).....	42
Table 3.3.1.2 Mean and median weekly hours of work (unemployed but had worked).....	43
Table 3.3.1.3 Respondents at various levels of weekly hours (employed when interviewed).....	43
Table 3.3.1.4 Respondents at various levels of weekly hours (unemployed but had worked).....	44
Table 3.3.2.1 Respondents' hourly wages (employed when interviewed).....	44
Table 3.3.2.2 Respondents' hourly wages (unemployed but had worked).....	45
Table 3.3.2.3 Respondents at various hourly wage levels (employed when interviewed).....	46
Table 3.3.2.4 Respondents at various hourly wage levels (unemployed but had worked).....	47
Table 3.3.3.1 Respondents' mean and median weekly earnings (employed when interviewed).....	47
Table 3.3.3.2 Respondents' mean and median weekly earnings (unemployed but had worked).....	48
Table 3.3.3.3 Respondents at various weekly earnings levels (employed when interviewed).....	48
Table 3.3.3.4 Respondents at various weekly earnings levels (unemployed but had worked).....	49
Table 3.4.1.1 Respondents' health insurance coverage.....	50
Table 3.4.1.2 Respondents' health insurance types for those with insurance.....	50
Table 3.4.1.3 Respondents' health insurance coverage (employed when interviewed).....	51
Table 3.4.1.4 Respondents' health insurance types (employed when interviewed).....	51
Table 3.4.1.5 Respondents' health insurance coverage (unemployed but had worked).....	52
Table 3.4.1.6 Respondents' health insurance types (unemployed but had worked).....	52
Table 3.4.2.1 Health insurance coverage of respondents' children (all respondents with children).....	53

Table 3.4.2.2 Health insurance coverage of respondents' children (employed when interviewed)	54
Table 3.4.2.3 Health insurance coverage of respondents' children (unemployed but had worked).....	55
Table 4.1.1.1 Respondents reporting a pay increase while working (all working or had ever worked)	58
Table 4.1.1.2 Respondents reporting a pay increase while working (employed when interviewed).....	58
Table 4.1.1.3 Respondents reporting a pay increase while working (unemployed but had worked).....	59
Table 4.1.2.1 Respondents whose pay increases were associated with new job duties (all working or had worked)	60
Table 4.1.2.2 Respondents whose pay increases were associated with new job duties (employed when interviewed).....	60
Table 4.1.2.3 Respondents whose pay increases were associated with new job duties (unemployed but had worked)	61
Table 4.1.3.1 Respondents whose new job duties entailed additional training (all working or had worked)	62
Table 4.1.3.2 Respondents whose new job duties entailed additional training (employed when interviewed)	62
Table 4.1.3.3 Respondents whose new job duties entailed additional training (unemployed but had worked) ...	63
Table 4.1.4 Source of training for respondents whose new job duties required it (all who had worked since leaving W-2)	63
Table 4.2.1.1 Respondents' transportation to work (employed when interviewed).....	64
Table 4.2.1.2 Respondents' transportation to work (unemployed but had worked).....	65
Table 4.2.1.3 Respondents' reliance on bus service vs. other modes of transportation to work (Milwaukee County).....	66
Table 4.2.1.4 Respondents' reliance on bus service vs. other modes of transportation to work (not Milwaukee County).....	66
Table 4.2.2.1 Respondents' travel time to work (employed when interviewed).....	67
Table 4.2.2.2 Respondents' travel time to work (unemployed but had worked)	68
Table 4.2.3.1 Respondents with work transportation problems (employed when interviewed).....	69
Table 4.2.3.2 Frequency of work transportation problems (employed when interviewed)	69
Table 4.2.3.3 Respondents with work transportation problems (unemployed but had worked).....	70
Table 4.2.3.4 Frequency of work transportation problems (unemployed but had worked)	70
Table 4.2.4.1 Nature of work transportation problems (employed when interviewed).....	71
Table 4.2.4.2 Nature of work transportation problems (unemployed but had worked)	72
Table 5.1 Respondents receiving W-2 cash assistance at time of interview.....	74
Table 5.2 Respondents' (or families') participation in other cash benefits	77
Table 5.3 Non-cash assistance received by respondents or their families.....	80
Table 5.4 Respondents' awareness of continuing program eligibility after leaving W-2	81
Table 6.1.1 Respondents receiving child support payments.....	84
Table 6.2.1 Respondents living with a spouse or co-parent who works for pay	85
Table 6.2.2 Respondents living with a spouse or co-parent holding more than one job	85
Table 6.2.3 Types of jobs held by working spouses or co-parents in respondents' households.....	86
Table 6.2.4 Hours worked by spouses/co-parents in respondents' households.....	86
Table 6.2.5 Earnings of spouses or co-parents in respondents' households.....	87
Table 6.2.6 Job tenure of working spouses or co-parents.....	88
Table 6.3.1 Respondents aware of the federal Earned Income Tax Credit.....	89
Table 6.3.2 Respondents aware of the state Earned Income Tax Credit.....	90
Table 6.3.3.1 Respondents receiving an Earned Income Tax Credit by paycheck.....	90
Table 6.3.3.2 Respondents receiving an Earned Income Tax Credit when filing return.....	91
Table 6.3.3.3 Respondents planning to claim an Earned Income Tax Credit the following year.....	91
Table 6.3.4.1 Respondents aware of Homestead Tax Credit	92
Table 6.3.4.2 Respondents who received Homestead Tax Credit that year	92
Table 6.3.4.3 Respondents planning to claim Homestead Tax Credit the following year	93
Table 6.4.1 Respondents receiving free housing or bill payment help from relatives and friends	94
Table 6.4.2 Miscellaneous supports reported by respondents.....	95
Table 7.1.1 Reasons respondents lacked health coverage.....	98
Table 7.1.2 Respondents unable to afford medical care for an ill member of their household	99
Table 7.1.3 Respondents who lost a vehicle because unable to keep up with payments	100
Table 7.1.4 Respondents who fell behind in rent or house payments.....	101
Table 7.1.5 Respondents forced to move because unable to make housing payments	102
Table 7.1.6 Respondents who fell behind on utility bills	103

Table 7.1.7 Respondents experiencing episodes without electricity in their homes.....	104
Table 7.1.8 Respondents experiencing episodes without heat in their homes	105
Table 7.1.9 Respondents whose telephone service was cut off	106
Table 7.1.10 Respondents who stayed at a homeless shelter.....	107
Table 7.1.11 Respondents who moved in with others to share expenses	108
Table 7.1.12 Respondents who had others move in with them to share expenses	109
Table 7.1.13 Respondents with no way to buy food.....	110
Table 7.1.14 Respondents sending children to live elsewhere when unable to care for them	111
Table 7.1.15 Respondents unable to find a baby-sitter needed in order to work.....	112
Table 7.1.16 Respondents unable to pay for baby-sitter needed in order to work.....	113
Table 7.2.1 Respondents' assessments of their goal-setting skills	114
Table 7.2.2 Respondents' assessments of their money worries	115
Table 7.2.3 Respondents' assessments of their decision-making skills.....	115
Table 7.2.4 Respondents' assessments of their attitudes toward work.....	116
Table 7.2.5 Respondents' assessments of their life-management capabilities	116
Table 7.2.6 Respondents' feelings about themselves	117
Table 7.2.7 Respondents' assessments of money-handling skills	117
Table 7.2.8 Respondents' assessments of their family worries.....	118
Table 7.2.9 Respondents' assessments of their level of stress.....	118
Table 7.2.10 Respondents' satisfaction with their lives	119
Table 8.1.1 Respondents with children under 13 and some child-care arrangements.....	122
Table 8.1.2 Respondents with child-care arrangements and applying for child-care assistance.....	123
Table 8.1.3 Respondents receiving child-care assistance for which they applied	123
Table 8.1.4 Respondents lacking child care for at least one child under 13	124
Table 8.1.5 Respondents with children under 13 and child-care problems that interfered with work.....	125
Table 8.1.6 Respondents whose child-care problems interfered with work: lacked infant care	126
Table 8.1.7 Respondents whose child-care problems interfered with work: not hired	126
Table 8.1.8 Respondents whose child-care problems interfered with work: couldn't work full-time	127
Table 8.1.9 Respondents whose child-care problems interfered with work: had to quit	127
Table 8.1.10 Respondents having difficulty with transportation to child care.....	128
Table 8.2.1 Respondents' assessments of changes in child's grades	129
Table 8.2.2 Respondents' assessments of changes in child's school attendance.....	129
Table 8.2.3 Respondents' assessments of changes in child's interaction with teachers.....	130
Table 8.2.4 Respondents' assessments of changes in child's health.....	130
Table 9.1.1 Respondents' participation in English reading/writing training	133
Table 9.1.2 Respondents' participation in GED/HSED instruction	134
Table 9.1.3 Respondents' participation in job skills training	135
Table 9.1.4 Respondents' participation in job preparation and life skills workshop.....	136
Table 9.1.5 Respondents' seeking Job Access Loans.....	137
Table 9.1.6.1 Respondents' participation in Trial Jobs	138
Table 9.1.6.2 Reasons Trial Job did not lead to permanent job.....	139
Table 9.1.7 Respondents' participation in, views on Community Service Jobs	140
Table 9.1.8 Respondents' participation in, views on W-2 Transitions.....	142
Table 9.2.1 Respondents' assessments of W-2 agency staff	143
Table 9.2.2 Respondents' overall comparison of W-2 with AFDC	144
Table 9.2.3 Respondents' views about the clarity of W-2 rules	144
Table 9.2.4 Respondents' assessments of their job-readiness before participating in W-2.....	145
Table 9.2.5 Respondents' overall assessment of whether W-2 helped them find a job.....	145
Table 9.2.6 Respondents' participation in training programs outside of W-2.....	146
Table 9.3.1 Respondents' main reasons for leaving W-2	147
Table 9.3.2.1 Respondents' predictions of returning to W-2	148
Table 9.3.2.2 Respondents' reasons for believing they would not reapply to W-2	149
Table 9.3.2.3 Respondents' reasons for believing they might reapply to W-2	150
Table 9.3.3 Main reasons for being back on W-2 cash (respondents on assistance when interviewed).....	151

Executive Summary

This report presents combined data from three successive quarterly surveys taken of cash assistance recipients who left the Wisconsin Works (W-2) program between April 1 and December 31, 1998. This period represents the first three quarters in which every recipient of cash assistance in Wisconsin was enrolled directly in W-2, and every person leaving cash assistance was leaving that program rather than its entitlement-based predecessor, Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) or a program-in-transition from AFDC to W-2. Thus this is the first glimpse of the effects of W-2 in full implementation throughout Wisconsin, one that begins to capture not only the first moments of that implementation but the deepening impact of W-2 nine months into the program's development.

The "leavers" who were surveyed and whose responses are reported here are those W-2 participants who stopped receiving a cash payment for two or more consecutive months. A total of 11,417 persons met the definition of "leaver" over the nine-month period covered by the surveys. A random sample of 550 cases was drawn from each of the three quarters. Separate surveys were conducted on the three cohorts, which are defined by the quarter in which they left W-2.

The three quarterly survey cohorts were combined in order to produce a report more consistent with similar reports being produced by other states and covering a larger, possibly more representative "time slice" than would be the case with separate reports on each quarter. Out of the combined three-quarters sample of 1,650 W-2 leavers selected at random, survey responses had been obtained from 1,247 respondents in interviews conducted either over the telephone or in the field, for an overall response rate of nearly 76%. With the subtraction of eight duplicates, a survey sample consisting of 1,239 respondents provided the basis for the analysis in the report.

Throughout the report, a distinction is made between "continuous leavers" and "returners." Respondents were "continuous leavers" if they did not receive cash assistance at any time between the time they qualified as leavers (by virtue of having been off of cash assistance for at least two consecutive months) and the time they were interviewed. Respondents were "returners" if they returned to cash assistance at any time before the interview, but after the qualifying two consecutive months without cash assistance.

The result is a report with two analytical narratives unfolding side by side: one presenting results for leavers in general, the other comparing outcomes for continuous leavers and returners. In the report, this parallel structure frames discussions of several important areas of interest: demographics, employment, reliance on program supports, family needs and resources, child care and well-being, and experience with the W-2 program. The remainder of this executive summary offers some of the key findings in these different areas.

It is important to note that those findings reflect the subjective reporting of program participants, as distinct from objective data of the kind that might be gathered through the process of program administration. The possibility that such responses might differ from administrative data is especially great where the survey queried leavers about details of program participation that may have taken place a year or more earlier. But throughout the report, readers should bear in mind that the information it provides is confined mainly to what respondents told interviewers and has not undergone independent verification using other data.

Demographics

The population of W-2 leavers that emerges from the survey data consists mainly of single women in their twenties or early thirties living with from one to three children less than thirteen years old. Among the other salient characteristics of survey respondents:

- 86.5% reported living apart from the other parent of their children. The figure was higher for returners and lower for continuous leavers.
- 76.2% resided in Milwaukee County, with returners more likely than continuous leavers to reside there.
- 73.3% indicated that they were single and had never been married, with returners more likely than continuous leavers to report this.
- 65.8% reported living in a household in which at least one adult had at least a high school education or the equivalent. Continuous leavers were more likely than returners to report this.
- 63.7% reported living in a household in which at least one adult was working. Continuous leavers were more likely than returners to report living in such a household.
- 60.4% reported having at least one child under age five. Continuous leavers and returners reported similar numbers of children in various age groups.

Employment and earnings

Just under 58% of those leavers surveyed said they were employed at the time of the interview and approximately 82% reported that they had been employed at some point since leaving cash assistance. Most employed respondents were working at one “regular” job (as opposed to temporary or seasonal jobs or self-employment) in what would broadly be termed the service sector.

- Those who were employed reported working for an average of just over 35 hours per week, at wages averaging \$7.95 per hour. On average, continuous leavers reported more hours and higher wages than did returners.
- 65.1% of employed respondents reported wages of between \$6.00 and \$8.99 per hour, with 13% reporting wages of \$10.00 or more per hour. Larger percentages of continuous leavers than of returners reported earning \$8.00 or more per hour.
- 39.2% of working respondents said they had received a pay increase in their current job, with continuous leavers more likely than returners to report this.
- 42.6% of working respondents said they drove their own vehicles to work, with continuous leavers more likely than returners to report having access to a car of their own to get to work.
- 23.7% of working respondents reported problems with transportation to work, with returners more likely than continuous leavers to indicate such problems.

Health-care coverage

Most respondents to the survey said they had some health-care coverage both for themselves and for their families, through a combination of private insurance and public health insurance programs.

- 77% of respondents reported having health insurance coverage for themselves, with returners more likely than continuous leavers to be covered.
- 85.6% of employed respondents said they had health insurance coverage for all their children, with returners more likely than continuous leavers to have such coverage.

- 76.8% of all respondents said they or another family member had Medicaid coverage, with returners more likely than continuous leavers to report this.
- 19.2% of employed and insured respondents indicated having private health insurance coverage, with continuous leavers more likely than returners to be privately insured.

Continuing program supports

Most of the W-2 leavers surveyed for this report indicated that they were also continuing to make use of other program supports either available to them directly or obtained for or through another family member.

- 81.9% reported being aware of their possible eligibility for Medicaid coverage for their children after leaving W-2, and 67.6% were aware of their possible eligibility for Medicaid coverage for themselves. Continuous leavers and returners indicated such awareness at similar rates.
- 77.8% said they were aware of their possible eligibility for food stamps after leaving W-2, and 58% reported that they or another immediate family member were receiving food stamps. Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to report being aware of their eligibility for food stamps and to indicate that they or a family member were receiving them.
- 71% said they were aware of their possible continuing eligibility for child-care subsidies, and 65.3% indicated awareness that they might still be eligible for child support agency help after leaving W-2. Continuous leavers and returners were similar in these respects.
- 58% reported at least one family member participating in a subsidized school lunch program, with returners more likely than continuous leavers to report this.

Other family supports

A number of survey respondents indicated that they were also receiving some support from a spouse or from the co-parent of a child and from tax credits designed to supplement the earnings of working families.

- 27.7% said they were receiving child support payments from the absent parent of a child; findings for continuous leavers and returners were similar.
- 8% said they lived with a spouse or co-parent who worked for pay; findings for continuous leavers and returners were similar.
- Respondents reported that their working spouses or co-parents were earning an average of \$10.15 an hour—slightly more in the case of continuous leavers, slightly less in the case of returners.
- 71.5% said they were aware of the federal Earned Income Tax Credit and 45.7% said they were aware of a similar Wisconsin state tax credit for working families. Of those who were aware of both credits, 71.2% said they were claiming one or the other (or both) on their tax returns. Continuous leavers were more likely than returners to be aware of and claiming one of these credits.

Individual attitudes and family needs

Respondents to the survey reported both improvements in their sense of well-being and continuing challenges in meeting some basic personal and family needs. For example:

- 93.5% said they felt the same or better about themselves since leaving W-2, with continuous leavers and returners reporting similarly.
- 84.1% said their satisfaction with life was the same or better since leaving W-2, with continuous leavers more likely than returners to report improvement.
- 57.1% said their worries about money had either stayed the same or decreased, with returners more likely than continuous leavers to report increased money concerns.
- 48.8% reported experiencing times during the previous two years when they could not afford food, with returners reporting this at a higher rate than continuous leavers.
- 15.4% said that on occasion during the previous two years they had been unable to afford medical care for an ill household member, with continuous leavers reporting this at a higher rate than returners.
- 9.2% indicated that at some point during the previous two years they had stayed in a homeless shelter, with returners reporting this at a slightly higher rate than continuous leavers.

Child care

Child care was a central issue as W-2 leavers with young children ventured into the workforce. Most respondents with children under age 13 had some child-care arrangements, in many cases with the help of child-care subsidies designed to enable former assistance recipients to maintain jobs.

- 86.3% reported having some child-care arrangements while at work, with continuous leavers and returners reporting similar circumstances.
- 61% of those with child-care arrangements reported having sought a child-care subsidy, with returners more likely than continuous leavers to report this.
- 66.1% of those seeking child-care subsidies said they had received one, with continuous leavers and returners reporting this at similar rates.
- 30.2% of respondents with a child in child care reported that a child-care problem had interfered with work efforts, with returners more likely than continuous leavers to report this.
- 15.6% reported lacking child care for at least one child under age 13, with similar percentages of continuous leavers and returners encountering this circumstance.

Child well-being

When asked specifically about the well-being of a “sample” child in their families, respondents reported patterns of change or improvement similar to those they described for themselves.

- 83.2% reported that their child’s grades had improved or remained the same, with continuous leavers and returners reporting similar results.
- 88.5% reported that their child’s school attendance had improved or remained the same, with continuous leavers and returners reporting similarly.
- 93% reported that their child’s health had improved or stayed the same, again with similar results for continuous leavers and returners.

W-2 experience

The survey suggests that most leavers left the W-2 program having participated in one or more specific program elements designed to prepare them for employment. Survey respondents reported having found many of these program elements helpful. Finding a job or deciding to pursue work independently were among the principal reasons respondents cited for having left W-2 cash assistance.

- 51.5% said they were offered or assigned job skills training aimed at preparing them for unsubsidized employment, and with returners more likely than continuous leavers to have participated in such training.
- 74.1% found W-2 agency staff to be helpful in preparing them for work, and 46.8% said they thought W-2 was better than AFDC. Similar percentages of continuous leavers and returners reported finding agency staff helpful, but a higher percentage of continuous leavers than of returners said they considered W-2 better than AFDC.
- 34.3% said they stopped receiving W-2 cash assistance because they found a job, and another 14.4% said either that they simply preferred to work or could earn more that way. Continuous leavers and returners appeared similar in these respects.
- 22.1% said the W-2 program helped them find a job, while 73.7% said that they had felt capable of finding and holding a job at the time they first applied for W-2.

CHAPTER 1

WISCONSIN WORKS (W-2) AND THE 1998 LEAVERS SURVEY

1.1 Introduction

In recent years, Wisconsin has witnessed a phenomenal decline in its public assistance caseload. Although this caseload decline was under way before the welfare reform legislation of the mid-1990s, it accelerated with the implementation of Wisconsin's work-based family assistance program, Wisconsin Works (W-2). During the three years between September 1997 (the month W-2 began to be implemented statewide) and September 2000, Wisconsin's public assistance caseload fell by approximately 11,500 cases, or more than 50 percent.

This report presents combined data from three successive quarterly surveys taken of cash assistance recipients who left the W-2 program between April 1 and December 31, 1998.¹ This period represents the first three quarters in which every recipient of cash assistance in Wisconsin was enrolled directly in W-2, and every person leaving cash assistance was leaving that program rather than its entitlement-based predecessor, Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) or a program-in-transition from AFDC to W-2. This is thus the first glimpse of W-2 in full implementation throughout Wisconsin.

The surveys begin to capture not only the very first moments of that implementation but also the deepening impact of W-2 some nine months into the development of the program. Nevertheless, the fact that they address a relatively early stage in that development should be borne in mind when reading the report. The period covered was just long enough for many W-2 leavers to have had a first encounter with the workforce after what for many had been a prolonged period on assistance. It was not long enough to support detailed inferences about leavers' long-term attachment to or advancement in that workforce. Furthermore, such important related processes as the expansion of Medicaid to more working families through the BadgerCare program were just beginning as the survey was being conducted, and were therefore too recent for their full potential to figure significantly in the survey results.

Preliminary though it is, this report serves an important public interest in learning how a major innovation in family support was working at an early stage. The replacement, at the federal level, of the AFDC program with the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) program of block grants to states in 1996 was accompanied by a diverse range of expectations and predictions. Wisconsin's role in the welfare reform effort that led to TANF, as well as the combination of work requirements and employment supports that distinguish Wisconsin's TANF program, has made W-2 a particular focus of attention not only in its home state but across the country and around the world.

The topics covered by the surveys and this report reflect the priorities of the W-2 program itself. In keeping with the emphasis of the W-2 program on enabling participants to make a transition from cash assistance to unsubsidized employment, the longest and most detailed chapter (chapter 3) reports on W-2 leavers' experiences in the workplace after leaving W-2, offering information about jobs, hours, and wages. That chapter is followed immediately by a chapter detailing leavers' advancement in their jobs and patterns of transportation to work.

¹This report was funded in part by federal Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) grant number 98ASPE310A, which also funded similar surveys in thirteen other states and counties. The survey was conducted and the analysis compiled under the general direction of the Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development W-2 Management and Evaluation Project (MEP).

Because of the importance W-2 attaches to job preparation and to program supports for working families, both aspects of W-2 receive detailed attention in this report. Chapter 5 provides information about the various cash benefit and non-cash support services for which former W-2 participants or their families often remain eligible even after leaving W-2. Chapter 9 looks specifically at W-2 leavers' engagement in particular work-preparation activities as part of their participation in W-2, and reports on leavers' assessments of those elements and of the W-2 program in general.

Given W-2's commitment to support for families and to enabling families to be effective support networks, substantial portions of this report examine the composition, resources, and needs of leavers' families. Chapter 2 looks at the demography of leavers not only as individuals but also as members of families and households. Chapter 6 details work-related income and other supports provided to families by family or household members other than leavers themselves. Chapter 7 provides information about the material circumstances of leavers and their families and about leavers' perceptions of their own and their families' well-being.

Finally, and consistent with the importance W-2 places on parental responsibility, on child-care services, and on families as support structures for children, several sections of this report focus on the relationship between the W-2 program and children. Chapter 2 includes a detailed breakdown specifically of the child demographics of W-2 leavers' families. Chapter 6 provides information about leaver families' receipt of child support payments from absent parents. Chapter 8 offers details about leavers' child-care needs and arrangements, as well as about the well-being of leavers' children as revealed by various indicators.

Since the respondents surveyed here first left the W-2 program, that program has continued to evolve. This qualifies the respects in which the findings of this report bear directly on the W-2 program as it stands nearly three years after most of the survey respondents first stopped receiving cash assistance. Many of the circumstances the report describes were evident to policy-makers, and generating program responses, even as the survey was being conducted and its results compiled. Evaluating the W-2 program over the longer term of its ongoing development offers abundant opportunities for continuing research.

1.2 Methodology

1.2.1 Survey population

The population for this survey was W-2 participants who stopped receiving cash assistance between the beginning of April and the end of December 1998. "W-2 participants" refers to all W-2 cases, including two-parent families and members of the Bad River, Lac du Flambeau, and Oneida tribes who participated in the program and received W-2 cash assistance. The survey population did not include individuals who were receiving Supplemental Security Income (Caretaker Supplemental) or who were caring only for children of relatives (Kinship Care) and who are not part of the state's W-2 program.

"Leavers" are those participants who stopped receiving a cash payment for two or more consecutive months. Note that by this definition one could be a "leaver" and still be participating in other parts of the W-2 program, such as by receiving case management services.

Throughout the report, a distinction is made between "continuous leavers" and "returners." Respondents were "continuous leavers" if they did not receive cash assistance at any time between the time they qualified as leavers (by virtue of having been off of cash assistance for at least two

consecutive months) and the time they were interviewed. Respondents were “returners” if they returned to cash assistance at any time before the interview, but after the qualifying two consecutive months without cash assistance.²

1.2.2 Survey sample

A total of 11,417 persons met the definition of “leaver” over the period covered by this survey. From these, a random sample of 550 cases was drawn for each of the three quarters, for a total sample of 1,650. Since the sample was taken three times, a small number of people appeared more than once in the survey.³ For purposes of this report, those duplicates are only included the first time they appear as a leaver with a completed interview.

Separate surveys were conducted on the three cohorts, which are defined by the quarter in which they left W-2. Differences among the three surveys that might complicate combining their results were considered in deciding to produce a single report on all three cohorts. One potential problem was that the follow-up period for the three surveys was not the same.⁴ There were also subtle differences in the way some questions were asked and in the “skip logic” that determined which subsets of the total sample were asked certain questions from one quarter to the next. Finally, it is possible that differences over time in program operations, labor market conditions, and caseload characteristics affected the outcomes tracked by the survey. For example, the second quarter covered a period of great transition for the W-2 program, during which Milwaukee AFDC cases were converted to W-2.

Despite these differences among the three quarters, it was decided in consultation with the federal grant manager that the benefits of combining the three cohorts outweighed the potential drawbacks, and that those drawbacks could be addressed effectively by various means. One important benefit is a report more consistent with similar reports being produced by other states. Another is that combining the three cohorts allows analysis of a larger, possibly more representative “time slice” of the critical 1998 phase-in period for W-2. Efforts were made in the preparation, analysis, and presentation of the data to address differences in the survey structure and wording across the three quarters. Where these differences may affect outcomes, they are discussed in the text or in footnotes so that the reader may take them into account when interpreting the results.

1.2.3 Survey response rate

Researchers recognize the importance of attaining a high response rate in this type of study. It may be argued that those who leave cash assistance and cannot easily be located for a follow-up interview may be substantially different from those who are easily located, although the nature of the

²Note that these definitions neither specify the length of time a leaver may have been on assistance before leaving, nor capture any pattern of “cycling” on and off assistance. A W-2 participant need only have received one assistance payment prior to the two-month qualifying period to be considered a leaver, and may have moved on and off of assistance (either AFDC or W-2) several times before qualifying as a leaver for purposes of this study. Furthermore, “returners” warrant their designation by having returned at any time, no matter for how long, even if they had left again prior to being interviewed, and irrespective of how many times they may have left and returned prior to being interviewed.

³This occurred for persons who left in one quarter but were back on cash assistance in a subsequent quarter and also were selected in the random sample for more than one quarter and were among the respondents for more than one quarter. There were only eight respondents who appeared more than once in the data set.

⁴Quarter 2 interviews were conducted from 13 to 18 months after the respondent left cash assistance, quarter 3 interviews were conducted from 12 to 19 months after leaving, and quarter 4 interviews were conducted from 12 to 22 months after leaving.

bias is unclear. For example, some may be harder to locate because they lost telephone service or had to move because of financial hardship. On the other hand, persons who are working also tend to be harder to contact in a telephone survey.

To meet this concern, researchers made extraordinary efforts to locate and contact persons who could not be contacted initially at their last known telephone number or address. Location techniques included searching alternative databases and visiting last known addresses and, in some cases, questioning neighbors in an attempt to find leavers who had moved.

The University of Wisconsin Survey Center (UWSC) initially attempted to complete telephone interviews with all leavers in the sample, completing 922 interviews through that method.⁵ Interviews that could not be conducted by the UWSC, including those who could not be reached by phone, were institutionalized, non-English speaking or homeless, were assigned to the Department of Workforce Development, Office of Quality Assurance field staff, or to contractors. This effort resulted in an additional 325 completed interviews.⁶

The response rate (the percent of all potential respondents who completed the survey) varied slightly for the three surveys. As already noted, there were 1,650 cases sampled from the three quarters; of these, four were found to be deceased before the interview. Two other cases were excluded for other reasons. Of the remainder, a total of 1,247 were interviewed, resulting in a response rate for the combined surveys of 75.9 percent.⁷ This response rate compares favorably with that of other similar surveys.⁸

1.2.4 Bias and weighting

A frequent concern in this type of study is that those individuals who responded to the survey do not accurately represent the larger population of leavers. Such bias might occur at two points: first when the sample is selected for survey (such that the survey sample does not represent the larger population) and second when the responses to the survey are collected (such that the survey respondents do not represent the larger population).

Detailed data about W-2 clients and cases are collected in CARES, Wisconsin's statewide Client Assistance for Re-employment and Economic Support computer system. Using demographic data from the CARES database, comparisons were made between leavers who were sampled and the entire population of leavers with respect to age, sex, race/ethnicity, education and county of residence (Milwaukee versus the remainder of the state). There were no statistically significant differences between those in the sample and those in the population for the factors tested, indicating that the sample represents the population with respect to those factors.⁹

⁵The UWSC completed 324 telephone interviews in quarter 2, 316 in quarter 3 and 282 in quarter 4. The progressively lower ratio of telephone to in-person interviews over the three quarters may reflect the tendency for telephone numbers to become outdated over time. Because the elapsed time between sample selection and interview was greater in quarters 3 and 4, more in-person interviews may have been necessary in order to achieve the desired response rate for those quarters.

⁶Additional efforts resulted in the completion of 89 interviews in quarter 2, 103 in quarter 3, and 133 in quarter 4.

⁷With the subtraction of eight duplicate respondents, the final survey sample was 1,239.

⁸Two studies by the Urban Institute report on leaver surveys in 12 states. Response rates for those surveys vary from 51 to 85 percent (Brauner, Sarah and Pamela Loprest, *Where are they now?* Urban Institute, May 1999; Acs, Gregory and Pamela Loprest, *Initial Synthesis Report of the Findings from ASPE'S "Leavers" Grants*, Urban Institute, January 2001).

⁹Chi-square tests of statistical significance were used on categorical variables. A difference of means *t*-test was used to measure differences in age. Results were considered statistically significant if they exceeded a minimum .05 level of significance.

Next, comparisons were made between those who were selected for the sample and did respond to the survey and those who were sampled but did not respond, to determine whether the response rate among groups might introduce a bias in the analysis. Again, the respondents and non-respondents were compared with respect to age, sex, race/ethnicity, education, and county of residence. In this comparison, it was found that men and non-whites were less likely than were others to respond to the survey. While the magnitude of the differences caused by this response rate bias was small, the differences were statistically significant at a .01 level.¹⁰

To correct for the under-representation of non-whites and males in the final data set, cases were weighted in the tables reported in this report. To correct for the under-representation of non-whites, each case with that characteristic was multiplied by a factor of 1.027 in the analysis. Male cases were multiplied by a factor of 1.262. Fractions were rounded to the next closest whole number. Although this weighting had a very small impact on the results, it was deemed necessary to ensure the most accurate possible representation of the population of all leavers.

1.2.5 Survey structure

The survey instrument was based largely on an interview instrument developed in 1996 by Donald Klos for a similar study in South Carolina. The instrument was pre-tested and minor modifications made as a result. As already mentioned, there were also relatively minor changes in the instrument from one quarter to the next. Those differences were resolved and are addressed in the text of the report.

Many of the important outcome measures in the survey are in response to “open-ended” questions, which pose particular analytical challenges. Unlike closed-ended questions, to which respondents must answer “yes” or “no” or choose from a list of specific options, open-ended questions invite respondents to explain their answer in their own words, which are then assigned to a category by the interviewer or written down and assigned codes later. Open-ended questions also can elicit multiple responses, or explanations identifying multiple reasons or circumstances, most notably when a interviewer is asked to solicit both the “main” and “other” reasons for a given situation. Finally, there is typically a higher frequency of missing data (e.g. “no response” or “don’t know”) from open-ended questions than from closed-ended ones, so that the number of responses to this type of question tends to be smaller than the number of cases in the sample.

Considerable time was spent categorizing and coding open-ended responses. To maximize accuracy, each open-ended response was independently coded by two readers. In those cases where respondents offered or coders identified more than one response only the first response entered was included in the analysis as the “main” explanation. Where they bear on an interpretation of the survey results, difficulties in analyzing particular open-ended questions are discussed in the text or in footnotes.

In a very small number of cases, errors in data entry or anomalies in response coding caused responses to be reported as “missing.” In addition, most questions allowed for the entry of “don’t know” or “no response” as survey responses. In order to limit analysis to data containing substantive responses, “don’t know” and “no response” were treated as “missing” for analysis purposes. The number of responses “missing” in this broader sense is clearly indicated in each table, along with the effective sample size once the missing responses are subtracted.

¹⁰Chi-square tests on gender and non-white versus others were statistically significant ($p < .01$).

In some instances, the survey asked particular questions only of a specific subset of respondents grouped according to their response to a prior question. In such cases both the accompanying text and a note in the table will identify the subgroup and indicate its size (n). In these instances, the “missing” value refers only to responses missing from that subset. Successive subdivisions of the sample may contribute to a cumulative number of “missing” respondents not directly accounted for in a given table. For this reason, as well as because of the rounding of weighted responses, the number in a given subset, the number in the remainder, and the missing responses for that subset may not sum to the sample total of 1,239.

1.2.6 Significance testing

In many cases throughout this report, tests were done to determine whether an apparent relationship observed in a table is statistically significant. Chi-square tests were used on variables expressed as nominal or categorical data. Difference of means *t*-tests were used on variables expressed as interval data. Chi-square tests were done using weighted data. Because of the limitations of the statistical program used in the analysis, weights were not used when conducting *t*-tests.

The general format for the tests was to compare survey responses of continuous leavers with those of returners with respect to selected categories. In many cases, several categories that appear in a table were collapsed to create 2 x 2 tables to better address relationships for specific categories. Where categories were isolated for testing purposes by collapsing the remaining categories into “all others” this is specified in the relevant footnote.

Where a test was done, the difference or lack of difference is described in a footnote indicating what specific relationship was tested, the type of test that was used, and the outcome of the test. If there is no report of a test in the text or footnotes associated with a table, no test was done. Results are only reported as statistically significant if they exceeded a minimum .05 level of significance. The footnotes indicate whether the result was not significant, was significant at a .05 level ($p < .05$), or was significant at the higher .01 level ($p < .01$).¹¹

The use of statistical testing on selected comparisons between continuous leavers and returners is the basis for a particular narrative convention found throughout the report. Unless a statistically significant relationship of some kind was established using one of the tests described above, discussions of the survey results are confined to observations about “respondents,” to what surveyed leavers “reported,” or to what comparative relationship “appeared” to obtain. Only when a statistically significant result was found does the report refer without qualification to “continuous leavers” or “returners” in a manner that suggests inferences about the general population of “leavers.” The only other circumstance in which the report refers to “leavers” in general is in introductory conceptual discussions.

1.3 Additional analysis

This report represents only one of many possible approaches to analyzing the wealth of data collected by these 1998 leaver surveys. Producing a study of manageable size while covering the range of topics of interest has meant, among other things, limiting the amount of cross-tabular

¹¹Researchers recognize the increased potential for “Type II error,” or the finding of “false positives,” when large numbers of statistical tests are conducted. Readers should bear this in mind when interpreting results based on statistical tests.

analysis and cross-referencing of findings pursued here. Inevitably, what this study gains in breadth by covering three quarters, it loses somewhat in the depth at which it can explore any particular dimension of leavers' experiences.

It is important to note that the findings presented here reflect the subjective reporting of program participants, as distinct from objective data of the kind that might be gathered through the process of program administration. The possibility that such responses might differ from administrative data is especially great where the survey queried leavers about details of program participation that may have taken place a year or more earlier. But throughout the report, readers should bear in mind that the information it provides is confined mainly to what respondents told interviewers and has not undergone independent verification using other data.

Readers of this report may wish to consult the administrative data in appendix A for further perspective on the survey results. These administrative data present information about survey respondents as documented by the Department using its various case tracking tools, rather than in the form of survey responses. Several points at which compiled administrative data bear on issues addressed in the survey report are indicated in footnotes to the report. However, care should be exercised in comparing survey results with administrative data because of the different collection methods involved and the different time periods used for measurement.

Readers of this report should also note that the entire survey data set will soon be available for public use, in expectation that other researchers will access it and conduct additional analyses. In the meantime, those seeking a glimpse of a somewhat different way of organizing the information in this report may wish to examine a separate report that focuses exclusively on survey data for the second quarter (April-June) of 1998.¹² Although limited by that shorter time span and by the fact that it looks only at "continuous leavers" (thus precluding the continuous leaver/returner comparison that frames the full three-quarter report), the second quarter report makes more comprehensive and systematic use of distinctions between respondents who were working when interviewed and those who were not. An overview of that second quarter report is posted on the Department of Workforce Development Web site:

<http://www.dwd.state.wi.us/desw2/>

A printed copy of the full second quarter report is available from the Department upon request. To request a copy please contact:

Joanne Wallendal
DWD/DWS
201 E. Washington, Room A200
P.O. Box 7972
Madison, WI 53707-7972
Phone: 608-267-4525
E-mail: wallejo@dwd.state.wi.us

¹²*Survey of Continuous Leavers: Left W-2 Assistance and Did Not Return. April through June 1998 Quarterly Report.* Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development (November 2001).

CHAPTER 2

OVERVIEW OF THE LEAVER POPULATION

This chapter presents demographic information about W-2 leavers and their families. In addition to offering a general overview of the respondent population as a whole, it draws some preliminary comparisons between those respondents who returned to W-2 and those who did not.

The population that emerges from the survey data consists mainly of single women in their twenties or early thirties living with from one to three children less than thirteen years old. Among the other salient characteristics of survey respondents:

- 86.5% said they lived apart from the other parent of their children.
- 65.8% reported living in a household in which at least one adult had at least a high school education or the equivalent.
- 63.7% reported living in a household in which at least one adult (including the respondent) was working.
- 60.4% indicated having at least one child under age five.
- 76.2% lived in Milwaukee County.

Although with respect to some characteristics—age, gender, household size—returners to W-2 appeared broadly similar to continuous leavers, in other respects the two groups displayed marked differences. For example, among survey respondents:

- Continuous leavers were more likely than returners to live in a household with at least one employed adult (including the leaver).
- Continuous leavers were more likely than returners to be married, and more likely to be living with the spouse or the co-parent of one of their children.
- Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to report having less than a high school education.
- Returners tended to report more minor children in their households than did continuous leavers.
- Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to reside in Milwaukee County.

The remainder of this chapter examines these and other demographic features of the respondent population in further detail. Section 2.1 presents basic information about survey respondents themselves, including age, gender, racial/ethnic background, marital status, and educational attainment. Section 2.2 provides information about the size and composition of respondents' households, including the educational level and employment status of the adults living in those households. Finally, section 2.3 focuses specifically on the children in those households—their number, age, and distribution across various age groups.

2.1 Leaver Demographics

CARES data were used to establish each respondent's date of birth, and this along with the date of the interview was used to calculate the respondent's age. CARES data were also used to establish respondents' race/ethnicity. Respondents were asked directly about their gender, marital status, years of schooling, and level of education.

2.1.1 Respondents' ages

The average age of respondents at the time they were interviewed was just over 30 years, and the median age was 28. As table 2.1.1 indicates, returners to W-2 did not appear to differ greatly in average age from respondents who remained continuously off assistance.¹

	<i>All Leavers (n=1239)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=770)</i>	<i>Returners (n=466)</i>
Mean age	30.27	30.36	30.11
Median age	28	28	28

^a Sample = all surveyed, including 2 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

2.1.2 Respondents' ages, by age group

Almost all respondents were 19 years old or older, and nearly three-quarters (73.1%) were between 19 and 35 years old, at the time of the survey interview. About as many respondents fell into the lower and narrower 19-to-25 age category as fell into the higher and broader 26-to-35 range. Although not shown on this table, the largest single-year age group was the 7.4% of respondents who were 22 years old at the time of the interview. The age distribution of respondents across the various age categories appeared similar for continuous leavers and returners.

	<i>All Leavers (n=1237)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=770)</i>	<i>Returners (n=466)</i>
Under 19	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%
19 to 25	37.2%	36.6%	38.1%
26 to 35	35.9%	36.9%	34.3%
36 or over	26.8%	26.5%	27.4%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 2 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

¹A *t*-test comparing the means for continuous leavers and for returners of respondents' ages was not statistically significant.

2.1.3 Respondents' gender

Almost all (96%) of the survey respondents were women. As indicated in table 2.1.3, the ratio of women to men among respondents appeared similar for continuous leavers and returners.²

	<i>All Leavers (n=1237)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=770)</i>	<i>Returners (n=466)</i>
Female	96.0%	95.8%	96.5%
Male	4.0%	4.2%	3.5%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 2 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

²A chi-square test comparing continuous leaver and returner respondents by gender was not statistically significant.

2.1.4 Respondents' race/ethnicity

Slightly more than 58% of respondents were African American. White respondents constituted the next largest racial/ethnic group, at just under 21%, with Hispanics the third largest at 6.6%. Slightly more than 10% were of unknown racial/ethnic background. Complete figures for both continuous leavers and returners are presented in table 2.1.4.

African American respondents accounted for one-half (50.1%) of continuous leavers and represented just under three-quarters (72.1%) of returners.³ White respondents accounted for more than one-quarter (26.7%) of continuous leavers and 11% of returners.

	<i>All Leavers (n=1237)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=770)</i>	<i>Returns (n=466)</i>
African American	58.4%	50.1%	72.1%
White	20.8%	26.7%	11.0%
Unknown	10.1%	11.0%	8.6%
Hispanic	6.6%	7.0%	5.9%
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.4%	3.1%	1.2%
Native American	1.3%	1.5%	0.9%
Southeast Asian	0.5%	0.6%	0.4%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 2 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

³A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by African American respondents and respondents in all other categories of race/ethnicity was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

2.1.5 Respondents' marital status

Nearly three-quarters (73.3%) of respondents indicated that they were single and had never been married. Only 9% were married at the time they were interviewed. Table 2.1.5 summarizes the marital status both of continuous leaver and of returner respondents.

That table indicates some differences between continuous leavers and returners with respect to marital status. Continuous leavers were more likely to say they were married than were returners.⁴ Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to indicate that they had never been married.⁵

	<i>All Leavers (n=1229)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=764)</i>	<i>Returns (n=464)</i>
Single, never married	73.3%	69.1%	80.3%
Married	9.0%	11.4%	5.0%
Separated	7.3%	7.5%	7.0%
Divorced	9.9%	11.5%	7.2%
Widowed	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 10 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

⁴A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by married respondents and all other respondents was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

⁵A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who were "single, never married" and all other respondents was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

2.1.6 Respondents' formal education

Respondents reported having spent an average of slightly more than 11 years in school. The figure was higher for continuous leavers than for returners.⁶ The averages (means) of the numbers of years of schooling for continuous leavers and for returners are reported in table 2.1.6.1.

	<i>All Leavers (n=1230)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=765)</i>	<i>Returners (n=463)</i>
Mean years of schooling	11.21	11.39	10.90

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 9 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total.

More than one-half of the survey respondents reported having at least a high school education or the equivalent. Only about 5%, however, had earned any academic degree or professional certificate beyond a high school diploma. The attained levels of education reported by continuous leavers and returners are summarized in Table 2.1.6.2.

Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to indicate having less than a high school education.⁷ Overall among respondents, the educational profile of continuous leavers as a group appeared to display a higher level of educational attainment than that of returners as a group.

	<i>All Leavers (n=1208)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=752)</i>	<i>Returners (n=456)</i>
Less than high school	44.0%	38.1%	53.7%
High school diploma	39.0%	43.7%	31.1%
High school equivalent	12.0%	11.6%	12.6%
2-year associate degree	4.0%	5.1%	2.2%
College/ Bachelor's	1.0%	1.4%	0.5%
Master's degree or higher	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 31 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

⁶A *t*-test comparing the means for continuous leavers and for returners of respondents' reported years of schooling was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

⁷A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents reporting less than a high school education and all other respondents was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

2.1.7 Respondents' place of residence (Milwaukee vs. non-Milwaukee)

More than three-quarters (76.2%) of all respondents resided in Milwaukee County at the time they were interviewed. As shown in table 2.1.7, returners were more likely than continuous leavers to live in Milwaukee County.⁸

	<i>All Leavers (n=1237)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=770)</i>	<i>Returners (n=466)</i>
Milwaukee	76.2%	68.2%	89.5%
Not Milwaukee	23.8%	31.8%	10.5%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 2 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

⁸A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents from Milwaukee County and all other respondents was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

2.2 Leavers' Households

In addition to collecting information about W-2 leavers themselves, the survey gathered data about their families and households. Respondents were asked about the other people living with them, about the relationship of those other people to them, and about the age, educational level, and employment status of those other individuals. This information, collected in a detailed response grid unique to Wisconsin's survey, served as the basis for determining the composition of each respondent's household.

Throughout this report, *family* refers to the respondent, the respondent's spouse or the co-parent of at least one child, and the respondent's son(s), daughter(s), stepson(s), and stepdaughter(s). Responses to multiple parts of the survey were combined to establish the "co-parent" relationship. References to *household* encompass all individuals sharing the respondent's living quarters, regardless of the relationship to the respondent.

2.2.1 Size of respondents' households

Respondents reported living in households containing, on average, four people. Continuous leavers and returners did not appear to differ greatly in this respect.⁹ Nearly one-half (49.9%) of those who responded to the survey said they lived in households consisting of three or four people in all, and slightly more than 80% said they lived in households ranging in size from two to five people. The distribution of household sizes appeared generally similar for both continuous leaver respondents and for returners. The various household sizes for the two groups of respondents are reported in table 2.2.1.

	<i>All Leavers (n=1237)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=770)</i>	<i>Returners (n=466)</i>
Lived alone	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%
Two in all	16.4%	16.9%	15.6%
Three in all	28.1%	28.4%	27.5%
Four in all	21.8%	21.3%	22.5%
Five in all	14.6%	15.7%	12.7%
Six in all	9.1%	8.2%	10.6%
Seven or more	8.4%	7.8%	9.4%
Average size of household	4.00	3.94	4.08

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 2 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

⁹A *t*-test comparing the means for continuous leavers and for returners of respondents' reported household size was not statistically significant.

2.2.2 Composition of respondents' households

A substantial majority (62.4%) of respondents said they were single parents whose households consisted of themselves and their children. The next largest group, at 22.7%, reported living with a child or children and at least one other person who was not a spouse. Just over 10% of households consisted, based on survey responses, of a parent, a spouse or co-parent, and children. In a small percentage of cases, these latter households were reported to include others as well.

Table 2.2.2 presents the varied household configurations respondents reported. For the most part, the households depicted by continuous leaver respondents did not appear to differ greatly from those reported by returner respondents.¹⁰ In one exception to this generalization, continuous leavers were more likely than returners to say they lived in households that included themselves, a spouse, and children—a formation sometimes termed a “nuclear family.”¹¹

	<i>All Leavers (n=1237)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=770)</i>	<i>Returners (n=466)</i>
Single parent with children	62.4%	60.5%	65.7%
With children and others, no spouse	22.7%	21.9%	24.0%
With spouse and children	9.1%	11.6%	4.9%
With others, no spouse or children	2.3%	2.5%	2.1%
Lived alone	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%
With spouse, children, and others	1.6%	1.6%	1.5%
With spouse, no children	0.2%	0.3%	0.0%
With spouse and others, no children	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 2 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

¹⁰Although in the sample returner respondents appeared more likely than continuous leavers to report living in households consisting of single parents with children, a chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by reported single parent households and all other reported household types was not statistically significant.

¹¹A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents reporting households consisting of the respondent, a spouse, and one or more children (the “nuclear family”) and respondents reporting all other household types was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

2.2.3 Respondents living either with their spouse or the co-parent of a child

A large majority (86.5%) of respondents reported that they did not live with their spouse or the other parent of their child or children. However, as table 2.2.3 indicates, this majority was even larger (91.9%) for returners to W-2 than it was for continuous leavers (83.3%). Continuous leavers were more likely than returners to indicate that they lived with a spouse or co-parent.¹²

	<i>All Leavers (n=1231)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=765)</i>	<i>Returners (n=465)</i>
Lived with spouse or co-parent	13.5%	16.7%	8.1%
Did not live with spouse or co-parent	86.5%	83.3%	91.9%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 8 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

2.2.4 Educational characteristics of respondents' households

Slightly more than one-third (34.2%) of respondents indicated that their household included no adults with at least a high school education or the equivalent. Returners to W-2 were more likely than continuous leavers to indicate that no adult in their household had finished high school.¹³

	<i>All Leavers (n=1235)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=768)</i>	<i>Returners (n=466)</i>
All adults had less than high school	34.2%	29.2%	42.3%
At least one adult with high school or more	65.8%	70.8%	57.7%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 4 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

¹²A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported living with the other spouse or co-parent and respondents who did not report this was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

¹³A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents reporting that their household included no adult with at least a high school education and all other respondents was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

Slightly more than one-half (51.9%) of respondents reported living in a household in which every adult had at least a high school education or the equivalent. Continuous leavers were more likely than returners to say they lived in such a household.¹⁴

Table 2.2.4.2 Respondent households in which no adult had less than a high school education

	<i>All Leavers (n=1235)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=768)</i>	<i>Returners (n=466)</i>
No adult with less than high school	51.9%	57.3%	43.0%
At least one adult with less than high school	48.1%	42.7%	57.0%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 4 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

Approximately 6.8% of respondents said they lived in a household in which at least one adult had more than a high school education. Continuous leavers were more likely than returners to indicate living in a household that included at least one adult with education beyond high school.¹⁵

Table 2.2.4.3 Respondent households in which at least one adult had more than a high school education

	<i>All Leavers (n=1231)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=767)</i>	<i>Returners (n=463)</i>
No adult with more than high school	93.2%	91.9%	95.4%
At least one adult with more than high school	6.8%	8.1%	4.6%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 8 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

¹⁴A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents reporting that no adult in their household had less than a high school education and by respondents reporting at least one such adult in their household was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

¹⁵A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents reporting no adult in their household with more than a high school education and respondents reporting at least one such adult in their household was statistically significant ($p < .05$).

2.2.5 Employment status of respondents' households

Just under 64% of respondents reported living in a household that included at least one adult member who was employed at the time of the interview. Approximately 8.5% reported living with two or more working adult household members. Table 2.2.5 presents the details of these reported household employment patterns for both continuous leavers and returners.

That table indicates a contrast in the respective household employment profiles of continuous leavers and returners.¹⁶ Slightly more than one-half (52%) of returner respondents' households included no working adult, nearly twice the percentage reported by continuous leaver respondents. Continuous leavers were more likely than returners to report at least one adult household member employed at the time of the interview.¹⁷

	<i>All Leavers (n=1237)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=770)</i>	<i>Returners (n=466)</i>
None	36.3%	26.8%	52.0%
One	55.3%	62.7%	43.0%
Two	6.8%	8.2%	4.4%
Three	1.5%	2.0%	0.6%
Four	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 2 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

¹⁶Not all aspects of the employment profile displayed this contrast. As reported in section 6.2.1, within the much smaller subset of cases in which at least one of the employed members of the household was the respondent's spouse (or the co-parent of at least one child in the household) returners and continuous leavers both reported similar percentages. However, this is a separate issue from that of how many household members were working, since the working spouse could be the only employed person in the household or one of several, and there could be two or more working individuals in a household, none of whom was a spouse to or co-parent with any of the others.

¹⁷A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents reporting that their households included no working adult and by respondents reporting at least one working adult in their households was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

2.3 Leavers' Child Demographics

In addition to asking about leavers and their households in general, the survey also looked at the demographics specifically of the children in those households. Based on information respondents provided about the numbers and ages of the children living with them, it was possible to establish both the number of households with children belonging to various age groups and the number of children in those age groups that each respondent household contained.

The age groupings used here reflect the fact that children under 5 are typically not in school and present child-care issues of a distinct kind, and that, with some exceptions, age 12 is the maximum age for state-subsidized child-care assistance.

2.3.1 Respondents' households with at least one child in various age groups

As expected, given that W-2 is designed to serve parents with children, more than 95% of respondents had at least one child living with them. As shown in table 2.3.1, 60.4% reported having at least one child under age 5 in their household, and a similar percentage (59.0%) reported that their household included at least one child aged 5 to 12. However, only about one-half of that percentage (or 31.2% of all) reported sharing a household with at least one child aged 13 or older.

Continuous leaver respondents and returner respondents appeared broadly similar in the rates at which they reported having at least one child of these various age groups in their households.¹⁸

	<i>All Leavers (n=1237)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=770)</i>	<i>Returners (n=466)</i>
At least one child (any age)	95.3%	94.7%	96.3%
At least one child under 13	87.3%	87.8%	86.5%
• At least one child under 5	60.4%	61.8%	58.0%
• At least one child 5 to 12	59.0%	57.9%	60.7%
At least one child 13 to 18	31.2%	29.4%	34.2%
At least one child 5 to 18	71.6%	69.6%	74.8%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 2 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because families can fall into more than one category, column percentages do not sum to 100%.

¹⁸Chi-square tests comparing, for each of these age groups, continuous leavers and returners by respondents reporting at least one child in a given age group and by respondents not so reporting were not statistically significant.

2.3.2 Average/median age of respondents' children

The average (mean) age of respondents' children at the time the survey was conducted was slightly less than seven years of age. The reported average age was slightly lower (6.75 years) for children in the households of continuous leavers, than for children in the households of returners (whose ages averaged slightly more than 7 years).¹⁹ The median age was also slightly higher for children in returners' households (6.5 years) than it was for children in the households of continuous leavers and for leavers overall (6 years for both).

Table 2.3.2 Mean and median age of respondents' children

	<i>All Leavers (n=1181)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=730)</i>	<i>Returners (n=449)</i>
Mean age	6.88	6.75	7.08
Median age	6	6	6.5

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 59 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total.

2.3.3 Average number of children in respondents' households, by age group

Respondents reported, on average, two children under age 13 per household. Those households averaged slightly fewer than one preschool-aged child (under 5 years old) each, and slightly more than one child aged 5 to 12 each. The average number of children aged 13 to 18 was only one-half the average number of children reported for other age groups.

These averages for all respondents as well as the pattern by which they break down by continuous leavers and returners are shown in table 2.3.3. Returner households averaged a higher number of reported children overall than did continuous leaver households.²⁰ Returner households also appeared to average slightly more children in each of the various age groups than did continuous leavers, although only for the "under 13" category was this reported difference statistically significant.²¹

¹⁹A *t*-test comparing the means of reported children's ages for continuous leavers and for returners was not statistically significant.

²⁰A *t*-test comparing the means for continuous leavers and for returners of the reported numbers of children age 18 and under in respondent households was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

²¹The *t*-tests comparing the means for continuous leavers and for returners of the reported numbers of children in the under-5, 5-to-12, and 13-to-18 categories were not statistically significant. A *t*-test comparing the means for continuous leavers and for returners of the reported numbers of children under age 13 was statistically significant ($p < .05$).

Table 2.3.3 Average number of children per household (by age group)

	<i>All Leavers (n=1239)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=770)</i>	<i>Returners (n=466)</i>
18 or under	2.52	2.41	2.67
13 to 18	0.49	0.46	0.53
Under 13	2.03	1.97	2.13
Under 5	0.90	0.88	0.93
5 to 12	1.13	1.09	1.19

^a Sample = all surveyed, including 2 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total.

2.3.4 Number of children in respondents’ households, by age group

Slightly more than 72% of respondents reported living in households with one, two, or three children under age 13. About 15% said they lived in households with four or more children younger than 13, and the remainder lived with none in that age group. The pattern according to which children under age 13 were distributed among respondents’ households is presented in table 2.3.4.1.

Table 2.3.4.1 Number of children under age 13 per household

	<i>All Leavers (n=1237)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=770)</i>	<i>Returners (n=466)</i>
None	12.7%	12.2%	13.5%
One	26.8%	29.8%	21.9%
Two	29.3%	29.1%	29.7%
Three	16.3%	14.5%	19.3%
Four	9.3%	9.2%	9.4%
Five	3.3%	3.0%	3.7%
Six	1.3%	1.5%	1.1%
Seven	0.7%	0.5%	1.1%
Eight	0.3%	0.1%	0.4%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 2 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

This pattern appeared similar for both continuous leaver and returner respondents. One exception is that a higher percentage of continuous leavers than of returners reported living with only one child under age 13. Returner respondents reported living with three children in that age group at a higher rate than did continuous leaver respondents.

Just over 60% of respondents reported living with at least one pre-school-age child (less than five years old), including 36.8% who indicated that they lived with only one such child. Less than one-quarter (23.6%) of all respondents reported having two or more pre-school-age children in their households. Table 2.3.4.2 presents the distribution of pre-school-age children per household for both continuous leavers and returners.

A higher percentage of continuous leaver respondents than of returners reported only one child under age five in their households. A higher percentage of returner respondents than of continuous leavers reported having more than one pre-school-age child in their households.

	<i>All Leavers (n=1237)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=770)</i>	<i>Returners (n=466)</i>
None	39.7%	38.2%	42.0%
One	36.8%	40.3%	31.1%
Two	17.9%	17.2%	19.1%
Three	5.0%	3.9%	6.9%
Four	0.7%	0.5%	0.9%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 2 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

As expected given the wider age range, the number of children aged 5 to 12 that respondents reported living with them displayed a slightly greater tendency toward two, three, or even four per household than was the case with pre-school children. These rates are shown in Table 2.3.4.3. The observed distribution patterns for children in this age group appeared broadly similar for continuous leavers and returners.

Table 2.3.4.3 Number of children age 5 to 12 per household

	<i>All Leavers (n=1237)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=770)</i>	<i>Returners (n=466)</i>
None	41.1%	42.1%	39.3%
One	26.9%	27.2%	26.4%
Two	18.2%	17.6%	19.3%
Three	8.4%	8.2%	8.8%
Four	3.6%	3.3%	4.0%
Five	1.3%	1.1%	1.5%
Six	0.5%	0.6%	0.4%
Seven	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 2 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

Slightly less than one-third (31.2%) of respondents reported having any minors aged 13 to 18 in their household. Nearly two-thirds of those who so reported (18.6% of all respondents) indicated that they lived with only one child in that age bracket. As presented in table 2.3.4.4, respondents reporting two or more such children represented approximately 12.5% of the total.

Table 2.3.4.4 Number of children age 13 to 18 per household

	<i>All Leavers (n=1237)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=770)</i>	<i>Returners (n=466)</i>
None	68.8%	70.7%	65.9%
One	18.6%	17.4%	20.5%
Two	8.7%	7.9%	10.0%
Three	3.2%	3.6%	2.6%
Four	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Five	0.3%	0.1%	0.7%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 2 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

CHAPTER 3

EMPLOYMENT, EARNINGS, AND HEALTH COVERAGE

A basic premise of the W-2 program is that work is the foundation of self-sufficiency, and the primary goal of W-2 is to prepare participants for work and move them into unsubsidized employment that will make it possible to remain off of cash assistance.

This chapter examines the employment experiences of those leaving the W-2 program, as glimpsed through responses to the survey. Among leavers who provided responses:

- 57.8% said they were employed at the time they were interviewed.
- Of those who were not employed when interviewed, 59.1% said they had worked since leaving W-2, and nearly two-thirds said they were looking for work.
- Those who were employed reported working for an average of just over 35 hours per week, at wages averaging about \$7.95 per hour.
- Of those who were employed, 73.8% indicated that they had health insurance for themselves.

Among survey respondents, continuous leavers generally reported more successful work experiences than did returners to cash assistance. For example:

- Continuous leavers were more likely than returners to be employed at the time of the interview.
- Continuous leavers who were employed when interviewed reported working, on average, for more hours per week, and for higher hourly wages, than returners who were employed when interviewed.
- Returners reported working temporary, seasonal, or sporadic jobs at higher rates than continuous leavers.
- Returners who had worked at any time since leaving reported having held their current or most recent job for a shorter period of time, on average, than continuous leavers.

3.1 Current Employment Status

The survey asked W-2 leavers whether they were currently working for pay. Those who were not employed at the time of the interview were asked whether they had worked for pay at any time since leaving W-2 and whether they were currently looking for work. Respondents who were not employed when interviewed were also asked to specify the obstacles they believed prevented them from working.

Responses to a question about each unemployed leaver's "main" reason for not working (see item 3.1.4 below) were generally assigned pre-defined codes from a survey checklist, but could also include a reason not on that list, in which case the response was listed as "other" with the specific reason written in. Those "other" responses were subsequently treated as responses to an open-ended question and coded accordingly.

3.1.1 Respondents employed at time of interview

Nearly 58% (57.8%) of all respondents said they were working for pay at the time they were interviewed.¹ Continuous leavers were more likely than returners to report being employed at the time of their interviews.² Note that in table 3.1.1 the actual response frequencies are provided (in parentheses beneath the relevant percentages) to serve as points of reference for later analyses of particular subsets of working and unemployed respondents.

	<i>All Leavers (n=1235)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=769)</i>	<i>Returners (n=465)</i>
Working	57.8% (713)	67.9% (523)	41.0% (191)
Not working	42.2% (522)	32.1% (247)	59.0% (275)

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 4 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

¹Compare this with administrative data in appendix A, showing that 67.4% of respondents were employed in the fourth quarter after exiting W-2.

²A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported being employed and those who reported being unemployed was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

3.1.2 Unemployed respondents looking for work

Of those respondents who indicated that they were unemployed, nearly two thirds (66%) said that they were looking for either a full-time or a part-time job. Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to indicate that they were looking for work.³

	<i>All Leavers (n=519)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=244)</i>	<i>Returners (n=275)</i>
Looking	66.0%	60.7%	70.8%
Not looking	34.0%	39.3%	29.2%

^a Sample = only respondents *unemployed when interviewed*, minus 4 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

3.1.3 Unemployed respondents who had worked since leaving W-2

Of those respondents who at the time they were interviewed indicated they were not working, 59.1% said they had worked at some point since leaving W-2. The rates at which unemployed respondents reported having been employed at some point since leaving appeared similar for both continuous leavers and returners.⁴ As in table 3.1.1, in table 3.1.3 the actual response frequencies are provided (in parentheses beneath the relevant percentages) to serve as points of reference for later analyses of particular subsets of working and unemployed respondents.

	<i>All Leavers (n=516)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=246)</i>	<i>Returners (n=270)</i>
Had worked	59.1% (305)	58.7% (144)	59.5% (161)
Had never worked	40.9% (211)	41.3% (101)	40.5% (109)

^a Sample = only respondents *unemployed when interviewed* minus 7 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

³A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by unemployed respondents who reported seeking work and unemployed respondents who said they were not seeking work was not statistically significant ($p < .05$).

⁴A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by unemployed respondents who said they had worked since leaving W-2 and unemployed respondents who said they had not was not statistically significant.

3.1.4 Unemployed respondents' main reasons for not working

Of those respondents who were unemployed when interviewed, slightly less than one-third (32.8%) cited a specifically job-related circumstance as their “main” reason for not working. This figure includes those who said that they had been laid off or that they lacked job skills or experience. It also included nearly 13% who said that they could not find a job.

Another 30.3% of unemployed respondents cited a child-related reason, such as a problem with child care, a desire to stay home with a child, or pregnancy, as their main reason for not working. Finally, 28.1% of unemployed respondents pointed to illness, injury or disability—either their own or that of another person—as a barrier to employment.

As shown in table 3.1.4, continuous leaver respondents and returner respondents did not appear to differ greatly in the rates at which they cited particular obstacles, or sets of obstacles, to employment. Note that because of the small numbers involved in many of the subsidiary rows, a difference of several percentage points may represent a difference in actual numbers of only a handful of respondents.

	<i>All Leavers (n=476)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=226)</i>	<i>Returns (n=250)</i>
Job-related	32.8%	30.3%	35.0%
Could not find job	12.9%	9.9%	15.5%
Lacked skills/experience	5.0%	3.0%	6.8%
Pay not enough	4.5%	4.5%	4.5%
Had been fired	3.4%	3.0%	3.7%
Had been laid off	2.4%	4.1%	0.8%
Had quit job	2.1%	3.0%	1.2%
Temporary/seasonal job ended	2.1%	2.3%	2.0%
Was waiting to start	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%
Child-related	30.3%	28.6%	31.8%
Wanted to stay with children	11.1%	9.6%	12.4%
Lacked child care	9.2%	11.9%	6.8%
Pregnant	6.0%	2.7%	8.9%
Child-care problems	4.0%	4.4%	3.7%
Illness/Disability	28.1%	30.4%	26.1%
Illness/injury	23.4%	27.0%	20.0%
Illness/injury of another	4.8%	3.4%	6.0%
Other Issues	8.8%	10.6%	7.2%
Transportation problems	4.8%	5.8%	4.0%
In school	2.1%	2.2%	2.0%
Recently jailed	1.1%	1.4%	0.8%
Family problems	0.6%	0.8%	0.4%
Did not need a job	0.2%	0.5%	0.0%

^a Sample = only respondents *unemployed when interviewed*, minus 46 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don't know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.” General heading percentages in **bold** are also column percentages which should sum to 100%. Subsidiary percentages should sum to the heading percentage immediately above. Sums may not be exact because of rounding.

3.2 Leavers' Jobs and Work Histories

The question of employment versus unemployment gets at only the most basic fact of a W-2 leaver's relationship to the workforce. In the survey, respondents were also asked about the kinds of jobs they held as well as about the number of jobs they held at any given time and the length of time they had worked at those jobs.

Most of the information presented here is based on responses to survey questions specifically about each respondent's "main" job—that is, the job that occupied the most hours per week. In the case of respondents who were unemployed when interviewed but who had worked since leaving W-2, the question referred to the job that had represented the most hours the last time the respondent was employed.

Each respondent's industry of main employment was determined by assigning a code to a response to an open-ended question. Job tenure, or duration of employment at a current or most recent job, was re-calculated into months from values respondents offered variously in terms of weeks, months, or years.

3.2.1 Respondents' industries of primary employment

The largest single category of jobs employed respondents reported holding when interviewed was health services, representing 19.5%. The distribution of employed respondents across different job categories is presented in table 3.2.1.1. "Service" jobs of various kinds (health services, social services, business services, other miscellaneous service jobs, retail sales, and retail food and drink) represented a large majority (66.5%) of the jobs respondents held. Continuous leavers and returners appeared broadly similar with respect to their distribution across reported areas of employment.

Table 3.2.1.2 presents a similar breakdown of respondents' jobs for those respondents who were unemployed when interviewed but who had worked since leaving W-2. For those respondents, manufacturing represented the largest single category at 16.4%, although, as was the case for employed respondents, service jobs predominated overall (at nearly 61%). Except for a greater observed tendency for continuous leaver respondents to report being employed in manufacturing, unemployed continuous leavers and returners appeared similar in the rates at which they reported working in various industries when last employed.

**Table 3.2.1.1 Respondents' industries of primary employment
(employed when interviewed)**

	<i>All Leavers (n=710)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=520)</i>	<i>Returns (n=190)</i>
Health services	19.5%	19.7%	19.0%
Manufacturing	12.9%	13.9%	10.0%
Retail, except food and drink	12.3%	12.5%	11.7%
Miscellaneous service	12.0%	12.1%	11.7%
Social services including child care	7.9%	6.9%	10.7%
Eating/drinking establishments	7.5%	6.8%	9.4%
Business services, including temporary	7.3%	6.5%	9.7%
Public administration	6.0%	6.0%	5.9%
Transportation/Communication/Utilities	5.6%	5.7%	5.3%
Education	3.9%	4.1%	3.2%
Finance/Insurance/Real Estate	3.8%	4.4%	2.1%
Agriculture/Forestry	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%
Wholesale trade	0.4%	0.4%	0.5%
Construction	0.2%	0.3%	0.0%

^a Sample = only respondents *employed when interviewed*, minus 4 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

Table 3.2.1.2 Main industry of employment (unemployed but had worked)

	<i>All Leavers (n=304)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=144)</i>	<i>Returners (n=160)</i>
Manufacturing	16.4%	24.1%	9.4%
Health services	13.9%	12.5%	15.2%
Retail, except food and drink	13.6%	12.0%	15.0%
Business services, including temporary	12.3%	12.5%	12.1%
Miscellaneous service	10.9%	10.3%	11.5%
Public administration	9.8%	7.0%	12.3%
Eating/drinking establishments	7.2%	6.3%	8.1%
Transportation/Communication/Utilities	5.2%	3.4%	6.8%
Finance/Insurance/Real Estate	4.1%	3.5%	4.6%
Social services including child care	2.6%	3.5%	1.9%
Education	2.0%	2.1%	1.9%
Construction	1.0%	0.8%	1.3%
Wholesale trade	0.6%	1.3%	0.0%
Agriculture/Forestry	0.3%	0.7%	0.0%

^a Sample = only respondents who were *unemployed but had worked*, minus 1 respondent for whom data was missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who was recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

3.2.2 Types of jobs respondents have held

Three-quarters (74.3%) of all respondents who were working when interviewed or who had worked at some point since leaving W-2 said they were in or had held a “regular” full- or part-time permanent job, as opposed to performing temporary, seasonal, or odd jobs or being self-employed. However, as seen in table 3.2.2.1, a higher percentage of continuous leaver respondents than of returner respondents reported working a “regular” job.

	<i>All Leavers (n=1016)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=665)</i>	<i>Returns (n=351)</i>
Regular job	74.3%	79.1%	65.3%
Temporary job	17.6%	12.8%	26.7%
Seasonal	4.1%	3.5%	5.2%
Self-employment	3.2%	3.9%	2.0%
Odd jobs	0.8%	0.7%	0.9%

^a Sample = only respondents who either were *employed when interviewed* or were *unemployed but had worked* since leaving W-2, minus 4 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

The rate at which respondents reported working a “regular” job was slightly higher (81.8%) if one looked only at those respondents who were employed at the time of the interview (see table 3.2.2.2). Continuous leavers were more likely than returners to say they held a regular job.⁵ Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to indicate holding a temporary job.⁶

	<i>All Leavers (n=711)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=521)</i>	<i>Returners (n=191)</i>
Regular job	81.8%	84.9%	73.2%
Temporary job	10.4%	7.9%	17.2%
Self-employment	3.6%	4.0%	2.6%
Seasonal	3.5%	2.9%	5.4%
Odd jobs	0.7%	0.4%	1.6%

^a Sample = only respondents *employed when interviewed*, minus 3 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

⁵A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by employed respondents who reported holding regular jobs and all other employed respondents was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

⁶A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by unemployed respondents who reported having held temporary jobs and all other unemployed respondents who had worked was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

The percentage of respondents who reported working “regular” jobs was somewhat lower (57%) for those who were unemployed at the time of the interview but who had worked at some point since leaving. As shown in table 3.2.2.3, more than one-third (34.3%) of these respondents said their last job was a temporary one.

A higher percentage of continuous leavers than of returners reported having held a regular job when they last worked. A higher percentage of returners than of continuous leavers reported having held only a temporary job the last time they worked. In neither case, however, was the observed difference between continuous leavers and returners statistically significant.⁷

Table 3.2.2.3 Types of jobs respondents have held (unemployed but had worked)

	<i>All Leavers (n=305)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=144)</i>	<i>Returners (n=161)</i>
Regular job	57.0%	58.3%	55.8%
Temporary job	34.3%	30.4%	37.9%
Self-employment	2.3%	3.5%	1.3%
Seasonal	5.4%	5.8%	5.0%
Odd jobs	1.0%	2.1%	0.0%

^a Sample = only respondents who were *unemployed but had worked*, minus 1 respondent for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who was recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

⁷A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by unemployed respondents who reported having held regular jobs and all other unemployed respondents who had worked since leaving was not statistically significant. A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by unemployed respondents who reported having held temporary jobs and all other unemployed respondents who had worked since leaving was not statistically significant.

3.2.3 Number of jobs respondents held simultaneously

Nearly 93% of those respondents who were employed when interviewed or who had been employed at some point since leaving W-2 indicated that they had held only one job at any given time.⁸ Approximately 6% said they were working or had worked at two jobs simultaneously. Only 1.3% of those who were working or who had worked at some point said they had held down three or more jobs at a time.

	<i>All Leavers (n=1015)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=664)</i>	<i>Returns (n=351)</i>
One job	92.8%	92.3%	93.5%
More than one job	7.2%	7.7%	6.5%
• Two jobs	6.0%	6.5%	4.9%
• Three jobs or more	1.3%	1.1%	1.5%

^a Sample = only respondents who either were *employed when interviewed* or were *unemployed but had worked* since leaving W-2, minus 4 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: The last two rows are subtotals of the “more than one job” row and should sum to the “more than one job” percentage immediately above.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

⁸In the cases of those respondents who were not employed at the time of the interview, the question referred to the last time the respondent was employed.

Table 3.2.3.2 presents this information specifically for those respondents working at the time they were interviewed. Of these, 94.5% indicated that they were holding only one job. This figure was similar for continuous leavers and returners.⁹

Of the other 5.5% who reported working at more than one job, a large majority (but amounting to only 4.7% of all working respondents), said they were holding down two jobs simultaneously. Less than 1% of all employed respondents reported that they were working at three jobs or more at the same time.

	<i>All Leavers (n=711)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=521)</i>	<i>Returners (n=191)</i>
One job	94.5%	94.1%	95.6%
More than one job	5.5%	5.9%	4.4%
• Two jobs	4.7%	5.0%	3.8%
• Three jobs or more	0.8%	0.9%	0.5%

^a Sample = only respondents *employed when interviewed*, minus 3 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: The last two rows are subtotals of the “more than one job” row and should sum to the “more than one job” percentage immediately above.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

⁹A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by employed respondents reporting more than one job and employed respondents reporting not more than one job was not statistically significant.

As indicated in table 3.2.3.3, as compared with those who were employed, a somewhat larger percentage (11.3%) of those respondents who were unemployed but who had worked since leaving W-2 indicated that they had worked at more than one job at a time when last employed. The responses of continuous leavers and returners appeared similar in this respect.¹⁰

Of those respondents who said they had held more than one job at a time the last time they were employed, more than one-fifth (or 2.4% of all unemployed respondents who had worked since leaving) said they had held more than two jobs at that time.

Table 3.2.3.3 Number of jobs held simultaneously (unemployed but have worked)			
	<i>All Leavers (n=305)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=144)</i>	<i>Returners (n=161)</i>
One job	88.7%	86.1%	91.0%
More than one job	11.3%	13.9%	9.0%
• Two jobs	8.9%	11.8%	6.3%
• Three jobs or more	2.4%	2.0%	2.7%

^a Sample = only respondents who were *unemployed but had worked*, minus 1 respondent for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who was recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: The last two rows are subtotals of the “more than one job” row and should sum to the “more than one job” percentage immediately above.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

¹⁰A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by unemployed respondents reporting having held only one job when they last worked and by unemployed respondents reporting more than one job when they last worked was not statistically significant.

3.2.4 Duration of respondents' employment

Respondents who were employed when interviewed reported having held their current jobs for an average of slightly more than 26 weeks. Two-thirds (66.7%) of these said they had been working at their current jobs for six months or less; 15% said they had been working at their current jobs for more than one year.

Continuous leavers who were employed when interviewed had held their current jobs, on average, longer than returners.¹¹ Returners reported job tenures of six months or less at a higher rate than did continuous leavers (more than 80%, versus just over 61% for continuous leavers). The percentage of continuous leavers who reported having held their current jobs for more than a year was more than three times the percentage of returners who so reported.

	<i>All Leavers (n=705)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=518)</i>	<i>Returners (n=188)</i>
Three months or less	43.6%	40.3%	52.7%
More than 3 and up to 6 months	23.1%	21.3%	27.9%
More than 6 and up to 9 months	12.3%	13.0%	10.3%
More than 9 and up to 12 months	6.1%	7.2%	3.3%
More than 12 months	15.0%	18.3%	5.8%
Average job duration	26.4 wks.	28.9 wks.	19.4 wks.

^a Sample = only respondents *employed when interviewed*, minus 9 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

As shown in table 3.2.4.2, respondents who were unemployed when interviewed but who had worked since leaving W-2 reported having held their most recent jobs for an average of 19 weeks. Approximately 81.5% of these respondents reported having held their most recent jobs for six months or less. Only 5.5% said they had worked at their most recent jobs for more than a year.

¹¹A *t*-test comparing the means for continuous leavers and for returners of respondents' reported length of job tenure (in weeks) was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

Among respondents who were unemployed when interviewed but who had worked since leaving W-2, continuous leaver respondents reported having had held their most recent jobs for longer periods, on average, than did returner respondents, although this difference was not statistically significant.¹² A higher percentage of returners reported having worked for three months or less at their most recent jobs than was the case for continuous leavers.

	<i>All Leavers (n=298)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=141)</i>	<i>Returners (n=157)</i>
Three months or less	58.6%	52.9%	63.7%
More than 3 and up to 6 months	22.9%	24.0%	22.0%
More than 6 and up to 9 months	7.9%	8.9%	7.0%
More than 9 and up to 12 months	5.1%	7.8%	2.7%
More than 12 months	5.5%	6.4%	4.7%
Average job duration	19.0 wks.	21.4 wks.	16.9 wks.

^a Sample = only respondents who were *unemployed but had worked*, minus 8 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

¹²A *t*-test comparing the means for continuous leavers and for returners of the reported length of job tenure (in weeks) of unemployed respondents who had worked since leaving was not statistically significant.

3.3 Leavers' Hours, Wages, and Earnings

Employed respondents were asked how many hours per week they worked at their current job (or, if employed in more than one job, how many hours they worked at the job that represented the largest number of hours per week). Respondents who were unemployed when interviewed were asked about the job that represented the largest number of hours the last time they were employed. Respondents were also asked about their wages and earnings from their current or most recent primary job.

Because respondents could describe their earnings in either hourly or weekly amounts, obtaining a complete set of responses involved a combination of direct reporting by the respondent and recalculation of hourly into weekly values or vice versa depending on the units in which the respondent chose to report earnings.

3.3.1 Respondents' hours of work

Respondents who were employed when interviewed reported working an average of just over 35 hours per week (see table 3.3.1.1). Continuous leavers tended to indicate working, on average, more hours per week than returners.¹³ The median number of hours per week reported by continuous leavers was also greater than that reported by returners.

	<i>All Leavers (n=705)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=516)</i>	<i>Returners (n=189)</i>
Mean hours/week	35.29	35.86	33.73
Median hours/week	40	40	38

^a Sample = only respondents *employed when interviewed*, minus 9 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total.

¹³A *t*-test comparing the means for continuous leavers and for returners of reported hours per week for employed respondents was statistically significant ($p < .05$).

Respondents who were unemployed when interviewed but who had worked at some point since leaving W-2 reported working an average of just over 33.5 hours per week when last employed. Although continuous leavers reported working an average of nearly two hours more per week than returners, this difference was not statistically significant.¹⁴ The median number of hours reported was the same for continuous leavers and returners: 40 per week.

	<i>All Leavers (n=299)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=142)</i>	<i>Returners (n=157)</i>
Mean hours/week	33.52	34.40	32.73
Median hours/week	40	40	40

^a Sample = only respondents who were *unemployed but had worked*, minus 6 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total.

Among those respondents who were employed when interviewed, 43.3% reported working 40 hours per week, and an additional one-quarter (25.3%) reported working 30 to 39 hour per week (see table 3.3.1.3). Nearly 11% said they worked more than 40 hours per week. Larger percentages of continuous leavers than of returners reported working from 30 to 40 hours or more per week. Larger percentages of returners than of continuous leavers said they worked 29 hours per week or fewer.

	<i>All Leavers (n=705)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=516)</i>	<i>Returners (n=189)</i>
Fewer than 20 hours per week	6.1%	5.2%	8.5%
20-29 hours per week	14.5%	13.1%	18.2%
30-39 hours per week	25.3%	25.6%	24.7%
40 hours per week	43.3%	44.7%	39.5%
More than 40 hours per week	10.8%	11.5%	9.1%

^a Sample = only respondents *employed when interviewed*, minus 10 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

¹⁴A *t*-test comparing the means for continuous leavers and for returners of the reported hours of work per week of unemployed respondents who had worked since leaving W-2 was not statistically significant.

Among those respondents who were unemployed when interviewed but who had worked since leaving W-2, nearly 46% reported working 40 hours per week when last employed, with another 19% saying they had worked from 30 to 39 hours per week (see table 3.3.1.4). Slightly more than 9% indicated that they had worked more than 40 hours per week when last employed.

As with respondents who were employed, among those who were unemployed but who had worked since leaving W-2, larger percentages of continuous leavers than of returners reported working from 30 to 40 hours or more per week. On the other hand, larger percentages of returners than of continuous leavers said they worked 20 to 29 hours or fewer than 20 hours per week.

Table 3.3.1.4 Respondents at various levels of weekly hours (unemployed but had worked)

	<i>All Leavers (n=299)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=142)</i>	<i>Returners (n=157)</i>
Fewer than 20 hours per week	12.4%	10.8%	13.9%
20-29 hours per week	13.8%	11.5%	16.0%
30-39 hours per week	19.0%	20.0%	18.1%
40 hours per week	45.6%	47.6%	43.7%
More than 40 hours per week	9.2%	10.2%	8.3%

^a Sample = only respondents who were *unemployed but had worked*, minus 7 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

3.3.2 Respondents’ hourly wages

Respondents who were employed at the time they were interviewed reported earning hourly wages that averaged \$7.95 an hour. Continuous leavers were likely to report earning higher hourly wages, on average, than was the case for returners.¹⁵

Table 3.3.2.1 Respondents’ hourly wages (employed when interviewed)

	<i>All Leavers (n=683)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=501)</i>	<i>Returners (n=182)</i>
Mean hourly wage	\$7.95	\$8.16	\$7.38
Median hourly wage	\$7.50	\$7.78	\$7.00

^a Sample = only respondents *employed when interviewed*, minus 31 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total.

¹⁵A *t*-test comparing the means for continuous leavers and for returners of the hourly reported wages of employed respondents was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

Respondents who were not employed when interviewed but who had worked at some point since leaving W-2 reported, on average, lower hourly wages when last employed, at \$7.16, than did employed respondents. Within this category of unemployed respondents, the average hourly wages reported by returners was slightly lower than it was for continuous leavers, although this difference was not statistically significant.¹⁶

Table 3.3.2.2 Respondents' hourly wages (unemployed but had worked)

	<i>All Leavers (n=287)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=136)</i>	<i>Returns (n=151)</i>
Mean hourly wage	\$7.16	\$7.25	\$7.07
Median hourly wage	\$6.75	\$6.84	\$6.66

^a Sample = only respondents who were *unemployed but had worked*, minus 17 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total.

As shown in table 3.3.2.3, among respondents who were employed when interviewed, a solid majority (65.1%) indicated that they earned between \$6.00 and \$8.99 an hour. Approximately 13% reported earning \$10.00 or more per hour. Only about 4% reported earning less than the federal minimum hourly wage of \$5.15.¹⁷

¹⁶A *t*-test comparing the means for continuous leavers and for returners of the hourly reported wages of unemployed respondents who had worked since leaving W-2 was not statistically significant.

¹⁷Of those who were employed when interviewed but who reported earning less than the minimum wage, 63% said they were not working at "regular" jobs but rather at temporary, seasonal, or odd jobs or in some form of self-employment—circumstances which may explain reported wages less than the legal minimum. Those who were in "regular" jobs may have reported their take-home pay rather than their pre-tax wages. Those in "regular" jobs may also have been working in areas such as wait-staff work, in which less-than-minimum wages are permitted on the assumption of additional income from tips, but may not have included income from tips in their survey responses.

Within this category of respondents, a higher percentage of returners than of continuous leavers reported earning less than the federal minimum wage, and a lower percentage of returners than of continuous leavers reported earning \$10.00 or more per hour. Returners reported falling into each of the lower wage brackets (below \$7.00) at a higher rate—and into each of the higher wage brackets (above \$8.00) at a lower rate—than did continuous leavers.

	<i>All Leavers (n=682)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=501)</i>	<i>Returners (n=182)</i>
Less than \$5.15/hr.	3.9%	3.5%	4.8%
\$5.15-\$5.99/hr.	6.8%	5.5%	10.6%
\$6.00-\$6.99/hr.	23.1%	21.0%	28.9%
\$7.00-\$7.99/hr.	22.9%	22.8%	23.0%
\$8.00-\$8.99/hr.	19.1%	20.6%	15.0%
\$9.00-\$9.99/hr.	11.2%	12.5%	7.7%
\$10.00 or more/hr.	13.0%	14.1%	9.9%

^a Sample = only respondents *employed when interviewed*, minus 32 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

As shown in table 3.3.2.4, among respondents who were not employed when interviewed but who had worked since leaving W-2, 2.7% reported having earned less than the minimum wage when they last worked, while 7.1% reported having earned \$10.00 or more per hour.

Within this category of respondents, the different rates at which continuous leavers and returners reported falling into various hourly wage categories did not appear to display a clear pattern.

**Table 3.3.2.4 Respondents at various hourly wage levels
(unemployed but had worked)**

	<i>All Leavers (n=288)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=136)</i>	<i>Returners (n=151)</i>
Less than \$5.15/hr.	2.7%	4.3%	1.3%
\$5.15-\$5.99/hr.	16.0%	12.3%	19.2%
\$6.00-\$6.99/hr.	33.2%	34.7%	31.8%
\$7.00-\$7.99/hr.	21.8%	19.6%	23.8%
\$8.00-\$8.99/hr.	13.7%	16.3%	11.4%
\$9.00-\$9.99/hr.	5.5%	5.1%	5.8%
\$10.00 or more/hr.	7.1%	7.6%	6.7%

^a Sample = only respondents who were *unemployed but had worked*, minus 18 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

3.3.3 Respondents’ weekly earnings

Respondents who were employed when interviewed reported earning an average of slightly more than \$282 per week.¹⁸ As indicated in table 3.3.3.1, continuous leavers were likely to report, on average, higher weekly earnings than returners.¹⁹

**Table 3.3.3.1 Respondents’ mean and median weekly earnings
(employed when interviewed)**

	<i>All Leavers (n=674)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=494)</i>	<i>Returners (n=180)</i>
Mean weekly earnings	\$282.09	\$293.81	\$249.85
Median weekly earnings	\$271.25	\$280.00	\$257.25

^a Sample = only respondents *employed when interviewed*, minus 40 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total.

¹⁸Compare this with administrative data in appendix A showing quarterly earnings which, when divided by 3 to get monthly and in turn by 4.3 to obtain weekly amounts, show average weekly earnings for respondents of approximately \$198.50.

¹⁹A *t*-test comparing the means for continuous leavers and for returners of the reported weekly earnings of employed respondents was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

Respondents who were not working when interviewed but who had worked since leaving W-2 reported having earned, on average, just under \$240 per week when last employed (see table 3.3.3.2). Although continuous leavers who were unemployed but who had worked since leaving W-2 reported higher average weekly earnings when they last worked than did returners in that same employment category, this difference was not statistically significant.²⁰

	<i>All Leavers (n=282)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=135)</i>	<i>Returners (n=147)</i>
Mean weekly earnings	\$239.66	\$250.84	\$229.45
Median weekly earnings	\$240.00	\$253.00	\$231.00

^a Sample = only respondents who were *unemployed but had worked*, minus 23 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total.

As indicated in table 3.3.3.3, more than one-third (35.8%) of respondents who were employed when interviewed reported weekly earnings of between \$200 and \$299 per week, with approximately 63.6% reporting weekly earnings of between \$200 and \$399. Larger percentages of returners than of continuous leavers reported weekly earnings in the lower ranges (under \$300), while larger percentages of continuous leavers than of returners reported earnings in the higher earnings ranges, starting at \$300.

	<i>All Leavers (n=674)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=494)</i>	<i>Returners (n=180)</i>
Less than \$100/week	5.0%	4.2%	7.2%
\$100 to \$199	19.1%	17.0%	24.7%
\$200 to \$299	35.8%	34.8%	38.5%
\$300 to \$399	27.8%	29.9%	21.9%
\$400 to \$499	7.2%	8.0%	5.0%
\$500 or more	5.1%	6.0%	2.8%

^a Sample = only respondents *employed when interviewed*, minus 41 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

²⁰A *t*-test comparing the means for continuous leavers and for returners of the reported weekly earnings of unemployed respondents who had worked since leaving W-2 was not statistically significant.

Of those respondents who were unemployed when interviewed but who had worked since leaving W-2, nearly 41% reported having had weekly earnings of between \$200 and \$299 when they were last employed, with 58.2% reporting earnings of between \$200 and \$399 (see table 3.3.3.4). A higher percentage of returner respondents than of continuous leaver respondents reported weekly earnings in the lowest two ranges (“less than \$100” and “\$100 to 199”). A higher percentage of continuous leaver respondents than of returner respondents reported weekly earnings in each of the higher ranges, from \$200 on up.

	<i>All Leavers (n=282)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=135)</i>	<i>Returners (n=147)</i>
Less than \$100/week	9.3%	6.6%	11.8%
\$100 to \$199	24.1%	21.8%	26.2%
\$200 to \$299	40.9%	41.3%	40.6%
\$300 to \$399	17.3%	21.0%	13.9%
\$400 to \$499	6.4%	6.8%	6.1%
\$500 or more	1.9%	2.4%	1.4%

^a Sample = only respondents who were *unemployed but had worked*, minus 24 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

3.4 Leavers’ Health Coverage

Health insurance coverage is not solely a work issue. However, the fact that many rely on employer-provided insurance for health coverage, and that securing such coverage is a primary benefit of employment, makes this chapter an appropriate place to address the question of leavers’ access to such coverage.

In the survey, respondents were asked whether they and other members of their households had health coverage and what kind of coverage this was in each case. The responses to these questions made it possible to determine, among other things, how many respondents’ households had no health insurance of any kind for any member.

3.4.1 Respondents' health insurance coverage and sources

More than three-quarters (77%) of respondents said they had some kind of health coverage for themselves. As indicated in table 3.4.1.1, returners were more likely than continuous leavers to indicate having health coverage for themselves.²¹

	<i>All Leavers (n=1235)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=769)</i>	<i>Returners (n=465)</i>
Insurance	77.0%	71.1%	86.7%
No insurance	23.0%	28.9%	13.3%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 4 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

Nearly 85% of respondents who had health insurance coverage were covered by Medicaid or a related program, including BadgerCare, Wisconsin's Medicaid expansion program, implemented in July of 1999. As shown in table 3.4.1.2, just under 13% reported having health coverage through private insurance of some kind. Returners reported coverage through Medicaid at a higher rate than did continuous leavers. A higher percentage of continuous leavers than of returners reported having their health coverage through private insurance.

	<i>All Leavers (n=932)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=534)</i>	<i>Returners (n=398)</i>
Medicaid (incl. BadgerCare)	84.9%	79.8%	91.6%
Medicare	2.2%	1.5%	3.1%
Tribal, IHS	0.2%	0.4%	0.0%
Private Insurance	12.7%	18.3%	5.3%

^a Sample = only respondents who *reported having insurance*, minus 19 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

²¹A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported having health coverage for themselves and respondents who reported that they did not was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

About three-quarters (73.8%) of all respondents who were employed when interviewed indicated that they had health insurance coverage for themselves. As shown in table 3.4.1.3, continuous leavers were more likely than returners say they lacked coverage for themselves.²²

**Table 3.4.1.3 Respondents' health insurance coverage
(employed when interviewed)**

	<i>All Leavers (n=712)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=522)</i>	<i>Returners (n=191)</i>
Insurance	73.8%	70.7%	82.5%
No insurance	26.2%	29.3%	17.5%

^a Sample = only respondents *employed when interviewed*, minus 2 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

About one-fifth (19.2%) of respondents who were employed when interviewed and who had some form of health coverage reported being covered by private insurance of some kind. The breakdown by various types of insurance is presented in table 3.4.1.4. Almost all of the remainder (78.7%) were covered by Medicaid or BadgerCare. Returners reported private health coverage in lower percentages than did continuous leavers, and reported coverage through Medicaid in higher percentages.

Table 3.4.1.4 Respondents' health insurance types (employed when interviewed)

	<i>All Leavers (n=514)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=359)</i>	<i>Returners (n=155)</i>
Medicaid (incl. BadgerCare)	78.7 %	73.9 %	89.7 %
Medicare	1.8 %	0.8 %	3.9 %
Tribal, IHS	0.4 %	0.6 %	0.0 %
Private Insurance	19.2 %	24.7 %	6.3 %

^a Sample = only respondents *employed when interviewed* and who *reported having insurance*, minus 13 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

²²A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by employed respondents who reported having health coverage for themselves and employed respondents who reported not having coverage for themselves was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

Among respondents who were unemployed when interviewed but who had worked since leaving W-2, 80.6% said they had health insurance coverage for themselves. As was the case for employed respondents, continuous leavers in the unemployed-but-had-worked group were more likely than returners to indicate that they lacked health coverage for themselves.²³

	<i>All Leavers (n=304)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=144)</i>	<i>Returners (n=160)</i>
Insurance	80.6%	71.1%	89.1%
No Insurance	19.4%	28.9%	10.9%

^a Sample = only respondents who were *unemployed but had worked*, minus 3 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

An even larger percentage (96.3%) of unemployed respondents who had worked since leaving (as compared with those employed when interviewed) reported receiving health coverage through Medicaid. Only 3.7% indicated that they had private insurance. The ratios between unemployed respondents reporting coverage under Medicaid and those reporting private insurance coverage appeared roughly similar for continuous leavers and returners.

	<i>All Leavers (n=242)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=102)</i>	<i>Returners (n=140)</i>
Medicaid (incl. BadgerCare)	96.3 %	95.1 %	97.2 %
Private Insurance	3.7 %	4.9 %	2.8 %

^a Sample = only respondents who were *unemployed but had worked* and who *reported having insurance*, minus 3 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

²³A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by unemployed respondents who had worked since leaving W-2 and reported having health coverage for themselves and by similar respondents who reported not having health coverage for themselves was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

3.4.2 Respondents' families with at least one child insured

Slightly more than 85% of respondents who reported having one or more children in their immediate family living with them also reported having health coverage for all such children. In most (86.9%) of these cases the children were covered by Medicaid. Approximately 12% of respondents reported that their children were covered by private insurance. Just under 14% of respondents reported having at least one child for whom they had no health coverage.

Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to indicate having health coverage for all their children.²⁴ They were also more likely than continuous leavers to have children covered under Medicaid, and less likely than continuous leavers to report having children covered by private insurance.²⁵

Table 3.4.2.1 Health insurance coverage of respondents' children (all respondents with children)			
	<i>All Leavers (n=1165)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=721)</i>	<i>Returners (n=444)</i>
At least one child without insurance ^b	13.9%	16.6%	9.5%
All children insured ^b	85.6%	82.9%	90.0%
	<i>(n=1042)^c</i>	<i>(n=628)</i>	<i>(n=418)</i>
Medicaid (incl. BadgerCare)	86.9%	83.4%	92.3%
Medicare	2.0%	1.6%	2.7%
Private Insurance	12.0%	15.7%	6.3%

^a Sample = all respondents reporting *children in the immediate family living with them*, minus 2 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

^b The number of families reporting all children insured was calculated by a different method from that used to establish the number of families in which at least one child was uninsured, hence the two categories do not sum to exactly 100%.

^c Sample = all respondents reporting *children in the immediate family living with them* and who reported *insurance for at least one child*.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because families can have more than one type of coverage, column percentages do not sum to 100%.

²⁴A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents reporting that all children in the immediate family had medical coverage and respondents reporting that at least one child lacked coverage was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

²⁵A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents reporting at least one child in the immediate family covered by Medicaid and by all other respondents with insured children was statistically significant ($p < .01$). A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents reporting at least one child in the immediate family covered by private insurance and by all other respondents with insured children was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

Of those respondents who were employed when interviewed and who reported having some kind of health insurance coverage for at least one child in their immediate family, 85.3% reported having health coverage for every child in their family. Just over 14% reported having at least one child with no health coverage. Nearly 83% of employed respondents indicated that at least one child was covered by Medicaid, and nearly 16% reported that at least one child was covered by private insurance.

Among employed respondents, continuous leavers were more likely than returners to indicate having at least one child in their immediate family covered by private health insurance.²⁶ Returners were more likely to say they had at least one child covered by Medicaid.²⁷

Table 3.4.2.2 Health insurance coverage of respondents' children (employed when interviewed)			
	<i>All Leavers (n=682)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=500)</i>	<i>Returners (n=182)</i>
At least one child without insurance ^b	14.2%	15.6%	10.5%
All children insured ^b	85.3%	83.8%	89.5%
	<i>All Leavers (n=607)^c</i>	<i>Continuous (n=441)</i>	<i>Returners (n=168)</i>
Medicaid (incl. BadgerCare)	82.5%	78.8%	92.2%
Medicare	2.6%	2.1%	3.7%
Private Insurance	15.5%	19.3%	5.3%

^a Sample = only respondents *employed when interviewed* and reporting *children in the immediate family living with them*, minus 1 respondent for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who was recorded as offering "no response."

^b The number of families reporting all children insured was calculated by a different method from that used to establish the number of families in which at least one child was uninsured, hence the two categories do not sum to exactly 100%.

^c Sample = only respondents *employed when interviewed* and who reported *children in the immediate family living with them* and who *reported having insurance coverage for at least one child*.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because families can have more than one type of coverage, column percentages do not sum to 100%.

²⁶A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by employed respondents reporting at least one child covered by private insurance and all other respondents with insured children was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

²⁷A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by employed respondents reporting at least one child covered by Medicaid and all other employed respondents with insured children was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

Among respondents who were unemployed when interviewed but who had been employed at some point since leaving W-2 and who reported having some health coverage for their families, just over 12% reported having at least one child without any health insurance coverage. Nearly 94% reported that at least one child was covered by Medicaid or a related program.

Continuous leavers in this group were more likely than returners to indicate having at least one child in the immediate family with no health insurance coverage, and less likely than returners to indicate that all children were covered.²⁸ Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to report having at least one child covered by Medicaid, and less likely than continuous leavers to say they had at least one child covered by private insurance.²⁹

Table 3.4.2.3 Health insurance coverage of respondents' children (unemployed but had worked)			
	<i>All Leavers (n=287)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=137)</i>	<i>Returners (n=150)</i>
All children insured ^b	87.5%	82.7%	92.0%
At least one child w/o insurance ^b	12.1%	17.3%	7.3%
	<i>(n=261)^c</i>	<i>(n=117)</i>	<i>(n=144)</i>
Medicaid (incl. BadgerCare)	93.2%	92.5%	93.8%
Medicare	0.7%	0.0%	1.3%
Private Insurance	7.1%	8.2%	6.1%

^a Sample = only respondents who were *unemployed but had worked* and who *reported children in the their immediate family living with them*, minus 1 respondent for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who was recorded as offering "no response."

^b The number of families reporting all children insured was calculated by a different method from that used to establish the number of families in which at least one child was uninsured, hence the two categories do not sum to exactly 100%.

^c Sample = only respondents who were *unemployed but had worked* and who *reported children in the their immediate family living with them*, and who *reported having insurance coverage for at least one child*.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because families can have more than one type of coverage, column percentages do not sum to 100%.

²⁸As noted in table 3.4.2.3, respondents reporting at least one child without insurance and respondents reporting all children covered were calculated by slightly different methods. A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by unemployed respondents who reported having at least one child without health insurance coverage and by unemployed respondents who did not so report was statistically significant ($p < .01$). A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by unemployed respondents reporting all children insured and by all other unemployed respondents with insured children was statistically significant ($p < .05$).

²⁹A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by unemployed respondents with at least one child covered by Medicaid by all other unemployed respondents with insured children was statistically significant ($p < .01$). A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by unemployed respondents with at least one child covered by private insurance and all other unemployed respondents with insured children was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

CHAPTER 4

JOB ADVANCEMENT, TRAINING, AND TRANSPORTATION

This chapter provides information about leavers' successes in moving beyond obtaining work and toward advancing to new job duties and higher rates of pay. It also examines challenges some leavers faced finding reliable transportation to work.

Of those respondents who were working when interviewed:

- 39.2% said they had received a pay increase in their current or most recent job.
- 23.1% of those who reported having received a pay increase indicated that the increase was associated with new job duties.
- 42.6% said they used their own vehicles to get to work.
- 23.7% reported problems with transportation to work.

Among respondents who were employed when interviewed, continuous leavers tended to report more job advancement and fewer transportation difficulties than did returners to W-2. For example:

- Continuous leavers were more likely than returners to report having received a raise in their current job.
- Continuous leavers were more likely than returners to drive their own car to work.
- Continuous leavers were less likely than returners to report problems with transportation to work.

4.1 Advancement and Training

Survey respondents who had been employed at any time since leaving W-2 were asked whether or not they had received a pay increase at their current job (for those currently employed) or their most recent job (for those who were unemployed but who had worked since leaving). In the cases of those who worked at more than one job simultaneously, the responses reported below pertain to the respondent's primary job, that is, the one representing the most hours per week. Those who reported an increase were then asked if the pay increase had been related to new job duties. Those who had been assigned new job duties were asked whether or not those new duties entailed additional training and, if so, who provided that training.

4.1.1 Respondents receiving pay increases in their current or most recent job

Approximately one-third (33.6%) of those respondents who were working or who had worked at some point since leaving W-2 indicated that they had received a pay increase either at their current or most recent job. Continuous leaver respondents reported this at a higher rate than did returner respondents.

	<i>All Leavers (n=983)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=638)</i>	<i>Returners (n=344)</i>
Received pay increase	33.6%	39.9%	22.1%
No pay increase	66.4%	60.1%	77.9%

^a Sample = respondents either *employed when interviewed* or *unemployed but had worked*, minus 39 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

Among those respondents specifically who were employed at the time they were interviewed, 39.2% reported that they had received a pay increase for their current job. Continuous leavers were more likely than returners to indicate having received a pay increase for their current job.¹

	<i>All Leavers (n=683)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=499)</i>	<i>Returners (n=185)</i>
Received pay increase	39.2%	44.4%	25.2%
No pay increase	60.8%	55.6%	74.8%

^a Sample = only respondents *employed when interviewed*, minus 31 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

¹A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by employed respondents who reported a pay increase for their current job and employed respondents who did not was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

Among those respondents who were unemployed when interviewed but who had worked at some time since leaving W-2, slightly more than one-fifth (20.9%) reported having received a pay increase at their most recent job. Although continuous leavers reported this at a higher rate than did returners, the difference was not statistically significant.²

	<i>All Leavers (n=298)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=139)</i>	<i>Returners (n=159)</i>
Received pay increase	20.9%	23.7%	18.4%
No pay increase	79.1%	76.3%	81.6%

^a Sample = only respondents who were *unemployed but had worked*, minus 8 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

²A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by unemployed respondents who reported a pay increase for their last job and those who did not was not statistically significant.

4.1.2 Respondents whose pay increases were associated with new job duties

Approximately one-quarter (23.1%) of all respondents who had worked at any time since leaving W-2 and who reported receiving a pay increase for their current or most recent jobs said that the increase was associated with new job duties. Returners reported this at a lower rate than did continuous leavers, although in all cases the actual numbers of respondents involved were small.

Table 4.1.2.1 Respondents whose pay increases were associated with new job duties (all working or had worked)

	<i>All Leavers (n=329)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=253)</i>	<i>Returners (n=76)</i>
Job duties changed	23.1%	24.5%	18.5%
No change in job duties	76.9%	75.6%	81.5%

^a Sample = respondents *either employed when interviewed or who were unemployed but had worked* and who *reported a pay increase*.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

Among those respondents who were employed when interviewed, approximately one-quarter (23.3%) had received pay increases associated with new job duties. Although continuous leavers reported this at a somewhat higher rate than did returners, this difference was not statistically significant.³

Table 4.1.2.2 Respondents whose pay increases were associated with new job duties (employed when interviewed)

	<i>All Leavers (n=267)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=220)</i>	<i>Returners (n=47)</i>
Job duties changed	23.3%	24.1%	19.2%
No change in job duties	76.7%	75.9%	80.8%

^a Sample = only respondents *employed when interviewed* and who *reported a pay increase*, minus 1 respondent for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who was recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

³A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by employed respondents who reported a pay increase associated with new job duties for their current job and employed respondents who said their pay increase was not associated with new duties was not statistically significant.

Among those respondents who were unemployed when interviewed but who had worked since leaving W-2, 22.4% reported pay increases associated with changes in job responsibilities at their most recent job. Continuous leavers reported this at a higher rate than did returners.⁴

Table 4.1.2.3 Respondents whose pay increases were associated with new job duties (unemployed but had worked)

	<i>All Leavers (n=62)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=33)</i>	<i>Returns (n=29)</i>
Job duties changed	22.4%	26.7%	17.5%
No change in job duties	77.7%	73.4%	82.5%

^a Sample = only respondents who were *unemployed but had worked* and who reported a pay increase.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

⁴A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by unemployed respondents who reported a pay increase associated with new job duties in their most recent job and unemployed respondents who said their pay increase was not associated with new duties was not statistically significant.

4.1.3 Respondents whose new job duties entailed additional training

Overall, among all those respondents who were working or who had worked at any time since leaving W-2 and who reported receiving a pay increase in conjunction with new job duties, slightly more than 60% said those duties had involved further training. As shown in table 4.1.3.1, continuous leavers reported this at a slightly higher rate than did returners.

	<i>All Leavers (n=76)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=62)</i>	<i>Returners (n=14)</i>
New duties with added training	60.3%	61.2%	56.4%
No new training with new duties	39.7%	38.8%	43.6%

^a Sample = respondents *either employed when interviewed or who were unemployed but had worked* and who *reported a pay increase associated with new job duties.*

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

Among respondents who were employed when interviewed, nearly two-thirds (64.4%) of those whose pay raises were associated with new duties also reported that those new duties involved additional training. As indicated in table 4.1.3.2, returners within this subgroup reported new training at a higher rate than did continuous leavers.

	<i>All Leavers (n=62)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=53)</i>	<i>Returners (n=9)</i>
New duties with added training	64.4%	62.2%	77.2%
No new training with new duties	35.6%	37.8%	22.8%

^a Sample = only respondents *employed when interviewed* and who *reported a pay increase associated with new job duties.*

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

Among respondents who were unemployed when interviewed but who had worked since leaving W-2, 42.2% of those who had received a pay raise in conjunction with new duties at their last job also reported that those new duties had involved additional training (see table 4.1.3.3). Continuous leavers reported this at a higher rate than did returners, although the actual numbers of each reporting this were very small.

	<i>All Leavers (n=14)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=9)</i>	<i>Returners (n=5)</i>
New duties with added training	42.2%	55.1%	20.0%
No new training with new duties	57.8%	44.9%	80.0%

^a Sample = only respondents who were *unemployed but had worked* and who reported a pay increase associated with new job duties.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

4.1.4 Source of training for respondents whose new job duties required it

As shown in table 4.1.4, most respondents (91.6%) for whom the question was relevant reported that their employers provided the training required for any new duties associated with a pay increase.⁵ The remainder reported miscellaneous “other” sources of such training. None reported having received any such training either through a government program or at a vocational or technical school, two specific response options the survey offered.

	<i>All Leavers (n=46)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=38)</i>	<i>Returners (n=8)</i>
Employer	91.6%	89.9%	100.0%
Other	8.4%	10.1%	0.0%

^a Sample = respondents *either employed when interviewed or who were unemployed but had worked* and who reported a pay increase associated with new duties, and who said their new duties entailed additional training

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

⁵The number of respondents to whom this question applied was too small to warrant separate tabulation for those employed when interviewed and those who were unemployed but had worked since leaving W-2.

4.2 Leavers' Transportation to Work

In the survey, respondents were asked what means of transportation they used to get to work and how much time their trips to work typically required. Some categories of transportation methods listed in the survey, such as taxi and bicycle, received negligible responses and were therefore folded into the "other" category. Because reliance upon public transit is more characteristic of urban areas than of suburban and rural parts of Wisconsin, information about place of residence was used to distinguish Milwaukee County respondents from respondents living in other parts of the state in comparing use of public versus personal modes of transportation to work.

Respondents were also asked whether or not problems with transportation had sometimes left them unable to get to work, and how frequently those problems occurred. Those who reported experiencing such problems were asked an open-ended question about the nature of those problems, responses to which were then assigned answer codes.

4.2.1 Respondents' means of transportation to work

Less than one-half (42.6%) of those respondents who were employed when interviewed reported using their own motor vehicles to travel to work, although another 12.8% rode to work by automobile using a car pool or other shared ride arrangement (see table 4.2.1.1). Slightly less than one-third (31.9%) said they took the bus; only 5.4% said they walked.

Among respondents who were employed at time of interview, continuous leavers were more likely than returners to report using their own vehicle to get to work.⁶ Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to say they relied on the bus to get to work.⁷

	<i>All Leavers (n=692)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=507)</i>	<i>Returners (n=186)</i>
Own vehicle	42.6%	48.8%	25.5%
Bus	31.9%	27.3%	44.5%
Car pool/ shared ride	12.8%	12.7%	13.1%
Walk	5.4%	5.2%	6.0%
Borrowed vehicle	3.1%	2.7%	4.3%
Other	4.1%	3.2%	6.6%

^a Sample = only respondents *employed when interviewed*, minus 22 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

⁶A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by employed respondents who reported using their own vehicle and all other employed respondents was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

⁷A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by employed respondents who reported relying on the bus and all other employed respondents was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

Among respondents who were unemployed when interviewed but who had worked since leaving W-2, slightly less than one-quarter (23.5%) reported using their own vehicle to get to work, although an additional 13.1% said they rode to work by automobile through car pooling or another ride sharing arrangement. As shown in table 4.2.1.2, slightly more than 45% relied on the bus for transportation to work.

Within this unemployed subgroup a higher percentage of continuous leavers than of returners reported using their own vehicles to get to work, although the percentage difference between the two groups was smaller than among employed respondents.⁸ Among unemployed leavers, returners were more likely than continuous leavers to say they relied on the bus to get to work when last employed.⁹

Table 4.2.1.2 Respondents' transportation to work (unemployed but had worked)

	<i>All Leavers (n=299)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=140)</i>	<i>Returners (n=159)</i>
Bus	45.2%	39.0%	50.7%
Own vehicle	23.5%	28.1%	19.5%
Car pool/ shared ride	13.1%	14.0%	12.2%
Walk	7.4%	8.0%	6.8%
Borrowed vehicle	2.7%	3.7%	1.9%
Other	8.1%	7.3%	8.9%

^a Sample = only respondents who were *unemployed but had worked*, minus 7 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

⁸A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by unemployed respondents who reported using their own vehicle and all other unemployed respondents was not statistically significant.

⁹A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by unemployed respondents who reported using the bus and all other unemployed respondents was statistically significant ($p < .05$).

Tables 4.2.1.3 and 4.2.1.4 present information about use of public transportation (buses) by, respectively, respondents in Milwaukee and those in the rest of the state who either were employed or had been employed since leaving W-2. As those tables indicate, a larger percentage of Milwaukee County respondents relied on city buses to get to work than was the case for respondents living elsewhere in Wisconsin. However, both in and out of Milwaukee County, returners as a group were more reliant on bus transportation than were continuous leavers as a group.¹⁰

Table 4.2.1.3 Respondents' reliance on bus service vs. other modes of transportation to work (Milwaukee County)

	<i>All Leavers (n=757)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=452)</i>	<i>Returners (n=305)</i>
Used bus service	43.5%	38.7%	50.7%
Used modes other than bus	56.5%	61.3%	49.3%

^a Sample = only respondents *residing in Milwaukee* who were *either employed when interviewed or unemployed but had worked*, minus 22 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

Table 4.2.1.4 Respondents' reliance on bus service vs. other modes of transportation to work (not Milwaukee County)

	<i>All Leavers (n=235)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=195)</i>	<i>Returners (n=39)</i>
Used bus service	11.4%	9.5%	21.2%
Used modes other than bus	88.6%	90.5%	78.8%

^a Sample = only respondents *residing outside of Milwaukee County* who were *either employed when interviewed or unemployed but had worked*, minus 7 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

¹⁰A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by Milwaukee County respondents who had been employed at any time since leaving W-2 and who reported using the bus to get to work and by Milwaukee County respondents who reported using other modes of transportation to work was statistically significant ($p < .01$). A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by non-Milwaukee-County respondents who had been employed at any time since leaving W-2 and who reported using the bus to get to work and by non-Milwaukee-County respondents who reported using other modes of transportation to work was statistically significant ($p < .05$).

4.2.2 Respondents' travel time to work

Respondents who were employed when interviewed reported travel times to work that averaged approximately 33 minutes. Returners tended to report, on average, longer travel commutes than did continuous leavers.¹¹

Table 4.2.2.1 Respondents' travel time to work (employed when interviewed)

	<i>All Leavers (n=705)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=516)</i>	<i>Returners (n=190)</i>
Worked at home	2.7%	2.7%	2.7%
Less than 15 minutes	26.2%	28.1%	21.0%
16-30 minutes	36.6%	38.6%	31.1%
31-45 minutes	14.5%	14.3%	15.1%
46-60 minutes	12.2%	10.8%	16.2%
61-90 minutes	5.3%	3.7%	9.7%
More than 90 minutes	2.4%	1.8%	4.2%
Average travel time to work	33.0 mins.	30.8 mins.	39.4 mins.

^a Sample = only respondents *employed when interviewed*, minus 9 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

¹¹A *t*-test comparing the means for continuous leavers and for returners of travel times for employed respondents was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

Respondents who were not employed when interviewed but who had worked since leaving W-2 reported travel times to their most recent jobs averaging just under 40 minutes. Average reported travel times for continuous leavers and returners appeared similar (38.1 minutes and 41.2 minutes respectively).¹² Although more than one-half (57%) reported travel times to work of less than 30 minutes, nearly 13% reported travel times of more than 60 minutes.

	<i>All Leavers (n=303)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=143)</i>	<i>Returners (n=160)</i>
Worked at home	1.0%	2.1%	0.0%
Less than 15 minutes	25.5%	27.1%	24.0%
16-30 minutes	31.5%	30.0%	32.9%
31-45 minutes	16.0%	16.8%	15.3%
46-60 minutes	13.2%	10.5%	15.6%
61-90 minutes	7.5%	8.4%	6.6%
More than 90 minutes	5.4%	5.0%	5.7%
Average travel time to work	39.9 mins.	38.1 mins.	41.2 mins.

^a Sample = only respondents who were *unemployed but had worked*, minus 3 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

¹²A *t*-test comparing means for continuous leavers and for returners of travel times for unemployed respondents who had worked since leaving W-2 was not statistically significant.

4.2.3 Respondents' problems with transportation to work

Approximately one-quarter (23.7%) of respondents who were employed when interviewed reported having had problems with transportation to their jobs during the previous month. Returners to W-2 were more likely to have experienced such problems than were continuous leavers.¹³

Table 4.2.3.1 Respondents with work transportation problems (employed when interviewed)

	<i>All Leavers (n=690)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=506)</i>	<i>Returners (n=184)</i>
No problems	76.3%	79.1%	68.6%
Had problems	23.7%	20.9%	31.4%

^a Sample = only respondents *employed when interviewed*, minus 24 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

Of those employed respondents who reported problems with transportation to work during the previous month, 21.8% said they experienced such problems frequently. A smaller percentage of returners than of continuous leavers reported experiencing these problems frequently.

Table 4.2.3.2 Frequency of work transportation problems (employed when interviewed)

	<i>All Leavers (n=162)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=104)</i>	<i>Returners (n=58)</i>
Hardly ever	12.0%	11.8%	12.3%
Not very often	25.1%	23.4%	28.1%
Sometimes	41.1%	40.8%	41.8%
Frequently	21.8%	24.0%	17.8%

^a Sample = only respondents *employed when interviewed and reporting transportation problems*, minus 3 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

¹³A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by employed respondents reporting transportation problems and employed respondents not reporting such problems was statistically significant ($p < .05$).

Of respondents who were unemployed when interviewed but who had worked since leaving W-2, 27.3% reported problems with transportation to their most recent job. Returners within this subgroup reported these problems at only a slightly higher rate than did continuous leavers.¹⁴

**Table 4.2.3.3 Respondents with work transportation problems
(unemployed but had worked)**

	<i>All Leavers (n=300)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=141)</i>	<i>Returners (n=158)</i>
No problems	72.7%	74.5%	71.2%
Had problems	27.3%	25.5%	28.8%

^a Sample = only respondents who were *unemployed but had worked*, minus 6 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

Of those unemployed respondents who had worked since leaving W-2 and who indicated that they had experienced problems with transportation to work when last employed, just over one-quarter (26.2%) said that these problems had occurred frequently. The continuous leavers within this subgroup reported frequent problems at a somewhat higher rate than did returners.

**Table 4.2.3.4 Frequency of work transportation problems
(unemployed but had worked)**

	<i>All Leavers (n=81)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=36)</i>	<i>Returners (n=45)</i>
Hardly ever	15.0%	11.0%	18.3%
Not very often	18.6%	8.5%	26.8%
Sometimes	40.1%	47.7%	34.0%
Frequently	26.2%	32.9%	20.9%

^a Sample = only respondents who were *unemployed but had worked* and who *reported transportation problems*, minus 2 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

¹⁴A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by unemployed respondents reporting transportation problems and unemployed respondents who did not report such problems was not statistically significant.

4.2.4 Nature of respondents' work transportation problems

Slightly more than one-third (34.4%) of employed respondents who reported problems with transportation to work cited car trouble as the specific problem. Just over 41% cited problems with bus service, in the form either of an inability to afford the fare or of instances of missing the bus. Just under 10% said that they had no car or other ready means of transportation.

Given the tendency of continuous leavers as a group to rely more heavily than returners on their own vehicles for transportation to work, it may not be surprising that continuous leavers appeared more likely than returners to cite car trouble as the source of their work-related transportation problems. Returners, on the other hand, cited problems with bus fares or bus services at a rate more than twice that of continuous leavers, a response pattern that may reflect returners' heavier reliance on public transportation.

	<i>All Leavers (n=161)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=103)</i>	<i>Returners (n=58)</i>
Car trouble	34.4%	43.8%	17.6%
No bus fare	30.5%	20.1%	49.2%
Missed bus/ bus problem	10.8%	8.1%	15.6%
No car or other transportation	9.9%	11.5%	7.0%
Unreliable ride	6.7%	8.5%	3.5%
Unreliable loan car	3.9%	5.1%	1.8%
Other	3.8%	3.0%	5.3%

^a Sample = only respondents *employed when interviewed* and who *reported transportation problems*, minus 3 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

One-quarter (25.6%) of respondents who were unemployed when interviewed but who had worked since leaving W-2 and who reported transportation problems specifically cited car trouble, while slightly more than 45% reported problems with bus services or fares. Differences between continuous leavers and returners in the rates at which the two groups reported the various types of transportation problems appeared smaller than was the case with respondents who were employed when interviewed.

**Table 4.2.4.2 Nature of work transportation problems
(unemployed but had worked)**

	<i>All Leavers (n=82)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=36)</i>	<i>Returners (n=46)</i>
Car trouble	25.6%	22.3%	28.2%
Missed bus/ bus problem	23.3%	19.4%	26.3%
No bus fare	22.0%	22.3%	21.8%
No car or other transportation	11.1%	11.3%	10.9%
Unreliable ride	3.7%	8.5%	0.0%
Unreliable loan car	3.4%	5.0%	2.2%
Other	10.9%	11.3%	10.6%

^a Sample = only respondents who were *unemployed but had worked* and who *reported transportation problems*, minus 1 respondent for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who was recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

CHAPTER 5

CONTINUING PROGRAM PARTICIPATION & RELIANCE ON SUPPORT SERVICES

Many of those receiving W-2 cash assistance were also eligible for a variety of other program benefits and supports, or belonged to families in which another member was receiving such benefits or supports. These benefits and supports included cash assistance such as Supplemental Security Income (SSI), Social Security Disability Income (SSDI), Unemployment Insurance, and Worker's Compensation. They also included non-cash services (or services paid for through program subsidies directly to providers) such as Medicaid, food stamps, and subsidized school meals. In many cases, those leaving the W-2 program remained eligible for these programs even after they stopped receiving W-2 cash assistance.

The survey found that many W-2 leavers continued to participate in a variety of programs, services, and benefits. For example, among respondents to the survey:

- 10.5% said they were on W-2 cash assistance when interviewed.
- 76.8% reported being part of families with at least one member receiving Medicaid.
- 58% reported being in families with at least one member receiving food stamps.
- 65.3% or more indicated that they were aware of their possible eligibility for one or another of these programs.

There were some differences between continuous leavers and returners with respect to such program participation. For example:

- Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to report that at least one family member was receiving food stamps.
- Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to indicate at least one family member on Medicaid.
- Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to report that their family included at least one child participating in a free or reduced-price school breakfast or lunch program (or a summertime extension of such a program).
- Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to say that a family member was receiving charity food aid through a community shelter, pantry, or meal service.

5.1 W-2 Cash Assistance

Although all respondents to this survey left W-2 cash assistance between April 1 and December 31, 1998, approximately 38% returned to W-2 at some point two months or more after leaving.¹ Slightly more than 10% said they were actually on W-2 cash assistance (either by holding a W-2 Community Service Job, participating in W-2 Transitions, or receiving W-2 cash for a newborn) at the time they were interviewed.²

More than one-quarter (26.3%) of respondents who had returned to W-2 at some point after having been off assistance for at least two months said they were receiving cash assistance at the time of the interview. A handful of those who, based on CARES data, met the definition of continuous leavers reported, upon being interviewed, that they were receiving W-2 cash assistance again. This could include respondents who had applied for or begun participating in a cash assistance program but who had not yet received their first payment.

Table 5.1 Respondents receiving W-2 cash assistance at time of interview

	<i>All Leavers (n=1237)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=770)</i>	<i>Returns (n=466)</i>
Receiving W-2 cash assistance	10.5%	1.0%	26.3%
Not on W-2 cash assistance	89.5%	99.0%	73.7%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 2 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

¹Compare this with the administrative data in appendix A showing 35.5% of respondents to have received cash assistance again at any time within a year after leaving W-2.

²Compare this with the administrative data in appendix A showing 19.7% of respondents receiving cash assistance again during their fourth quarter after leaving W-2.

5.2 W-2 Leavers and Other Cash Benefit Programs

Many of those leaving W-2 cash assistance remained eligible for a variety of other cash benefit programs. In the survey, both continuous leavers and returners were asked whether or not they or someone in their immediate families (defined to include the respondent's children and his or her spouse or the co-parent of at least one child) were receiving such cash benefits. The percentages receiving cash from these other programs or sources are reported in table 5.2, and described in the subsections below.

5.2.1 Supplemental Security Income

Slightly less than 16% of respondents reported that they or someone in their family were receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI) payments. Continuous leavers were more likely than returners to indicate having a family member on SSI.³

5.2.2 Social Security Disability Income

Less than 3% of respondents reported that they or another member of their immediate family were receiving Social Security Disability Income (SSDI). Continuous leavers were more likely than returners to indicate having a family member on SSDI.⁴

5.2.3 Unemployment Insurance

Less than 3% of respondents reported that they or another member of their immediate family were receiving Unemployment Insurance benefits. This included 1.7% of respondents who had returned to W-2 cash assistance and 3.1% of continuous leavers.

5.2.4 Kinship Care payments

The Kinship Care program provides cash payments to caretaker relatives (such as grandparents, aunts, and uncles) of minor children. Approximately 2.4% of respondents reported that they or another member of their immediate family were receiving payments under the Kinship Care program. Just under 2% of continuous leavers reported such payments, as did just over 3% of returners.

5.2.5 Caretaker Supplement

The Caretaker Supplement program provides a benefit to eligible parents who receive SSI payments. About 1% of respondents indicated that they or another member of their immediate family were receiving Caretaker Supplement payments. This included 1.5% of continuous leavers, and 0.4% of returners.

³A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents reporting that they or a family member were receiving SSI and respondents not reporting this it was statistically significant ($p < .05$).

⁴A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents reporting that they or a family member were receiving SSDI and those not reporting this was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

5.2.6 Foster Care payments

Less than 1% of respondents reported that they or another member of their immediate family were receiving Foster Care payments. This included slightly more than 1% of continuous leavers but only 0.2% of returners.

5.2.7 Worker's Compensation

Less than 1% of respondents reported that they or another member of their immediate family were receiving Worker's Compensation benefits. This included 0.6% of continuous leavers and 0.4% of returners.

5.2.8 Tribal payments

Just over one-half of one percent (0.6%) of respondents reported that they or another member of their immediate family were receiving tribal payments. This included 0.8% of continuous leavers and 0.2% of returners.

5.2.9 Retirement fund or pension

Less than one-half of one percent (0.3%) of respondents reported that they or another member of their immediate family were receiving payments from a retirement or pension fund. This reported percentage was similar for both continuous leavers and returners.

Table 5.2 Respondents' (or families') participation in other cash benefits

	<i>All Leavers</i> % receiving (total n/missing) ^a	<i>Continuous</i> % receiving (of n continuous)	<i>Returners</i> % receiving (of n returners)
Supplemental Security Income	15.6% (1222/17)	17.1% (763)	13.0% (459)
Social Security Disability	2.6% (1209/30)	3.6% (754)	0.9% (454)
Unemployment Insurance	2.6% (1221/18)	3.1% (762)	1.7% (459)
Kinship Care	2.4% (1221/18)	1.9% (762)	3.2% (459)
Caretaker Supplement	1.1% (1222/18)	1.5% (763)	0.4% (459)
Foster Care Payments	0.8% (1221/18)	1.1% (762)	0.2% (459)
Worker's Compensation	0.6% (1222/17)	0.6% (763)	0.4% (459)
Tribal Payments	0.6% (1222/18)	0.8% (763)	0.2% (459)
Pensions/Retirement funds	0.3% (1222/18)	0.3% (763)	0.4% (459)

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus varying numbers per row for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response." The resulting effective sample size for each row is presented to the left of the number of missing responses, in parentheses beneath percentages: (effective sample/missing).

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because each row represents a separate data table, column percentages do not sum to 100%.

5.3 Non-cash Assistance Received by Leavers

In addition to other cash assistance for which those leaving W-2 may be eligible, a variety of non-cash benefits and services are often available to W-2 leavers or members of their families. In the survey, respondents were asked whether or not they or any member of their immediate family (i.e. their children and the spouse or co-parent of a child) received any of these services or benefits. The responses for both continuous leavers and returners are reported in table 5.3, and discussed in the subsections below.

5.3.1 Medicaid

More than three-quarters (76.8%) of respondents reported that they or a member of their immediate family were receiving medical assistance through Medicaid or a related program.⁵ This could include Wisconsin's Medicaid extension program, BadgerCare, which began on July 1, 1999 and was available to some respondents at the time they were interviewed. Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to say they were receiving such medical assistance.⁶

5.3.2 Food Stamp program

Approximately 58% of respondents reported that they or a member of their immediate family were receiving food stamps.⁷ However, returners were more likely than continuous leavers to say they were participating in the Food Stamp program either directly or through another immediate family member, with only about one-half of continuous leavers but nearly three-quarters of returners so responding.⁸

5.3.3 School lunch program

Approximately 58% of respondent families indicated that they had a child participating in a program providing free or reduced-price school lunches. Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to say they were participating in such a school lunch program.⁹

5.3.4 School breakfast program

Just over 43% of respondents had a child participating in a free or subsidized school breakfast program. Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to say they had a child participating in such a program.¹⁰

⁵Compare this with the administrative data in appendix A showing that more than 75% of respondents were covered by Medicaid at some time in the fourth quarter after exit.

⁶A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondent families receiving Medicaid with those not receiving it was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

⁷Compare this with the administrative data in appendix A showing that 62.9% of respondents were receiving food stamps in the fourth quarter after exit.

⁸A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents reporting that they or a family member were receiving food stamps and those not reporting this was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

⁹A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents reporting that they or a family member were participating in a school lunch program and those not reporting this was statistically significant ($p < .05$).

¹⁰A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents reporting that they or a family member were participating in the school breakfast program and those not reporting this was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

5.3.5 Women, Infants and Children (WIC) program

Just under 38% of respondents reported that they or a family member were receiving food assistance through the Women, Infants and Children (WIC) program. Continuous leavers and returners appeared similar in the rates at which they reported such participation in the WIC program.

5.3.6 Energy assistance

Just over 29% of respondents indicated that they or a family member were receiving assistance in paying their energy bills. The percentages at which continuous leavers and returners reported this appeared similar.

5.3.7 Rent assistance

One-fifth (20.1%) of respondents said they were receiving housing support through rental assistance, a Section 8 rent subsidy, or residency in public housing. Continuous leavers were more likely than returners to indicate receiving housing support through one or another of these programs.¹¹

5.3.8 Charity food

Slightly more than 13% of respondents reported that they or another family member were receiving food from a community or charitable source such as a local shelter, food pantry, or meal program. Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to say they were receiving such food aid.¹²

5.3.9 Summer food programs

Just over 6% of respondents reported that one or more of the children in their immediate family were participating in a summer food service designed to replace school breakfast and lunch programs during the summer school vacation period. Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to report a child or children in such a program.¹³

5.3.10 Mental health services

Less than 5% of respondents said that they or a family member were receiving mental health services or assistance. Continuous leavers and returners were similar in the rates at which they reported that they or a family member were receiving such assistance.

5.3.11 Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse services

About 2.4% of respondents reported that they or another member of their immediate families were receiving Alcohol or Other Drug Abuse (AODA) program services. The percentages

¹¹A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents reporting that their family was receiving public housing assistance and by those not reporting this was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

¹²A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents reporting that their family was receiving charity food aid and those not reporting this was statistically significant ($p < .05$).

¹³A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents reporting that their family was participating in a summer food program and those not reporting this was statistically significant ($p < .05$).

of continuous leavers and returners reporting that they or their families had received such help appeared similar.

Table 5.3 Non-cash assistance received by respondents or their families

	<i>All Leavers % receiving (total n/missing)^a</i>	<i>Continuous % receiving (of n continuous)</i>	<i>Returners % receiving (of n returners)</i>
Medicaid (incl. BadgerCare)	76.8% (1237/2)	71.8% (770)	85.3% (466)
Food stamps	58.0% (1219/20)	48.4% (762)	73.9% (458)
School lunch program	58.0% (1217/22)	55.4% (761)	62.3% (456)
School breakfast program	43.1% (1213/26)	39.3% (759)	49.3% (453)
WIC program	37.9% (1221/18)	36.2% (762)	40.9% (458)
Energy assistance	29.1% (1219/20)	27.7% (762)	31.5% (456)
Rent assistance	20.1% (1220/19)	22.6% (762)	16.0% (458)
Charity food	13.3% (1222/17)	11.8% (763)	15.9% (459)
Summer breakfast and lunch	6.4% (1220/19)	5.2% (763)	8.2% (456)
Mental health services	4.7% (1221/18)	4.7% (762)	4.6% (459)
AODA services	2.4% (1223/16)	2.7% (764)	1.8% (459)

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus varying numbers per row for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.” Resulting effective sample size for each row is presented to the left of the number of missing responses, in parentheses beneath percentages: *(effective sample/missing)*.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because each row represents a separate data table, column percentages do not sum to 100%.

5.4 Leavers' Awareness of Post-W-2 Assistance Eligibility

In the survey, respondents were asked whether they were aware that they or their children might be eligible, under certain circumstances, for particular assistance programs after leaving W-2. Responses to these questions are reported in table 5.4.

More than three-quarters (77.8%) of respondents reported knowing that they might be eligible for food stamps, and returners were more likely than continuous leavers to be aware of this.¹⁴ Slightly more than two-thirds (67.6%) said they were aware that they might be eligible for Medicaid assistance for themselves, with returners again more likely than continuous leavers to know of this.¹⁵ A smaller percentage reported being aware that after working for nine months they might be eligible for child care or partial funding for additional work-related training or education.

	<i>All Leavers</i> % receiving (total n/missing) ^a	<i>Continuous</i> % receiving (of n continuous)	<i>Returners</i> % receiving (of n returners)
Food stamps	77.8% (1220/19)	75.9% (763)	80.9% (456)
Medicaid – child	81.9% (1221/18)	81.4% (764)	82.9% (456)
Medicaid – self	67.6% (1217/22)	65.4% (760)	71.2% (458)
Child-care assistance	71.0% (1220/19)	71.5% (762)	70.2% (458)
Child support service	65.3% (1212/27)	65.4% (755)	65.2% (458)
Child-care/ training assistance post-9 months at work	28.0% (1215/24)	28.6% (760)	27.0% (455)

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus varying numbers per row for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.” Resulting effective sample size for each row is presented to the left of the number of missing responses, in parentheses beneath percentages: (effective sample/missing).

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because each row represents a separate data table, column percentages do not sum to 100%.

¹⁴A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who said they were aware of their possible eligibility for food stamps and those who said they were not aware was statistically significant ($p < .05$).

¹⁵A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who said they were aware of their possible eligibility for Medicaid and those who said they were not aware of this was statistically significant ($p < .05$).

CHAPTER 6

OTHER SUPPORTS FOR LEAVERS AND THEIR FAMILIES

This chapter examines some of the other sources of support on which surveyed W-2 leavers and their families were relying, apart from the wages leavers were earning themselves or program supports leavers or their families were receiving. For example, among those leavers who responded to the survey:

- 27.7% said they were receiving child support payments.
- 8% said they lived with a spouse or co-parent who worked for pay.
- Respondents reported that their working spouses or co-parents were earning an average of \$10.15 an hour.
- 71.2% of those who said they were aware of the federal or state Earned Income Tax Credits for working families were claiming such a credit on their tax returns.

There was not always much to distinguish continuous leavers from returners in this regard, though in some areas the two groups displayed some apparent differences. For example:

- Similar percentages of continuous leavers and returners reported receiving child support.
- Similar percentages of continuous leavers and returners reported living with a spouse or co-parent who worked for pay; however:
- Continuous leavers were more likely than returners to indicate that they were aware of the federal or state Earned Income Tax Credits.

The remainder of this chapter examines these findings more closely. Section 6.1 looks at the rates at which respondents reported receiving child support. Section 6.2 offers details about the hours, wages, and earnings of spouses or co-parents of respondents living in the same household. Section 6.3 considers several tax credits for which W-2 leavers may be eligible. Finally, Section 6.4 details the miscellaneous types of income reported by those not identifying themselves or their spouses or co-parents as working or receiving other types of cash assistance through public programs.

6.1 Child Support

For those leaving the W-2 program, as for many working families, child support payments from the absent parent of a child can be an important source of household income. Ensuring that children receive the child support owed to them is an important corollary to W-2's work-based assistance to families. In the survey, respondents were asked whether they were receiving such child support payments.

6.1.1 Respondents receiving child support payments

Somewhat more than one-quarter (27.7%) of respondents reported receiving child support payments from an absent parent of a child. The percentage of respondents who reported receiving child support payments was similar for both continuous leavers and returners.¹

Table 6.1.1 Respondents receiving child support payments

	<i>All Leavers (n=1221)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=762)</i>	<i>Returners (n=459)</i>
Received child support	27.7%	27.6%	27.9%
Did not receive child support	72.3%	72.4%	72.1%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 18 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

6.2 Leavers with a Working Spouse or Co-parent

As noted in chapter 2 (table 2.2.3), slightly more than 13% of respondents reported living in a household that included the other parent of at least one of the children in that home. Respondents were asked about the employment status of those co-parents who lived with them. Specifically, they were asked whether these spouses or co-parents worked for pay, what types of jobs they had, how many jobs they held, how many hours they worked, how long they had held their jobs, and how much they earned. Because respondents could report their spouse's/co-parent's income either by the hour or by the week, hourly wages and weekly earnings were based on a combination of direct reporting and calculation that depended upon which unit of measure the respondent reported.

¹A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported receiving child support with those who did said they did not receive child support was not statistically significant.

6.2.1 Respondents living with a spouse or co-parent who works for pay

Of those respondents who indicated that a spouse or co-parent lived in the same household, 62.8% (or approximately 8.4% of all those surveyed) reported that this spouse or co-parent was working for pay at the time of the survey. Although continuous leavers reported this at a slightly higher rate than did returners, this difference was not statistically significant.²

	<i>All Leavers (n=166)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=128)</i>	<i>Returners (n=38)</i>
Spouse/co-parent works for pay	62.8%	63.8%	59.4%
Spouse/co-parent does not work	37.2%	36.2%	40.6%

^a Sample = only respondents reporting that a spouse or co-parent of at least one child lived in the household.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

6.2.2 Respondents living with a spouse or co-parent holding more than one job

Of the respondents who indicated that a working spouse or co-parent lived with them, 8.1% reported that this spouse or co-parent held more than one job. No respondent indicated that a working spouse or co-parent held more than two jobs. Although a higher percentage of continuous leavers than of returners reported having a working spouse or co-parent holding down more than one job, this difference was not statistically significant.³

	<i>All Leavers (n=104)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=82)</i>	<i>Returners (n=22)</i>
Not more than one job	91.9%	90.9%	95.4%
More than one job (two jobs) ^b	8.1%	9.1%	4.6%

^a Sample = only respondents reporting that a spouse or co-parent of at least one child lived in the household and reporting that the spouse/co-parent worked for pay.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

^b **NOTE:** In a separate question, respondents who indicated a spouse or co-parent holding more than one job were asked how many jobs that spouse or co-parent held. The answer in all cases was two jobs.

²A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents reporting a working spouse or co-parent and respondents reporting that a spouse or co-parent lived with them but did not work was not statistically significant.

³A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents reporting that a working spouse or co-parent living with them held more than one job and other respondents reporting a working spouse or co-parent living with them was not statistically significant.

6.2.3 Types of jobs held by spouses or co-parents in respondents' households

More than 80% of respondents who reported that a working spouse or co-parent lived with them also indicated that this spouse or co-parent held a “regular” job as opposed to temporary, seasonal, or sporadic employment. Returner respondents reported working spouses holding regular jobs at a somewhat higher rate than did continuous leavers.

Table 6.2.3 Types of jobs held by working spouses or co-parents in respondents' households

	<i>All Leavers (n=104)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=82)</i>	<i>Returners (n=22)</i>
Regular job	80.7%	79.2%	86.3%
Self-employment	6.6%	7.2%	4.6%
Seasonal work	6.1%	7.7%	0.0%
Temporary job	3.7%	3.5%	4.6%
Odd jobs	2.9%	2.5%	4.6%

^a Sample = only respondents reporting that a spouse or co-parent of at least one child lived in the household and reporting that the spouse/co-parent worked for pay.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

6.2.4 Hours worked by spouses or co-parents in respondents' households

About one-half (51.4%) of those respondents who said that a working spouse or co-parent lived with them also reported that this spouse or co-parent worked 40 hours per week. Nearly 80% indicated that a working spouse or co-parent worked 40 hours or more per week. As indicated in table 6.2.4, the observed differences between continuous leavers and returners in this respect were small and did not appear to form a clear pattern.

Table 6.2.4 Hours worked by spouses/co-parents in respondents' households

	<i>All Leavers (n=104)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=82)</i>	<i>Returners (n=22)</i>
Fewer than 20 hours per week	9.3%	9.4%	9.1%
20-29 hours per week	2.2%	1.6%	4.6%
30-39 hours per week	10.3%	9.4%	13.7%
40 hours per week	51.4%	51.7%	50.4%
More than 40 hours per week	26.7%	27.9%	22.3%

^a Sample = only respondents reporting that a spouse or co-parent of at least one child lived in the household and reporting that the spouse/co-parent worked for pay.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

6.2.5 Earnings of working spouses or co-parents in respondents' households

The hourly wages respondents reported for their working spouse or co-parent averaged just over \$10.00, yielding average earnings of slightly less than \$412 per week. The median hourly wage was \$9.00 and the median weekly paycheck amounted to \$360. The mean and median wages and earnings for both continuous leavers and returners are reported in table 6.2.5.

The relatively smaller percentage of returners whose spouses or co-parents worked more than 40 hours a week (see subsection 6.2.4) may be one reason why returners reported, on average, higher hourly wages but lower weekly earnings for their spouses or co-parents than did continuous leavers. However, meaningful comparisons between continuous leavers and returners are difficult to make because of the small number of total responses.

Table 6.2.5 Earnings of spouses or co-parents in respondents' households

	<i>All Leavers (n=90)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=72)</i>	<i>Returners (n=18)</i>
Average hourly wage	\$10.15	\$9.95	\$10.95
Median hourly wage	\$9.00	\$9.00	\$9.25
Average weekly earnings	\$411.87	\$420.23	\$379.70
Median weekly earnings	\$360.00	\$360.00	\$368.83

^a Sample = only respondents reporting that a spouse or co-parent of at least one child lived in the household and reporting that the spouse/co-parent worked for pay, minus 18 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total.

6.2.6 Job tenure of working spouses or co-parents in respondents' households

Slightly more than one-half (52.1%) of respondents' working spouses or co-parents had held their current jobs for more than a year (see table 6.2.6). Just under 29% had worked for their current employers for less than three months.

A larger percentage of returners than of continuous leavers reported that the working spouses or co-parents in their households had been with their current employers for three months or less. However, a larger percentage of returners than of continuous leavers also reported having worked at their current jobs for longer than one year.

Table 6.2.6 Job tenure of working spouses or co-parents

	<i>All Leavers (n=104)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=82)</i>	<i>Returners (n=22)</i>
Three months or less	28.7%	27.9%	31.4%
More than 3 and up to 6 months	11.7%	13.8%	4.0%
More than 6 and up to 9 months	5.7%	7.2%	0.0%
More than 9 and up to 12 months	1.8%	2.4%	0.0%
More than 12 months	52.1%	48.7%	64.6%

^a Sample = only respondents reporting that a spouse or co-parent of at least one child lived in the household and reporting that the spouse/co-parent worked for pay.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

6.3 Tax Credits for Working Leavers

Many of those leaving W-2 are eligible for tax credits designed to assist lower-income working families. Such tax credits include the federal Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) and its counterpart at the state level. They also include the Wisconsin Homestead Tax Credit program.

In the survey, respondents were asked if they were aware of these tax credits. Those who said yes were asked whether or not they were receiving any of those credits and through what payment mechanism, as well as whether or not they planned to claim such credits the following year.

Because the sequence of questions about awareness and receipt of particular tax credits was asked a slightly different way in each quarterly survey, the responses from all three surveys were difficult to combine. Providing the largest number of responses that were equivalent across all three quarters entailed identifying that subset of respondents who indicated awareness of *both* the federal *and* the state EITC, and then reporting on those within this subgroup who claimed *either* the federal or the state credit.

6.3.1 Respondents aware of the federal Earned Income Tax Credit

More than 71% of respondents said they knew of the federal Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC). As indicated in table 6.3.1, continuous leavers were more likely than returners to indicate an awareness of the federal EITC.⁴

	<i>All Leavers (n=1182)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=738)</i>	<i>Returners (n=444)</i>
Aware of federal EITC	71.5%	75.7%	64.6%
Not aware of federal EITC	28.5%	24.3%	35.5%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 57 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

⁴A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who said they were aware of the federal tax credit and those who said they were not aware was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

6.3.2 Respondents aware of the state Earned Income Tax Credit

Less than one-half (45.7%) of respondents indicated knowledge of the Earned Income Tax Credit, similar to the federal one, offered by the State of Wisconsin. As in the case of the federal credit, however, continuous leavers were more likely than returners to indicate awareness of this credit.⁵

	<i>All Leavers (n=1163)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=721)</i>	<i>Returners (n=442)</i>
Aware of state EITC	45.7%	48.0%	42.0%
Not aware of state EITC	54.3%	52.0%	58.0%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 76 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

6.3.3 Respondents receiving either state or federal Earned Income Tax Credits

Of respondents who indicated that they were aware of both the federal and the state Earned Income Tax Credits, 12.7% said they were receiving a portion of the federal tax credit in advance with their regular paychecks.⁶ Continuous leavers and returners appeared to report this at similar rates.

	<i>All Leavers (n=424)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=279)</i>	<i>Returners (n=145)</i>
Receiving in paycheck	12.7%	12.1%	13.9%
Not receiving in paycheck	87.0%	87.5%	86.1%
Not eligible	0.2%	0.4%	0.0%

^a Sample = only respondents reporting that they were aware of both the federal and the state tax credits, minus 59 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

⁵A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who said they were aware of the state tax credit with those who said they were not was statistically significant ($p < .05$).

⁶The opportunity to receive a portion in advance via paycheck is available only for the federal EITC; the state EITC can only be claimed on an individual’s annual tax return.

Among respondents who said they knew of both the federal and the state Earned Income Tax Credits, slightly more than 71% said they claimed either or both credits when filing their most recent tax returns. A larger percentage of continuous leaver respondents than of returner respondents reported claiming tax credits in this fashion.

	<i>All Leavers (n=451)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=297)</i>	<i>Returners (n=154)</i>
Receiving through tax filing	71.2%	76.0%	62.2%
Not receiving through filing	27.4%	23.7%	34.6%
Not eligible	1.3%	0.3%	3.2%

^a Sample = only respondents reporting that they were aware of both the federal and the state tax credits, minus 32 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

Of those respondents who said they knew of both the federal and state Earned Income Tax Credits, 91.2% said they planned to apply for either or both of these credits the following year. The reported figure was slightly higher for returners than for continuous leavers.

	<i>All Leavers (n=451)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=301)</i>	<i>Returners (n=150)</i>
Planned to claim credit next year	91.2%	90.0%	93.4%
Did not plan to claim credit	8.0%	8.7%	6.6%
Not eligible	0.8%	1.2%	0.0%

^a Sample = only respondents reporting that they were aware of both the federal and the state tax credits, minus 32 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

6.3.4 Respondents aware of and receiving the Wisconsin Homestead Tax Credit

Nearly 61% of respondents said they knew of Wisconsin's Homestead Tax Credit. Continuous leavers were more likely than returners to indicate awareness of this tax credit.⁷

	<i>All Leavers (n=1195)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=745)</i>	<i>Returners (n=450)</i>
Aware of credit	60.7%	63.2%	56.6%
Not aware of credit	39.3%	36.8%	43.4%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 44 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

Of those who reported knowing about the Homestead Credit, only about 17% said they had received or were receiving the credit for the tax year during which they were interviewed. A higher percentage of continuous leavers than returners reported receiving the credit the year they were surveyed.

	<i>All Leavers (n=680)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=435)</i>	<i>Returners (n=245)</i>
Did not receive the credit that year	80.5%	77.9%	85.1%
Received the credit that year	16.9%	19.3%	12.8%
Not eligible	2.6%	2.9%	2.1%

^a Sample = only respondents reporting that they were aware of the Homestead Credit, minus 47 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

⁷A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who said they were aware of the Homestead Credit and those who said they were not aware of it was statistically significant ($p < .05$).

Nearly three-quarters (73.3%) of respondents who were aware of the Homestead Credit said they planned to claim that credit the following year. Continuous leavers and returners appeared similar in the rates at which they reported expecting to apply for the credit the following year.

Table 6.3.4.3 Respondents planning to claim Homestead Tax Credit the following year

	<i>All Leavers (n=647)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=414)</i>	<i>Returners (n=233)</i>
Planned to claim next year	73.3%	72.6%	74.7%
Did not plan to claim	22.6%	22.0%	23.6%
Not eligible	4.1%	5.5%	1.8%

^a Sample = only respondents reporting that they were aware of the Homestead Credit, minus 80 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

6.4 Other Family Supports

Those leaving W-2 were asked about other support they might be receiving from relatives and friends. Specifically, leavers were asked if they were receiving free housing from a parent or other relative. They were also asked if they relied on relatives or friends for help in paying bills and, if so, whether those helping them in this way also lived with them. A smaller subset of leavers who did not report that they or a spouse or co-parent were working or receiving support through a public program were asked upon what other sources of support they relied.

6.4.1 Respondents receiving housing or bill-paying help from relatives and friends

A relatively small percentage (7.6%) of respondents reported receiving free housing from a parent or other relative (see table 6.4.1). This figure appeared roughly similar for continuous leavers and returners.

Just over one-quarter (26%) of respondents said they received help in paying their bills from relatives or friends. Of these, about one-quarter (23.8%) reported that the person providing that help lived in the household with them. This response pattern was roughly similar for both continuous leavers and returners, except that a slightly smaller percentage of returners than of continuous leavers reported that those relatives or friends helping them out with bills lived in the same household with them.

Table 6.4.1 Respondents receiving free housing or bill payment help from relatives and friends

	<i>All Leavers (n=1221)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=762)</i>	<i>Returners (n=459)</i>
Received free housing	7.6%	7.5%	7.7%
Received help paying bills	26.0%	24.5%	28.3%
<i>Of those receiving help paying bills:</i>	<i>(n=317)^b</i>	<i>(n=187)</i>	<i>(n=130)</i>
• Helper lived with family	23.8%	26.1%	20.5%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 18 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

^b Sample = *only respondents who received help from friends or family* to pay bills minus 1 respondent for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who was recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because rows represent separate data tables, column percentages do not sum to 100%.

6.4.2 Miscellaneous supports

Just under 15% of respondents indicated by their responses to several survey questions that they lacked any source of regular income from work or support through public programs.

A higher percentage of returners than of continuous leavers reported having no regular means of support. Within this group of those lacking support, however, continuous leavers and

returners reported relying on various particular means of subsistence at similar rates. The single largest source of support for both continuous leavers and returners who lacked other supports (apart from the miscellaneous “other” category) was other adults outside of the household, with assistance from other adults in the household ranking second. “Odd jobs” ranked third, while 8.5% claimed to rely at least in part on savings and 7.2% said they relied on charity.

Table 6.4.2 Miscellaneous supports reported by respondents

	<i>All Leavers (n=1110)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=764)</i>	<i>Returners (n=346)</i>
Leavers indicating no regular means of support	14.9%	10.4%	24.9%
<i>Of these, other ad hoc supports:</i>	<i>(n=165)^b</i>	<i>(n=79)</i>	<i>(n=86)</i>
Others outside household	33.8%	34.9%	32.9%
Other adults in household	21.6%	22.0%	21.3%
Odd jobs	9.0%	8.2%	9.8%
Savings	8.5%	8.9%	8.0%
Charity	7.2%	5.2%	8.9%
Baby-sitting	3.1%	5.2%	1.2%
Selling plasma	1.2%	0.0%	2.4%
Other ^c	15.4%	12.8%	17.8%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 129 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

^b Sample = only respondents *indicating no regular means of support*, minus 1 respondent for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

^c This open-ended category includes only miscellaneous responses left after responses initially coded as “other” were re-coded and allocated to one of the other row categories; remaining responses included “in jail,” (3 resp.), “getting a job,” (3 resp.), “temp work” (2 resp.), “house cleaning” (1 resp.), “income tax return” (1 resp.), “lawsuit settlement” (1 resp.), “selling aluminum” (1 resp.), “Medicare,” (1 resp) and “former unemployment comp, but no more” (1 resp.). A remaining 11 respondents were still recorded as offering “none” or “other” after this further re-coding.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

CHAPTER 7

FAMILY NEEDS AND INDIVIDUAL WELL-BEING

This chapter provides information about the material and financial circumstances W-2 leavers reported experiencing in the two years prior to being interviewed. It also presents W-2 leavers' assessments of their own sense of well-being, and whether and to what extent that sense of well-being had changed since leaving the W-2 program.

Some of the most pressing questions about W-2 concern the financial circumstances participants face both while on assistance and after leaving. Among other things, the survey found that during the two years prior to respondents' being interviewed:

- 48.8% reported experiencing times when they could not afford food.
- 31.8% reported moving because of problems meeting rent or house payments.
- 19.7% said they had gone for a time without heat in their homes.
- 15.4% said they sometimes could not afford medical care for an ill household member.
- 9.2% indicated that they had stayed in a homeless shelter.

Although, in general, higher percentages of respondents reported these circumstances "off of assistance" than reported them "on assistance," many reported experiencing these situations both on and off of assistance. Furthermore, although in most cases the incidence of these situations appears to have been higher for returners to W-2 than for continuous leavers, a pattern of difference between continuous leavers and returners was not always clear or consistent. Section 7.1 presents this pattern in detail.

This chapter also considers leavers' assessments of whether and how their emotions and attitudes had changed since leaving W-2. For example, among the observations the survey yielded:

- 96.1% believed their attitudes toward work had either improved or stayed the same since leaving W-2, with continuous leavers and returners reporting similarly.
- 93.5% of respondents said they felt the same or better about themselves since leaving W-2, with continuous leavers and returners reporting similarly.
- 84.1% said their satisfaction with life was the same or better since leaving W-2, with continuous leavers more likely than returners to report improvement.
- 57.1% said their worries about money had either stayed the same or decreased, with returners more likely than continuous leavers to report increased money concerns.

In many instances, respondents appeared nearly evenly divided between those reporting improvement and those reporting no change, though in this and in patterns of difference between continuous leavers and returners there was considerable variation from one question to another. Section 7.2 examines these findings more closely.

7.1 Family Needs Faced by W-2 Leavers

In the survey, respondents were asked about a variety of situations they might have experienced during the two years prior to being interviewed, such as a lack of medical care when needed, falling behind in bill payments, loss of utilities service, the inability to buy food and the need to combine households to cut costs. In addition to asking respondents whether they had experienced such circumstances, the survey asked them to indicate whether these occurred when the respondents were on assistance, when they were off it, or both when on and when off.

7.1.1 Reasons respondents lacked health coverage

As noted in chapter 3 (table 3.4.1.1), slightly more than three-quarters (77%) of respondents indicated that they had some health coverage. When the remaining respondents were asked why they lacked any coverage, nearly 35% said that they could not afford health insurance. Nearly one-fifth believed themselves to be ineligible for subsidized medical assistance based on their family composition (because, for example, they lacked children of eligible age) or income. An additional 7.1% blamed a caseworker or agency decision ruling them ineligible for medical assistance. Just under 16% attributed their lack of health coverage to the fact either that their employer did not offer insurance or that they had not worked at their job long enough to qualify. The pattern of responses for continuous leavers and returners appeared generally similar with respect to these various explanations for not having health coverage.

	<i>All Leavers (n=267)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=209)</i>	<i>Returners (n=58)</i>
Could not afford insurance	34.7%	35.3%	32.8%
Was not eligible for Medicaid	19.4%	18.3%	22.9%
Job did not offer insurance	11.0%	10.2%	14.1%
Had not sought, did not want insurance ^b	10.1%	9.9%	10.4%
Case management issues ^c	7.1%	8.1%	3.6%
No job, hence no insurance	7.1%	8.1%	3.5%
Hadn't worked long enough	4.7%	4.4%	5.8%
Other ^d	6.1%	5.7%	7.1%

^a Sample = only respondents *indicating that they had no health coverage*, minus 18 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

^b Includes respondents who indicated they had not applied for insurance as well as those who said they were in fact insured, had SSI, or "didn't like the system."

^c Includes respondents who indicated that they were "sanctioned," or "cut off" as well as those who said they applied for insurance and were denied or had cases pending.

^d A large percentage of responses originally coded only as "other" turned out, on closer inspection, to belong in one of the other pre-coded categories. These were re-coded accordingly. Among the responses remaining as "other" even after re-coding were "in jail," "don't know," "no reason," and just over 3% who were listed simply as "other."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

7.1.2 Respondents unable to afford medical care for an ill member of their household

Slightly more than 15% of respondents said they had experienced one or more times during the previous two years when they could not afford medical care for a household member who was ill. Table 7.1.2 presents the overall rates at which both continuous leavers and returners reported such episodes, including when these episodes occurred. As that table indicates, the percentage of continuous leavers who reported such circumstances at some time was similar to that for returners.¹

Somewhat clearer contrasts between continuous leavers and returners were apparent once one distinguished between respondents who experienced this situation only when on assistance, those who experienced it only when off of assistance, and those who experienced it under both circumstances. For example, a higher percentage of continuous leavers than of returners reported an inability to pay for needed medical care only when off assistance.

	<i>All Leavers (n=1230)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=766)</i>	<i>Returners (n=465)</i>
No	84.6%	83.3%	86.9%
Yes	15.4%	16.7%	13.1%
• When on assistance	1.8%	1.3%	2.6%
• When off assistance	9.2%	11.6%	5.4%
• Both on and off assistance	4.3%	3.9%	5.0%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 9 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Percentages in the last three rows are subtotals of the "Yes" row.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

¹A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported being unable to pay for medical care for an ill household member with those who did not report this was not statistically significant.

7.1.3 Respondents who lost a vehicle because unable to keep up with payments

Slightly more than 5% of respondents reported having lost a car or truck during the previous two years because they were unable to keep up with the payments. The similar figures for continuous leavers and returners in this respect are presented in table 7.1.3, as is a further breakdown detailing when these circumstances occurred.² A slight plurality of those respondents who reported losing a vehicle indicated that this occurred only when off assistance, although even this largest subgroup represented just over 2% of total respondents.

	<i>All Leavers (n=1233)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=768)</i>	<i>Returners (n=465)</i>
No	94.7%	93.9%	96.0%
Yes	5.3%	6.1%	4.0%
• When on assistance	1.6%	2.0%	1.1%
• When off assistance	2.3%	2.7%	1.6%
• Both on and off assistance	1.4%	1.5%	1.3%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 6 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Percentages in the last three rows are subtotals of the “Yes” row.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

²A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported losing a vehicle at any time and respondents who did not was not statistically significant.

7.1.4 Respondents who fell behind on their rent or other housing payment

More than one-half (54.7%) of respondents reported having fallen behind on their rent or other housing payment at some point during the previous two years. As table 7.1.4 indicates, however, returners to W-2 were more likely to have experienced such episodes than were continuous leavers.³

A relatively small percentage (8.8%) said they experienced this problem only when on public assistance. Similar percentages of continuous leavers and returners reported having fallen behind in these payments only when off assistance.

	<i>All Leavers (n=1230)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=766)</i>	<i>Returners (n=465)</i>
No	45.3%	50.1%	37.4%
Yes	54.7%	49.9%	62.6%
• When on assistance	8.8%	6.4%	12.7%
• When off assistance	23.5%	23.8%	23.1%
• Both on and off assistance	22.4%	19.7%	26.8%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 9 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Percentages in the last three rows are subtotals of the “Yes” row.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

³A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported falling behind on a payment and respondents who did not was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

7.1.5 Respondents forced to move because unable to make housing payments

Less than one-third (31.8%) of respondents indicated that they had been forced to move at some point during the previous two years because they could not pay their rent or make another housing payment. Figures for both continuous leaver respondents and returner respondents appear in table 7.1.5. Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to have experienced this situation.⁴

Of those respondents who reported having to move, the largest single group was that reporting that this occurred only when off assistance. The percentages of respondents reporting this experience appeared to be somewhat higher for returners than for continuous leavers across all three subgroups: those who encountered this circumstance only when on assistance, those who experienced it only when off, and those who reported that it occurred both on and off assistance.

Table 7.1.5 Respondents forced to move because unable to make housing payments			
	<i>All Leavers (n=1231)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=766)</i>	<i>Returners (n=464)</i>
No	68.2%	72.0%	61.8%
Yes	31.8%	28.0%	38.2%
• When on assistance	6.9%	5.8%	8.5%
• When off assistance	14.8%	13.9%	16.4%
• Both on and off assistance	10.2%	8.3%	13.4%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 8 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Percentages in the last three rows are subtotals of the "Yes" row.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

⁴A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported having to move for financial reasons and respondents who did not was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

7.1.6 Respondents who fell behind on a utility bill or bills

More than 70% of respondents said that they had fallen behind on a utility bill at some point during the previous two years, either when on assistance, off assistance, or both. Table 7.1.6 presents the breakdown of these responses for continuous leavers and returners as well as the details of when these circumstances occurred. As that table shows, returners were more likely than returners to indicate having encountered such circumstances.⁵

Of those respondents who reported falling behind on a utility bill, those who said they had fallen behind only when on assistance formed the smallest group. Returners to W-2 reported this at higher rates than continuous leavers, but reported falling behind only when off assistance at lower rates than continuous leavers.

	<i>All Leavers (n=1232)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=769)</i>	<i>Returners (n=463)</i>
No	28.6%	30.7%	25.0%
Yes	71.4%	69.3%	75.0%
• When on assistance	12.9%	11.5%	15.1%
• When off assistance	27.0%	28.8%	24.1%
• Both on and off assistance	31.6%	29.0%	35.8%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 7 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Percentages in the last three rows are subtotals of the “Yes” row.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

⁵A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported having fallen behind at some point and respondents who did not was statistically significant ($p < .05$).

7.1.7 Respondents experiencing episodes without electricity in their homes

Just under 20% of respondents indicated that on one or more occasions during the previous two years they had gone without electricity because of a failure to keep up with payments. As shown in table 7.1.7, returners were more likely than continuous leavers to indicate having experienced such episodes.⁶

Respondents who reported experiencing episodes without electricity in their homes appeared to divide about evenly among those who experienced this while on assistance, while off assistance, or both. Continuous leavers and returners were roughly similar in the rates at which they reported having had this happen only when off of assistance.

	<i>All Leavers (n=1229)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=766)</i>	<i>Returners (n=463)</i>
No	80.5%	84.4%	73.9%
Yes	19.6%	15.6%	26.1%
• When on assistance	5.9%	4.1%	8.8%
• When off assistance	7.0%	6.5%	7.8%
• Both on and off assistance	6.7%	5.0%	9.4%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 10 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Percentages in the last three rows are subtotals of the “Yes” row.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

⁶A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported a loss of electrical service due to failure to pay and respondents who did not was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

7.1.8 Respondents experiencing episodes without heat in their homes

Approximately one-fifth (19.7%) of respondents said that they had gone without heat in their homes at some time during the previous two years because of an inability to pay for it. As table 7.1.8 indicates, returners were more likely than continuous leavers to say they had experienced such circumstances.⁷

The largest percentage of respondents who went without heat in their homes were those who reported having experienced this only when off assistance. Similar percentages of returners and continuous leavers reported going without heat only when off assistance.

Table 7.1.8 Respondents experiencing episodes without heat in their homes

	<i>All Leavers (n=1233)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=769)</i>	<i>Returners (n=464)</i>
No	80.3%	82.9%	76.1%
Yes	19.7%	17.1%	24.0%
• When on assistance	5.3%	4.2%	7.1%
• When off assistance	9.2%	8.8%	9.9%
• Both on and off assistance	5.2%	4.1%	7.0%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 5 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Percentages in the last three rows are subtotals of the “Yes” row.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

⁷A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported going without heat at any time and respondents who did not was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

7.1.9 Respondents whose telephone service was cut off

Slightly more than one-half (52.2%) of respondents reported having their telephone service cut off at some point in the previous two years because of an inability to pay their bills.⁸ Returners to W-2 were more likely than continuous leavers to indicate that this had happened to them.⁹

One-fifth of respondents reported experiencing a loss of telephone service only when off assistance, and similar percentages indicated that this happened to them both when they were on assistance and when they were off. Returners to W-2 appeared similar to continuous leavers in the rate at which they reported experiencing this situation only when off assistance. However, a larger percentage of returners than of continuous leavers reported losing telephone service both when on and when off assistance.

Table 7.1.9 Respondents whose telephone service was cut off

	<i>All Leavers (n=1229)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=766)</i>	<i>Returners (n=464)</i>
No	47.9%	51.0%	42.6%
Yes	52.1%	49.0%	57.4%
• When on assistance	12.2%	11.1%	14.1%
• When off assistance	20.0%	20.6%	19.0%
• Both on and off assistance	19.9%	17.3%	24.3%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 10 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Percentages in the last three rows are subtotals of the "Yes" row.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

⁸The higher rate at which this occurred as compared with heat and electricity cutoff may reflect laws that restrict utility companies' ability summarily to terminate heat and electricity service but that do not apply to telephone service.

⁹A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported having their telephone service cut off at any point and respondents who did not was statistically significant ($p < .05$).

7.1.10 Respondents who stayed in a homeless shelter

Slightly more than 9% of respondents said that they had stayed in a homeless shelter on one or more occasions during the previous two years. Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to report having made use of a homeless shelter at some point during this period.¹⁰

Of those respondents who reported staying at a homeless shelter, those who said this happened only when off assistance represented the single largest group. Similar percentages of returners and continuous leavers reported using a homeless shelter only when off assistance.

	<i>All Leavers (n=1233)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=768)</i>	<i>Returners (n=464)</i>
No	90.8%	92.6%	87.8%
Yes	9.2%	7.4%	12.2%
• When on assistance	3.0%	2.1%	4.4%
• When off assistance	3.9%	3.9%	3.7%
• Both on and off assistance	2.4%	1.3%	4.1%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 6 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Percentages in the last three rows are subtotals of the “Yes” row.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

¹⁰A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported having to stay in a homeless shelter and respondents who did not was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

7.1.11 Respondents who moved in with others to share expenses

One-quarter (25.5%) of respondents said that on one or more occasions during the previous two years they had found it necessary to move in with others in order to save on expenses. Returners to W-2 were more likely than continuous leavers to report have taken this step at some point during this time, either on or off assistance or both.¹¹

Of those respondents who reported moving in with others in order to share expenses, about one-half (12.9% of total respondents) indicated that this only happened when they were off assistance. Returners reported this experience at somewhat higher rates than did continuous leavers whether they were referring to periods on assistance, off assistance, or both.

	<i>All Leavers (n=1234)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=768)</i>	<i>Returners (n=465)</i>
No	74.5%	77.0%	70.3%
Yes	25.5%	23.0%	29.8%
• When on assistance	4.6%	4.2%	5.2%
• When off assistance	12.9%	12.1%	14.2%
• Both on and off assistance	8.1%	6.8%	10.4%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 5 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Percentages in the last three rows are subtotals of the "Yes" row.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

¹¹A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported moving in with others to share expenses and respondents who did not was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

7.1.12 Respondents who had others move in with them to share expenses

Approximately 10% of respondents reported having others move in with them to share expenses at one time or another during the previous two years. Continuous leavers and returners appeared similar in this respect.¹²

As was the case with many other circumstances about which respondents were asked, of those who had others move in with them to share expenses, those who said this happened only when off assistance represented the single largest group. This was true of both continuous leaver respondents and of returners. However, a higher percentage of continuous leavers than of returners reported having this happen to them only when off assistance.

Table 7.1.12 Respondents who had others move in with them to share expenses

	<i>All Leavers (n=1233)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=767)</i>	<i>Returners (n=465)</i>
No	90.0%	90.1%	89.9%
Yes	10.0%	9.9%	10.1%
• When on assistance	1.8%	1.0%	3.1%
• When off assistance	5.7%	6.4%	4.6%
• Both on and off assistance	2.5%	2.6%	2.4%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 6 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Percentages in the last three rows are subtotals of the “Yes” row.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

¹²A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported having others move in with them and respondents who did not was not statistically significant.

7.1.13 Respondents with no way to buy food

Nearly one-half of survey respondents reported having experienced, during the previous two years, one or more episodes when they could not afford to buy food. Respondents who returned to W-2 and those who did not appeared similar in this respect.¹³

Of those respondents who experienced episodes of inability to afford food, the largest single group consisted of those who had experienced this only when off of assistance, although the percentage of respondents reporting this experience both on and off of assistance was nearly as large. Returners reported experiencing this off assistance at lower rates than did continuous leavers.

	<i>All Leavers (n=1234)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=770)</i>	<i>Returners (n=464)</i>
No	51.2%	52.0%	49.9%
Yes	48.8%	48.0%	50.1%
• When on assistance	7.6%	5.8%	10.5%
• When off assistance	21.5%	24.0%	17.3%
• Both on and off assistance	19.7%	18.2%	22.3%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 5 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Percentages in the last three rows are subtotals of the “Yes” row.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

¹³A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported instances of being unable to buy food and respondents who did not was not statistically significant.

7.1.14 Respondents who sent children to live elsewhere when unable to care for them

Nearly 9% of respondents reported having experienced, during the previous two years, situations in which they felt unable to provide for their children and sent those children to live with others. Similar percentages of returners and continuous leavers reported finding themselves in such circumstances.¹⁴

Of respondents who sent their children to live with others, those who reported doing so only when off assistance formed the single largest group. Continuous leaver respondents and returner respondents appeared similar in their reporting of when in their histories of moving on and off of assistance they experienced this situation.

Table 7.1.14 Respondents sending children to live elsewhere when unable to care for them			
	<i>All Leavers (n=1233)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=768)</i>	<i>Returners (n=465)</i>
No	91.2%	91.3%	91.2%
Yes	8.8%	8.7%	8.8%
• When on assistance	2.5%	2.5%	2.4%
• When off assistance	4.1%	4.0%	4.4%
• Both on and off assistance	2.2%	2.3%	2.0%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 6 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Percentages in the last three rows are subtotals of the "Yes" row.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

¹⁴A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported sending their children to live with others and respondents who did not was not statistically significant.

7.1.15 Respondents unable to find a baby-sitter needed in order to work

Slightly more than one-third (34.2%) of respondents reported having been unable, one or more times during the previous two years, to find a baby-sitter when necessary in order to work. The figures appeared similar for both continuous leavers and returners.¹⁵

Among respondents who reported occasions when they could not find a baby-sitter they needed in order to go to work, those who reported experiencing this both on and off of assistance represented the largest single group, with those who only experienced this when off of assistance representing a slightly smaller percentage. A larger percentage of continuous leaver respondents than of returner respondents indicated that this had happened to them only when off assistance.

Table 7.1.15 Respondents unable to find a baby-sitter needed in order to work

	<i>All Leavers (n=1228)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=767)</i>	<i>Returners (n=461)</i>
No	65.8%	66.5%	64.7%
Yes	34.2%	33.6%	35.3%
• When on assistance	5.7%	3.9%	8.7%
• When off assistance	13.2%	14.8%	10.5%
• Both on and off assistance	15.3%	14.8%	16.1%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 11 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Percentages in the last three rows are subtotals of the "Yes" row.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

¹⁵A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported instances of an inability to find a baby-sitter and respondents who did not was not statistically significant.

7.1.16 Respondents unable to pay for a baby-sitter needed in order to work

More than 40% of respondents said that they had, during the previous two years, occasionally needed a baby-sitter in order to work and been unable to pay for one. Continuous leavers and returners appeared to report this experience at similar rates.¹⁶

Among respondents who reported occasions when they could not afford a baby-sitter needed in order to go to work, those who reported experiencing this both on and off of assistance represented the largest single group, with those who only experienced this when off of assistance representing a slightly smaller percentage. Returners reported this at roughly similar rates to continuous leavers, whether referring to periods on assistance, off assistance, or both.

Table 7.1.16 Respondents unable to pay for baby-sitter needed in order to work			
	<i>All Leavers (n=1229)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=767)</i>	<i>Returners (n=462)</i>
No	58.1%	57.6%	58.8%
Yes	41.9%	42.4%	41.2%
• When on assistance	6.0%	4.6%	8.3%
• When off assistance	16.0%	16.9%	14.7%
• Both on and off assistance	19.9%	20.9%	18.3%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 10 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Percentages in the last three rows are subtotals of the "Yes" row.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

¹⁶A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported an inability to pay for a needed baby-sitter at any time and respondents who did not was not statistically significant.

7.2 Leavers' Sense of Well-being

In addition to gathering information from leavers about particular material needs, the survey asked respondents specific questions about their well-being. These included questions about skills and capacities like setting goals, making decisions, handling money, and managing life. They also included questions about emotional states such as stress, self-esteem and worries about finances and family. In each case, respondents were asked whether they felt they had improved, grown worse, or remained the same with respect to that particular attribute since leaving the W-2 program.

7.2.1 Respondents' assessments of their goal-setting skills since leaving W-2

Nearly one-half (48.7%) of those who responded to the survey felt that they had become "better at setting goals" for themselves since leaving W-2. Continuous leavers were more likely than returners to report such improvement.¹⁷

	<i>All Leavers (n=1198)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=755)</i>	<i>Returners (n=443)</i>
Better	48.7%	51.7%	43.8%
No difference	41.7%	39.6%	45.2%
Worse	9.6%	8.7%	11.1%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 41 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

¹⁷A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who said their goal-setting skills were better and all other respondents was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

7.2.2 Respondents' assessments of their money worries since leaving W-2

Approximately 43% of respondents reported that they “worried more about money” since leaving W-2, while more than one-third (35.6%) registered no change in this area. Respondents who returned to W-2 were more likely to indicate such increased worries than were continuous leavers.¹⁸

	<i>All Leavers (n=1210)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=756)</i>	<i>Returners (n=453)</i>
More	42.9%	40.0%	47.9%
No difference	35.6%	37.6%	32.2%
Less	21.5%	22.4%	19.9%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 29 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

7.2.3 Respondents' as of their decision-making skills since leaving W-2

One-half (49.5%) of all respondents reported believing that they “made better decisions” since leaving W-2, although a substantial percentage (44.4%) reported no change. Respondents who returned to cash assistance reported such improvement at a rate similar to that reported by continuous leavers.¹⁹

	<i>All Leavers (n=1203)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=749)</i>	<i>Returners (n=454)</i>
Better	49.5%	51.7%	45.9%
No difference	44.4%	43.4%	45.9%
Worse	6.1%	4.9%	8.2%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 36 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

¹⁸A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who said they were more worried about money and all other respondents was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

¹⁹A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who said they had become better at making decisions and all other respondents was not statistically significant.

7.2.4 Respondents' assessments of their attitude toward work since leaving W-2

Slightly more than one-half (51.2%) of respondents reported that their "attitude toward working was better" since leaving W-2. Similar percentages of returners and continuous leavers indicated that they believed their attitude toward work had improved.²⁰

Table 7.2.4 Respondents' assessments of their attitudes toward work

	<i>All Leavers (n=1203)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=752)</i>	<i>Returners (n=450)</i>
Better	51.2%	49.4%	54.4%
No difference	44.9%	47.2%	40.9%
Worse	3.9%	3.4%	4.7%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 36 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

7.2.5 Respondents' assessments of their life-management capabilities since leaving W-2

One-half (50.1%) of all respondents reported that "the way they managed their lives was better" since leaving W-2. Continuous leavers were more likely to indicate such improvement than were returners to W-2.²¹

Table 7.2.5 Respondents' assessments of their life-management capabilities

	<i>All Leavers (n=1195)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=749)</i>	<i>Returners (n=446)</i>
Better	50.1%	53.9%	43.8%
No difference	42.9%	40.1%	47.5%
Worse	7.1%	6.1%	8.7%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 44 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

²⁰A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who indicated that their attitude toward work had improved and all other respondents was not statistically significant.

²¹A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who said their life-management skills had improved and all other respondents was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

7.2.6 Respondents' feelings about themselves since leaving W-2

Approximately 60% of all respondents said that they felt “better about themselves” since leaving W-2 cash assistance. Another one-third (33.5%) indicated they felt the same. Continuous leavers and returners appeared similar in the rates at which they reported that their self-evaluation had improved.²²

	<i>All Leavers (n=1209)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=758)</i>	<i>Returners (n=450)</i>
Better	60.0%	59.5%	60.8%
No difference	33.5%	34.4%	31.9%
Worse	6.5%	6.1%	7.3%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 30 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

7.2.7 Respondents' assessments of their money-handling skills since leaving W-2

Just over 40% of respondents believed they had become “better at handling money” since leaving W-2, while more than one-half (51.7%) reported no change in this area. Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to perceive improvement in this respect.²³

	<i>All Leavers (n=1211)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=757)</i>	<i>Returners (n=454)</i>
Better	40.5%	38.3%	44.2%
No difference	51.7%	55.1%	46.1%
Worse	7.8%	6.6%	9.7%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 28 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

²²A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported feeling better about themselves and all other respondents was not statistically significant.

²³A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported improved money-handling skills and all other respondents was statistically significant ($p < .05$).

7.2.8 Respondents' assessments of their family worries since leaving W-2

Approximately 43% of respondents indicated that they “worried more about their families” since leaving W-2, although almost as large a percentage (39.7%) said they perceived no change. However, returners to W-2 were more likely than continuous leavers to say they had experienced increased worries since leaving.²⁴

	<i>All Leavers (n=1213)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=757)</i>	<i>Returners (n=456)</i>
More	43.4%	39.0%	50.7%
No difference	39.7%	41.3%	37.0%
Less	16.9%	19.7%	12.3%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 26 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

7.2.9 Respondents' assessments of their level of stress since leaving W-2

Less than one-half (46.8%) of respondents said they “felt more stress” since leaving W-2, with just under one-quarter (23.6%) saying they felt less stress and nearly 30% reporting no change. The distributions of responses for continuous leavers and returners appeared similar.²⁵

	<i>All Leavers (n=1212)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=757)</i>	<i>Returners (n=454)</i>
More	46.8%	45.6%	48.7%
No difference	29.6%	30.1%	28.9%
Less	23.6%	24.4%	22.4%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 27 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

²⁴A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who said they worried more about their families and by all other respondents was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

²⁵A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported increased stress and all other respondents was not statistically significant.

7.2.10 Respondents' satisfaction with their lives since leaving W-2

Close to one-half (46.1%) of respondents reported feeling “more satisfied with their lives” since leaving W-2, with another 38% reporting no change. However, continuous leaver respondents were more likely than returner respondents to register such increased satisfaction.²⁶

	<i>All Leavers (n=1199)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=752)</i>	<i>Returns (n=448)</i>
More	46.1%	49.2%	41.0%
No difference	38.0%	36.9%	40.0%
Less	15.9%	14.0%	19.0%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 40 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don't know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

²⁶A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported increased satisfaction with life and by all other respondents was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

CHAPTER 8

LEAVERS' CHILD CARE AND CHILD WELL-BEING

This chapter provides information about leavers' access to child care and the relationship between that access and leavers' ability to obtain and sustain work. This includes findings about leavers' use of W-2-related child-care assistance. This chapter also reports on several indicators of child well-being, particularly as these relate to the performance of leavers' children in school.

The survey results reveal a leaver population making active use of child-care arrangements and assistance in conjunction with efforts to find and hold jobs, albeit while encountering some challenges along the way. For example, among respondents with children under age 13:

- 86.3% reported having some child-care arrangements while at work, with continuous leavers and returners reporting similar circumstances.
- 61% of those with child-care arrangements reported having sought a child-care subsidy, with returners more likely than continuous leavers to report this.
- 66.1% of those seeking child-care subsidies said they had received one, with continuous leavers and returners reporting this at similar rates.
- 30.2% of respondents with a child in child care reported that a child-care problem had interfered with work efforts, with returners more likely than continuous leavers to report this.
- 15.6% reported lacking child care for at least one child under age 13, with similar percentages of continuous leavers and returners reporting this circumstance.

When asked about the well-being of a randomly selected "sample" child in each of their families, few respondents reported that their children had become worse off in the preceding months. In fact:

- 83.2% reported that their child's grades had improved or remained the same, with continuous leavers and returners reporting similar results.
- 88.5% reported that their child's school attendance had improved or remained the same, with continuous leavers and returners reporting similarly.
- 93% reported that their child's health had improved or stayed the same, again with similar results for continuous leavers and returners.

The remainder of this chapter explores these findings in greater detail. Section 8.1 presents information about child-care arrangements for the children under 13 in survey respondents' immediate families. Section 8.2 reports survey results concerning the well-being of a randomly-selected "sample" child of any age in the respondent's family.

8.1 Leavers' Access to and Problems with Child care

Respondents were asked about their basic child-care needs and arrangements for children in their families younger than age 13: whether they had such arrangements and whether all such children in their families were covered by these arrangements.¹ Respondents who indicated that they had child-care arrangements for at least some of their children under age 13 were then asked whether they had sought and received child-care assistance through the W-2 program.

Respondents who indicated that difficulties obtaining child care had interfered in some way with their efforts to find and hold a job were asked more specifically about these challenges. For example, respondents were asked whether they had ever not been hired for a job, or had ever felt it necessary to quit a job, because of problems with their child-care arrangements.

Readers should bear in mind when consulting the following tables that in many cases the percentages shown are of a specific smaller **subset** of the survey sample, not of the entire population of survey respondents. In such cases, percentages shown for that subset will actually represent much smaller percentages of the survey sample as a whole.

8.1.1 Respondents with children under 13 and some child-care arrangements

Slightly more than 86% of respondents who had one or more children under age 13 in their immediate families also indicated that they had someone to care for at least some of those children while the respondent was at work, in training, or looking for work. Slightly less than 14% said they lacked such child-care arrangements. Similar percentages of returners and continuous leavers reported having child-care arrangements.²

	<i>All Leavers (n=1035)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=652)</i>	<i>Returners (n=383)</i>
Had child care	86.3%	86.3%	86.2%
No child care	13.7%	13.7%	13.8%

^a Sample = only respondents reporting at least one child under 13 in their immediate family; minus 12 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

¹Note that responses in this area were sought only with respect to children under 13 in the respondent's *immediate family*, a slightly smaller number than that for respondents reporting a child under 13 in the *household* (on the latter, see table 2.3.1).

In the second-quarter survey, respondents were asked directly whether or not they had "someone to care for" their children while at work, in training, or looking for work. This question was not asked in this direct fashion in the third- and fourth-quarter surveys. Combining results from all three quarters entailed creating, for the third and fourth quarters, the functional equivalents of answers to the direct second-quarter question from information recorded in a grid of responses to more detailed questions about child-care arrangements for each child under age 13 in the respondent's immediate family. Respondents with family grids showing any answer code entered for any child in response to a question about whether care was provided inside or outside the home were considered the same as a "yes" response to the direct question asked in the second-quarter survey.

²A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported having some child-care arrangements and those who reported not having them was not statistically significant.

8.1.2 Respondents with child-care arrangements and applying for child-care assistance

Of those respondents who had children under age 13 and who indicated having child-care arrangements, 61% reported having applied for child-care subsidy assistance. Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to have applied for such assistance.³

	<i>All Leavers (n=879)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=556)</i>	<i>Returners (n=323)</i>
Applied for subsidy	61.0%	57.7%	66.5%
Did not apply for subsidy	39.0%	42.3%	33.5%

^a Sample = only respondents reporting at least one child under 13 in their immediate family and reporting some child-care arrangements, minus 15 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

8.1.3 Respondents receiving child-care assistance for which they applied

Of respondents who had child-care arrangements and who had applied for a child-care subsidy to pay for those arrangements, nearly two-thirds (66.1%) reported that they were receiving such assistance through their local W-2 or county agency. Similar percentages of continuous leavers and returners reported receiving such child-care assistance.⁴

	<i>All Leavers (n=500)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=303)</i>	<i>Returners (n=197)</i>
Received subsidy	66.1%	66.2%	66.0%
Did not receive subsidy	33.9%	33.8%	34.0%

^a Sample = only respondents reporting at least one child under 13 in their immediate family and reporting some child-care arrangements and who reported applying for W-2 child-care assistance, minus 37 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

³A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents with child-care arrangements for at least one child under age 13 and who applied for child-care assistance and by similar respondents who did not apply for child-care assistance was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

⁴A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who applied for and received child-care assistance and those who applied but did not receive it was not statistically significant.

8.1.4 Respondents lacking child care for at least one child under 13

Having child-care arrangements did not necessarily mean having them for every child in a family. Approximately 15.6% of respondents with a child under age 13 reported lacking any child care for at least one such child while engaged in work activity.⁵ Continuous leavers and returners reported such circumstances at roughly similar rates.⁶

	<i>All Leavers (n=1037)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=652)</i>	<i>Returners (n=385)</i>
Had no child under 13 without care	84.4%	85.2%	83.1%
At least one child under 13 without care	15.6%	14.8%	16.9%

^a Sample = only respondents reporting at least one child under 13 in their immediate family; minus 10 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

⁵The second-quarter survey asked respondents directly whether or not there were any children under 13 in their immediate families for whom they had no child-care arrangements while at work. This question was not asked in this direct way in the third- and fourth-quarter surveys. As with the information reported in table 8.1.1 above (see footnote 2), in order to obtain equivalent information for the third and fourth quarters and combine the results for all three quarters, a proxy question/response set was fashioned for the third and fourth quarters from detailed responses about each child that were entered in a response grid for that respondent family. Grids which displayed any answer code with respect to any child in response to a question about “reasons for lacking child care” were treated, for the third and fourth quarters, as equivalent to a “yes” response to the direct question asked in the second quarter survey.

In comparing the findings reported tables 8.1.4 with those in table 8.1.1 one should note that the question addressed in table 8.1.1 did not clearly specify that a respondent have child-care arrangements for *all* the children under 13 in the family. Respondents could answer “yes” to the direct question asked in quarter 2—whether they had “someone to care for” their children while at work—without necessarily having care arrangements for all of their children. For quarters 3 and 4 the equivalent of a “yes” response to that question was entered if the respondent indicated having child-care arrangements for *any* child under 13 in the family. In neither case did a “yes” response here preclude indicating elsewhere in the survey that that the respondent had one or more children under 13 for whom child-care arrangements were not available. Hence it was possible for the number of respondents indicating a least one child without care (table 8.1.4) to be somewhat greater than those reporting no child-care arrangements whatsoever (table 8.1.1).

⁶A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported lacking care for at least one child and those who did not was not statistically significant.

8.1.5 Respondents whose child-care problems interfered with work

Of those respondents with child care for at least one child under age 13, slightly more than 30% reported that a problem with child care had interfered with efforts to find or hold a job. Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to have a child-care problem that interfered with their job or job search.⁷

Table 8.1.5 Respondents with children under 13 and child-care problems that interfered with work

	<i>All Leavers (n=884)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=561)</i>	<i>Returners (n=323)</i>
Problems did not interfere	69.8%	72.2%	65.8%
Had problems that interfered	30.2%	27.8%	34.2%

^a Sample = only respondents reporting at least one child under 13 in their immediate family and reporting some child care, minus 10 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

⁷A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents with child care for at least one child under 13 and who reported that child-care problems interfered with work and by similar respondents who did not report this was statistically significant ($p < .05$).

8.1.6 Respondents whose child-care problems interfered with work: lacked infant care

Of those respondents who reported that a problem with child care had interfered with their work efforts, approximately one-half (47.8%) specified that these problems included an inability to find care for an infant. Although a slightly higher percentage of continuous leavers than of returners reported experiencing this problem, the difference was not statistically significant.⁸

Table 8.1.6 Respondents whose child-care problems interfered with work: lacked infant care

	<i>All Leavers (n=264)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=154)</i>	<i>Returners (n=110)</i>
Problem was lack of infant care	47.8%	49.8%	45.0%
Problem wasn't lack of infant care	52.2%	50.2%	55.0%

^a Sample = only respondents reporting at least one child under 13 in their immediate family and reporting some child care and reporting that a child-care problem interfered with work, minus 2 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

8.1.7 Respondents whose child-care problems interfered with work: not hired

Among those respondents who reported that child-care problems interfered with their work, slightly more than one-third (35.5%) indicated more specifically that a child-care problem had caused them not to be hired for a job they were seeking. Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to report having not been hired for a job because of a child-care issue.⁹

Table 8.1.7 Respondents whose child-care problems interfered with work: not hired

	<i>All Leavers (n=263)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=154)</i>	<i>Returners (n=109)</i>
Never not hired because of child-care problems	64.5%	69.5%	57.4%
Was not hired, owing to child-care problems	35.5%	30.5%	42.6%

^a Sample = only respondents reporting at least one child under 13 in their immediate family and reporting some child care and reporting that a child-care problem interfered with work, minus 3 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

⁸A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents reporting that problems with child care interfered with work and further indicating problems specifically with infant care and by similar respondents who did not indicate this was not statistically significant.

⁹A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents reporting that problems with child care interfered with work and further reporting that they were not hired because of a child-care problem and other respondents reporting that a child-care problem interfered with work was statistically significant ($p < .05$).

8.1.8 Respondents whose child-care problems interfered with work: couldn't work full-time

Of those respondents who reported that a problem with child care had interfered with their work, slightly more than two-thirds (68.7%) specified that they were unable to work full-time because of a child-care problem. A slightly higher percentage of continuous leavers than of returners reported having this difficulty, but the difference was not statistically significant.¹⁰

Table 8.1.8 Respondents whose child-care problems interfered with work: couldn't work full-time

	<i>All Leavers (n=265)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=155)</i>	<i>Returners (n=110)</i>
Unable to work full time	68.7%	67.8%	70.0%
Able to work full time	31.3%	32.2%	30.0%

^a Sample = only respondents reporting at least one child under 13 in their immediate family and reporting some child care and reporting that a child-care problem interfered with work, minus 1 respondent for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who was recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

8.1.9 Respondents whose child-care problems interfered with work: had to quit

Among respondents who said a child-care problem interfered with their work, just over 60% indicated specifically that they had quit a job because of a child-care problem. Continuous leavers and returners in this group were similar in the rates at which they reported having to quit a job over child-care issues.¹¹

Table 8.1.9 Respondents whose child-care problems interfered with work: had to quit

	<i>All Leavers (n=265)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=155)</i>	<i>Returners (n=110)</i>
Quit a job over child care	60.3%	60.0%	60.7%
Never quit over child care	39.7%	40.0%	39.3%

^a Sample = only respondents reporting at least one child under 13 in their immediate family and reporting some child care and reporting that a child-care problem interfered with work, minus 1 respondent for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who was recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

¹⁰A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who said that a child-care problem interfered with work and who further reported being unable to work full-time because of a child-care problem, and similar respondents who did not report being unable to work full time was not statistically significant.

¹¹A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who said that a child-care problem interfered with work and who further reported having quit a job because of a child-care problem, and similar respondents who did not report having quit a job for that reason was not statistically significant.

8.1.10 Respondents having difficulty with transportation to child care

Of those respondents who reported having at least one child under age 13 in child care, 28.5% said they either “frequently” or “sometimes” experienced difficulties with transportation to or from the child-care provider. Returner respondents reported such difficulties at a higher rate than did continuous leaver respondents.

	<i>All Leavers (n=853)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=539)</i>	<i>Returns (n=314)</i>
Never	45.0%	48.9%	38.4%
Not very often	28.5%	29.2%	27.3%
Sometimes	17.0%	14.3%	21.6%
Frequently	9.5%	7.7%	12.7%

^a Sample = only respondents reporting at least one child under 13 in their immediate family and reporting some child care, minus 43 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

8.2 Well-being of Leavers' Children

In the survey, respondents were asked several questions about one of their children, selected at random as a "sample child." If the child was in school or had been enrolled during the last school year, the questions concerned any changes in the child's grades, attendance, and interactions with teachers since January 1999. Respondents were also asked generally about any changes in their "sample" child's state of health in the previous six months.

8.2.1 Respondents' assessments of changes in child's grades

Nearly 44% of those respondents whose "sample" child was in school reported that this child's grades had improved since January 1999. Nearly another 40% said their sample child's grades had remained the same. This pattern of responses appeared roughly similar for both continuous leavers and returners.

	<i>All Leavers (n=641)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=383)</i>	<i>Returners (n=258)</i>
Better	43.8%	44.3%	43.1%
Same	39.4%	39.9%	38.6%
Worse	16.8%	15.8%	18.3%

^a Sample = respondents reporting that a randomly selected "sample child" was in school, minus 47 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

8.2.2 Respondents' assessments of changes in child's school attendance

One-third (33.3%) of respondents with a "sample" child in school reported that this child's school attendance had improved between January 1999 and the end of the school year. More than one-half reported that the child's attendance pattern had remained the same. A higher percentage of returners than of continuous leavers reported that their child's school attendance had grown worse.

	<i>All Leavers (n=653)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=386)</i>	<i>Returners (n=267)</i>
Better	33.3%	31.3%	36.2%
Same	55.2%	59.3%	49.1%
Worse	11.5%	9.3%	14.7%

^a Sample = only respondents reporting that a randomly selected "sample child" was in school, minus 35 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

8.2.3 Respondents' assessments of changes in child's interaction with teachers

Approximately 29% of respondents whose "sample" child was in school reported that this child was getting along better with his or her teachers, with just under 15% saying that their child's interaction had grown worse. Similar percentages of continuous leavers and returners reported that their child's interaction with teachers was either the same or better.

Table 8.2.3 Respondents' assessments of changes in child's interaction with teachers

	<i>All Leavers (n=648)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=382)</i>	<i>Returners (n=265)</i>
Better	29.0%	27.9%	30.6%
Same	56.2%	59.1%	52.0%
Worse	14.9%	13.0%	17.4%

^a Sample = only respondents reporting that a randomly selected "sample child" was in school, minus 40 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

8.2.4 Respondents' assessments of changes in their child's health

Nearly one-third (32.7%) of respondents said that their "sample" child's health had improved in the previous six months, and just over 60% said that the child's health had not changed. This pattern of responses appeared similar for continuous leavers and returners.

Table 8.2.4 Respondents' assessments of changes in child's health

	<i>All Leavers (n=1146)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=711)</i>	<i>Returners (n=435)</i>
Better	32.7%	32.0%	33.9%
Same	60.3%	61.4%	58.5%
Worse	7.0%	6.9%	7.6%

^a Sample = only respondents reporting at least one child from one year to eighteen years of age, minus 31 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

CHAPTER 9

LEAVERS' EXPERIENCES AND EVALUATIONS OF THE W-2 PROGRAM

This chapter examines the details of leavers' reported participation in various aspects of the W-2 program and presents information about leavers' assessments of and attitudes toward that program.¹ The survey responses portray a leaver population experiencing a range of program engagement in W-2. For example:

- More than one-half (51.5%) indicated they were assigned or offered job skills training aimed at preparing them for unsubsidized employment, and one-third (33.7%) reported participating in job preparation and life-skills workshops having that same objective.
- Just over 44% said they had participated in a W-2 subsidized Community Service Job; 16.1% said they had participated in W-2 Transitions, and 6.6% indicated that they had held a subsidized Trial Job.
- Just over 70% found W-2 agency staff to be helpful in preparing them for work, and nearly one-half (46.8%) said they thought W-2 was better than AFDC.
- More than one-third (34.3%) said they stopped receiving W-2 cash assistance because they found a job, and another 14.4% said either that they simply preferred to work or could earn more that way.
- Of those who were back on cash assistance when interviewed, about one-third (34.1%) cited some specific problem or event (such as pregnancy, illness, or a desire for more training), rather than general unemployment or lack of income, as the reason.

As a group, respondents who returned to W-2 cash assistance after a period off of it also tended to report having made more intensive use of many aspects on the W-2 program than did continuous leavers. However, with respect to their attitudes toward W-2 and their reasons for leaving or returning to the program, differences between the two groups were less clear or consistent.

- Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to report having been offered (and when offered, to have taken) skills training aimed at preparation for unsubsidized employment.
- Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to say they had Community Service Jobs or were assigned to W-2 Transitions.
- Returners and continuous leavers appeared broadly similar in their assessments of how well specific W-2 programs or W-2 as a whole prepared them for employment.

The remainder of this chapter explores these findings in greater detail. Section 9.1 looks at leavers' participation in specific elements of the W-2 program. Section 9.2 reports on leavers' evaluations of W-2 and their experience with it, with particular emphasis on how effective respondents believed W-2 was in preparing them for the workforce. Section 9.3 examines the reasons why leavers left the program and why some eventually returned to cash assistance.

¹Data presented in this chapter represent only what respondents told survey interviewers. The figures may differ from participation figures obtained from the CARES database for the purposes of this survey report.

9.1 Leavers' participation in, perceptions of particular W-2 program elements

The survey asked both continuous leavers and returners about their experiences with various aspects of the W-2 program. Some questions sought to gauge leavers' general attitudes about the clarity of W-2 program rules or the helpfulness of W-2 agency staff. Other sets of questions first determined whether respondents had participated in a particular tier or "rung" of the W-2 "ladder" (W-2 Transitions, Community Service Jobs, or Trial Jobs) or other program element (such as language assistance, life skills training, or Job Access Loans), then asked only those participants about their experiences with and perceptions of a given program feature.

Continuous leavers (and returners who were not on assistance at the time of the interview) were asked specifically about their assignment to and participation in various program elements when they became eligible for W-2. Respondents who were on cash assistance at the time of the interview were asked about program participation associated with their most recent reapplication for assistance.

Readers should note that all respondents were asked about their participation in these program elements even though many of these elements offer specific skills not all W-2 participants need. A respondent may not have been directed to participate in such a program element because in the judgment of the case manager (Financial and Employment Planner, or FEP) such participation was not appropriate or necessary.

9.1.1 Respondents' participation in W-2 English reading/writing training

As indicated in table 9.1.1, approximately one-third (32.7%) of respondents reported that they were offered or assigned training in English reading and writing as part of their participation in the W-2 program. Of those who reported being offered this training, 57.5% said they took the course of training. Of those who took the training, more than three-quarters (76.4%) reported that it helped improve their English language skills.

Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to report having been offered or assigned training in English reading and writing skills.² Among those who were offered the training, returners were more likely than continuous leavers to have taken it.³ Similar percentages of returners and continuous leavers who took the training reported that the training helped improve their reading and writing skills.⁴

	<i>All Leavers (n=1184)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=734)</i>	<i>Returners (n=450)</i>
Were not offered training	67.3%	72.5%	59.0%
Were offered training	32.7%	27.6%	41.0%
If offered:	<i>(n=386)^b</i>	<i>(n=201)</i>	<i>(n=185)</i>
Did not take	42.5%	48.1%	36.5%
Took training	57.5%	51.9%	63.5%
Of those taking:	<i>(n=218)^c</i>	<i>(n=103)</i>	<i>(n=115)</i>
Thought it helped	76.4%	78.7%	74.3%
Did not think it helped	23.6%	21.3%	25.7%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 55 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

^b Sample = only respondents *offered/assigned the training* minus 1 respondent for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who was recorded as offering "no response."

^c Sample = only respondents *offered/assigned the training* and who *participated*, minus 4 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

²A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who were offered or assigned reading and writing training and respondents who were not was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

³A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who were offered and who took reading and writing training and by respondents who were offered the training but did not take it was statistically significant ($p < .05$).

⁴A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported that reading and writing training helped them and respondents who took the training but reported that it did not help was not statistically significant.

9.1.2 Respondents' participation in W-2 GED/HSED instruction

As reported in table 9.1.2, slightly more than one-third (36.4%) of respondents reported that they were offered general education or high-school equivalency degree instruction as part of their participation in the W-2 program. Of those who reported being offered this instruction, more than one-half (54.2%) said they took it. Of those who took the instruction, slightly more than 60% said they felt it helped prepare them to obtain a high-school equivalency certificate.

Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to report being offered or assigned to high school equivalency instruction.⁵ Of those who were offered or assigned to such instruction, returners were also more likely than continuous leavers to participate in the course.⁶ Of those who received the instruction, returners were more likely than continuous leavers to find it helped them obtain their high-school equivalency.⁷

	<i>All Leavers (n=1144)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=707)</i>	<i>Returners (n=437)</i>
Was not offered	63.6%	71.6%	50.7%
Was offered	36.4%	28.4%	49.3%
If offered:	<i>(n=415)^b</i>	<i>(n=201)</i>	<i>(n=215)</i>
Did not take	45.8%	53.9%	38.3%
Took training	54.2%	46.1%	61.7%
Of those taking:	<i>(n=219)^c</i>	<i>(n=89)</i>	<i>(n=130)</i>
Thought it helped	60.1%	49.4%	67.4%
Did not think it helped	39.9%	50.6%	32.7%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 95 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

^b Sample = only respondents *offered/assigned the instruction*, minus 2 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

^c Sample = only respondents *offered/assigned the instruction* and who *participated*, minus 6 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

⁵A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported being offered or assigned GED/HSED instruction and respondents who did not was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

⁶A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who took GED/HSED instruction and respondents who were offered it but did not take it was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

⁷A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported that GED/HSED instruction helped them and respondents who reported that it did not was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

9.1.3 Respondents' participation in job skills training

More than one-half (51.5%) of respondents reported that they were offered or assigned to job skills training either in a workshop, classroom, or on-the-job setting as part of their participation in the W-2 program (see table 9.1.3). Of those who reported being offered or assigned to such training, more than two-thirds (69.5%) said they took it. Of those who took the training, more than one-half (51.9%) said they felt it helped them find a job.

	<i>All Leavers (n=1182)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=743)</i>	<i>Returns (n=440)</i>
Was not offered	48.5%	54.9%	37.7%
Was offered	51.5%	45.1%	62.3%
If offered:	<i>(n=606)^b</i>	<i>(n=335)</i>	<i>(n=272)</i>
Did not take	30.5%	34.5%	25.7%
Took training	69.5%	65.5%	74.3%
Those taking:	<i>(n=412)^c</i>	<i>(n=216)</i>	<i>(n=196)</i>
Thought it helped	51.9%	53.5%	50.2%
Did not think it helped	48.1%	46.5%	49.8%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 57 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

^b Sample = only respondents *offered/assigned the training* minus 3 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

^c Sample = only respondents *offered/assigned the training* and who *participated*, minus 10 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to report being offered or assigned to job skills training.⁸ Of those who were offered or assigned to such training, returners were also more likely than continuous leavers to participate in it.⁹ Of those respondents who received the training, a higher percentage of continuous leavers than of returners indicated that it helped them find a job.¹⁰

⁸A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who were offered or assigned job skills training and respondents who were not was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

⁹A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who took skills training and respondents who were assigned or offered such training but did not participate was statistically significant ($p < .05$).

¹⁰A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported that skills training helped them and respondents who participated in the training but said it did not help them was not statistically significant.

9.1.4 Respondents' participation in W-2 job preparation and life skills workshops

One-third (33.7%) of respondents said that they had attended a job preparation and life skills training workshop as part of their participation in the W-2 program. Of those who attended the training, more than one-half said they felt it helped them find and/or keep a job. When asked whether the workshop helped in other ways, 65% or more of respondents who participated in it credited the workshop with increasing their self-confidence, enhancing their career goal-setting skills, and improving their ability to assess their job preparation and skills. More than one-half felt the workshops helped them with their parenting and general life-management skills.

	<i>All Leavers (n=1146)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=713)</i>	<i>Returns (n=433)</i>
Did not attend	66.3%	68.2%	63.3%
Attended	33.7%	31.9%	36.7%
Those attending said it helped in:	% resp. "yes" <i>(total n/missing)^b</i>	% resp. "yes" <i>(of n continuous)</i>	% resp. "yes" <i>(of n returns)</i>
Finding a job	56.3% <i>(378/9)</i>	58.1% <i>(220)</i>	53.7% <i>(158)</i>
Keeping a job	51.0% <i>(362/25)</i>	54.1% <i>(212)</i>	46.7% <i>(150)</i>
Dealing with life	56.2% <i>(375/12)</i>	56.1% <i>(216)</i>	56.4% <i>(159)</i>
Budgeting income	47.1% <i>(376/11)</i>	45.6% <i>(218)</i>	49.3% <i>(158)</i>
Self confidence	65.1% <i>(380/7)</i>	61.7% <i>(222)</i>	69.9% <i>(158)</i>
Parenting skills	54.2% <i>(376/11)</i>	50.0% <i>(218)</i>	60.1% <i>(158)</i>
Career goal-setting	67.0% <i>(379/8)</i>	65.1% <i>(221)</i>	69.8% <i>(158)</i>
Assessing job skills	70.7% <i>(375/12)</i>	70.2% <i>(217)</i>	71.4% <i>(158)</i>

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 93 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

^b Sample = only respondents who *reported attending the skills workshop*, minus varying numbers of respondents per row for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response." These and/or the resulting effective sample size are indicated in parentheses underneath the response rate percentages.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returns, and missing may not equal total. Because responses represented in each row are not mutually exclusive, column percentages do not sum to 100%.

Similar percentages of continuous leavers and returners reported attending these workshops.¹¹ Among those who attended, similar percentages of continuous leavers and returners reported that the workshops were helpful.¹²

¹¹A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who attended workshops and respondents who did not was not statistically significant.

¹²Chi-square tests comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported that skills training helped them and respondents who participated but reported that it did not were performed for each of

9.1.5 Respondents' use of Job Access Loans

A Job Access Loan (JAL) is a short-term, no-interest loan designed to assist eligible individuals to meet emergency needs that arise in the process of finding and holding a job. Approximately 13% of respondents reported that they had applied for a Job Access Loan as part of their participation in the W-2 program.¹³ Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to indicate having applied for a Job Access Loan.¹⁴

Among those who said they applied for a JAL, nearly one-half indicated they sought the money to cover rent, utilities or other general bills and more than one-third sought the loan either to buy a car, fix a car, or pay for other transportation. About 4% sought the loan to cover moving expenses and another 2% sought it to pay for work clothes.

Table 9.1.5 Respondents' seeking Job Access Loans

	<i>All Leavers (n=1194)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=743)</i>	<i>Returners (n=451)</i>
Did not apply for a JAL	87.1%	90.6%	81.3%
Applied for a JAL	12.9%	9.4%	18.8%
Purpose of JAL:	<i>(n=154)^b</i>	<i>(n=70)</i>	<i>(n=84)</i>
Rent	39.0%	28.4%	47.8%
Buy car	27.0%	33.6%	21.5%
Fix car	8.8%	13.9%	4.6%
General bills	7.7%	8.6%	7.0%
Moving	3.9%	2.7%	4.9%
Utilities	3.2%	4.2%	2.3%
Work clothes	1.9%	2.7%	1.2%
Other	1.3%	0.0%	2.3%
(Applied but were turned down)	7.2%	5.8%	8.4%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 45 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

^b Sample = only respondents who *reported applying for a JAL*, minus 1 respondent for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who was recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

the specific life skills or job preparation areas listed in Table 9.1.8. None were statistically significant.

¹³The survey responses did not distinguish those that merely applied for a JAL from those who both applied for and received one. The open-ended follow-up question about the purposes of the JAL was asked of all who applied for one, irrespective of whether the respondent actually received one.

¹⁴A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported applying for a JAL and respondents who did not was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

9.1.6 Respondents' participation in Trial Jobs

A Trial Job is a W-2 subsidized employment position, contracted between a W-2 agency and an employer, which is expected to become a permanent, unsubsidized position. As indicated in table 9.1.6.1, only 6.6% of respondents reported that they had held a Trial Job while receiving W-2 cash assistance. This percentage was similar for both continuous leavers and returners.¹⁵ Of those respondents who held a Trial Job, approximately one-third (32.0%) said that the Trial Job had led to a permanent job. However, returners were more likely than continuous leavers to indicate that their Trial Job did not lead to a permanent job.¹⁶

Those respondents who said that their Trial Job did not lead to a permanent job pointed to a variety of reasons why it did not, as summarized in table 9.1.6.2. No particular reason clearly predominated.

	<i>All Leavers (n=1190)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=740)</i>	<i>Returners (n=450)</i>
Did not have Trial Job	93.4%	93.2%	93.8%
Had a Trial Job	6.6%	6.8%	6.2%
Trial Job:	<i>(n=77)^b</i>	<i>(n=50)</i>	<i>(n=27)</i>
Led to permanent job	32.0%	41.1%	15.1%
Did not lead to permanent job	68.0%	58.9%	84.9%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 49 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

^b Sample = only respondents who *reported holding a Trial Job*, minus 1 respondent for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who was recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

¹⁵A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported having held a Trial Job and respondents who did not was not statistically significant.

¹⁶A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who said their Trial Job led to a permanent job and respondents who held a Trial Job but said it did not help was statistically significant ($p < .05$).

Table 9.1.6.2 Reasons Trial Job did not lead to permanent job

	<i>All Leavers (n=52)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=29)</i>	<i>Returners (n=23)</i>
Quit	5.9%	7.1%	4.4%
Was fired	5.5%	6.3%	4.4%
Job ended	4.0%	7.1%	0.0%
Lacked skills	4.0%	3.67%	4.4%
Other	84.4%	86.2%	82.3%
Of those indicating "other":	<i>(n=42)^b</i>	<i>(n=24)</i>	<i>(n=18)</i>
Disability precluded	21.2%	7.6%	39.5
Didn't like job	19.7%	17.2%	23.0%
Not certified/ qualified	9.8%	17.2%	0.0%
Employer wanted a temp	9.3%	8.1%	10.8%
Employer wasn't hiring	7.1%	8.6%	5.1%
Transportation problems	6.8%	0.0%	15.9%
Got a different job	4.9%	8.6%	0.0%
Didn't perform well	4.3%	7.6%	0.0%
Child-care problems	2.5%	4.3%	0.0%
Other	14.5%	21.0%	5.7%

^a Sample = only respondents who *reported holding a Trial Job* and who *reported that their Trial Job did not become permanent*, minus 17 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response." Because respondents could answer "yes" to more than one reason, column percentages in this section of the table do not sum to 100%.

^b Sample = only respondents who *reported holding a Trial Job* and who *reported that their Trial Job did not become permanent* and who *cited "other" as the reason*, minus 2 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

9.1.7 Respondents' participation in and views on Community Service Jobs

A Community Service Job (CSJ) is a W-2 position for individuals who are not ready for regular employment and who need further education or work training. Just over 44% of respondents indicated that they had held at least one CSJ while on W-2 cash assistance (see table 9.1.7). Of those who had a CSJ, somewhat less than one-half (47.1%) said that participating in a CSJ had improved their job skills and about the same percentage (47.8%) reported that doing so had improved their work habits. More than one-third (36.4%) of those who said they had performed a CSJ reported having done so in conjunction with classroom training. Of respondents whose CSJs were accompanied by classroom training, nearly two-thirds (63.5%) said the classroom training helped them in finding a job.

Table 9.1.7 Respondents' participation in, views on Community Service Jobs

	<i>All Leavers (n=1191)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=740)</i>	<i>Returns (n=451)</i>
Did not have CSJ	55.7%	66.2%	38.4%
Had at least one CSJ	44.3%	33.8%	61.6%
Of those who had CSJ:	% resp. "yes" <i>(total n/missing)^b</i>	% resp. "yes" <i>(of n continuous)</i>	% resp. "yes" <i>(of n returns)</i>
CSJ improved job skills	47.1% <i>(504/24)</i>	45.5% <i>(237)</i>	48.5% <i>(267)</i>
CSJ improved work habits	47.8% <i>(506/22)</i>	45.2% <i>(241)</i>	50.1% <i>(265)</i>
CSJ included classroom training	36.4% <i>(505/24)</i>	29.3% <i>(236)</i>	42.7% <i>(269)</i>
Of those taking training:	<i>(n=173)^c</i>	<i>(n=67)</i>	<i>(n=106)</i>
Classroom helped	63.5%	62.1%	64.4%
Classroom didn't help	36.5%	37.9%	35.6%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 48 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

^b Sample = only respondents *who reported holding a CSJ*, minus varying numbers of respondents per row for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response." These and/or the resulting effective sample size are indicated in parentheses under the response rate percentages.

^c Sample = only respondents *who reported holding a CSJ and who reported participating in classroom training* minus 11 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to report having held a Community Service Job and having received classroom training in conjunction with their CSJs.¹⁷ However, among respondents who held CSJs, similar percentages of continuous leavers and returners believed their CSJs had helped improve their job skills and work habits, and that any related classroom training had helped them find permanent employment.¹⁸

9.1.8 Respondents' participation in, views on W-2 Transitions

W-2 Transitions (W-2 T) provides education and work training to individuals on cash assistance who are unable to participate either in other W-2 positions or in unsubsidized employment because of personal barriers or crises. Approximately 16% of respondents said they had participated in W-2 T, and those who did so were asked why (see table 9.1.8).

Just under 44% said they had been assigned to W-2 T because they were temporarily unemployed; a similar percentage attributed their assignment to W-2 T to a lack of needed job skills. Three-quarters (73.1%) reported having done so at least in part because they "had no choice." Slightly less than one-half (46.4%) of those who participated in W-2 T said they believed that program element had improved their preparation for the workforce.

Returners were more likely than continuous leavers to indicate having participated in W-2 T.¹⁹ Among respondents who participated in W-2 T, however, returners and continuous leavers were similar in the rates at which they offered various reasons for participating, and in their assessments of W-2 T's effectiveness in preparing them for the workforce.²⁰

¹⁷A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who performed CSJs and respondents who did not was statistically significant ($p < .01$). A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents whose CSJs included classroom training and respondents whose CSJs did not was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

¹⁸Chi-square tests comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who reported that their CSJs improved job skills and work habits and who said their CSJ classroom training helped them find a job by respondents who said their CSJs did not help them in these respects were not statistically significant.

¹⁹A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who participated in W-2 T and respondents who did not was statistically significant ($p < .01$).

²⁰Chi-square tests comparing, with respect to each of the reasons for participating in W-2 T listed in Table 9.1.11, continuous leavers and returners by respondents who cited those reasons for participating and respondents participating in W-2 T who did not cite those reasons were not statistically significant. A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who said W-2 T prepared them for the workforce and other respondents who participated in W-2 T was not statistically significant.

Table 9.1.8 Respondents' participation in, views on W-2 Transitions

	<i>All Leavers (n=1161)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=721)</i>	<i>Returners (n=440)</i>
Did not participate	83.9%	90.1%	73.7%
Participated	16.1%	9.9%	26.3%
Reason for participation ^b :	% resp. "yes" <i>(total n/missing)^c</i>	% resp. "yes" <i>(of n continuous)</i>	% resp. "yes" <i>(of n returners)</i>
Lacked skills	42.0% <i>(185/4)</i>	41.2% <i>(70)</i>	42.4% <i>(115)</i>
Caring for another	12.1% <i>(186/3)</i>	10.4% <i>(70)</i>	13.1% <i>(116)</i>
Waiting for SSI decision	19.9% <i>(186/3)</i>	22.1% <i>(71)</i>	18.6% <i>(115)</i>
Temporarily couldn't work	43.9% <i>(186/3)</i>	40.1% <i>(71)</i>	46.2% <i>(115)</i>
Had no choice	73.1% <i>(183/6)</i>	70.7% <i>(68)</i>	74.6% <i>(115)</i>
Other reason	5.8% <i>(185/4)</i>	9.4% <i>(71)</i>	3.6% <i>(114)</i>
Participants' views on W-2 T:	<i>(n=178)^d</i>	<i>(n=69)</i>	<i>(n=109)</i>
Improved job preparation	46.4%	50.8%	43.6%
Did not improve	53.6%	49.2%	56.4%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 78 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

^b Respondents may have offered more than one reason; column percentages in this part of the table do not sum to 100%.

^c Sample = only respondents who *reported participating in W-2 T*, minus varying numbers of respondents per row for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response." These and/or the resulting effective sample size are indicated in parentheses under the response rate percentages.

^d Sample = only respondents who *reported participating in W-2 T*, minus 11 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

9.2 Leavers' assessments of the W-2 program

In the survey, respondents were asked whether they found agency staff helpful and W-2 program rules clear, and how W-2 compared overall to the AFDC cash assistance program it replaced. Respondents were also asked several questions about the role of W-2 in their efforts to find and hold a job. Respondents were asked how prepared for work they felt they had been prior to participating in W-2, to what extent they felt W-2 had helped them find employment, and whether or not they were engaged in other training or job preparation activities separate from the W-2 program.

9.2.1 Respondents' assessments of W-2 agency staff

Approximately 70% of respondents reported that they had found W-2 agency staff either "somewhat" or "very" helpful in preparing them for work, including more than one-quarter (25.8%) who found agency staff "very helpful" in this respect. Returners reported such impressions at a higher rate than did continuous leavers, who reported finding W-2 workers "not helpful" at a higher rate than was the case for returners.

	<i>All Leavers (n=1161)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=720)</i>	<i>Returners (n=441)</i>
Somewhat helpful	44.2%	41.8%	48.3%
Very helpful	25.8%	25.7%	26.1%
Not helpful	29.9%	32.5%	25.7%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 78 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

9.2.2 Respondents' overall comparison of W-2 with AFDC

Nearly one-half (46.8%) of respondents said they considered W-2 better (either “much better” or “somewhat better”) than its predecessor, AFDC. A larger percentage of continuous leavers than of returners told interviewers they felt W-2 was better than AFDC. A larger percentage of returners than of continuous leavers said they thought W-2 was actually “much worse” than AFDC.

	<i>All Leavers (n=1078)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=648)</i>	<i>Returns (n=430)</i>
Much better	15.6%	18.1%	11.8%
Somewhat better	31.2%	32.5%	29.1%
Somewhat worse	17.3%	18.8%	15.2%
Much worse	35.9%	30.7%	43.9%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 161 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don't know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

9.2.3 Respondents' views about the clarity of the W-2 rules

Although more than one-fifth of respondents said they found the W-2 rules to be “very clear,” more than 60% of respondents reported that they found the W-2 rules confusing - including nearly one-quarter who found them “very confusing.” This pattern of responses with respect to the clarity of the W-2 rules appeared similar for both continuous leaver and returner respondents.

	<i>All Leavers (n=1192)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=738)</i>	<i>Returns (n=453)</i>
Very clear	21.0%	22.0%	19.3%
Somewhat clear	18.7%	18.2%	19.6%
Somewhat confusing	36.1%	36.9%	34.6%
Very confusing	24.2%	22.8%	26.5%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 47 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don't know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.”

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

9.2.4 Respondents' assessments of their job-readiness before participating in W-2

Nearly three-quarters (73.7%) of respondents said they believed that when they first applied for W-2 they already had the skills, education, and capability to find a job. Similar percentages of continuous leavers and returners reported such an assessment of their pre-W-2 job-readiness.²¹

	<i>All Leavers (n=1185)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=735)</i>	<i>Returners (n=450)</i>
Felt capable	73.7%	74.7%	71.9%
Did not feel capable	26.3%	25.3%	28.1%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 54 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

9.2.5 Respondents' overall assessment of W-2's effectiveness in finding them a job

About 22% of respondents believed the W-2 program helped them find a job. The percentage of respondents who said W-2 did not help them find a job was comparable to the percentage who said they had felt capable of securing a job even before participating in W-2 (see table 9.2.4 above). The ratio between those who found W-2 helpful in finding them work and those who did not appeared similar for continuous leavers and returners.²²

	<i>All Leavers (n=1192)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=745)</i>	<i>Returners (n=446)</i>
W-2 helped	22.1%	21.2%	23.6%
W-2 didn't help	77.9%	78.8%	76.5%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 47 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

²¹A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents reporting they felt capable of working before W-2 and respondents who reported feeling they were not capable was not statistically significant.

²²A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who said W-2 helped them find a job and respondents who said it did not was not statistically significant.

9.2.6 Respondents' participation in training programs outside of W-2

Nearly 13% of respondents reported that they were receiving training in a program outside of the W-2 program. This percentage appeared similar for continuous leavers and returners.²³

	<i>All Leavers (n=1221)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=762)</i>	<i>Returners (n=459)</i>
Receiving training	12.9%	13.5%	11.9%
Not receiving training	87.1%	86.5%	88.1%

^a Sample = all surveyed, minus 18 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

²³A chi-square test comparing continuous leavers and returners by respondents who said they were receiving training outside of W-2 and those who said they were not was not statistically significant.

9.3 Why Leavers Left—and Why Some Returned

In the survey, those respondents who were not receiving W-2 cash assistance when interviewed were asked to describe their main reason for having stopped receiving such assistance. Those same respondents were asked whether they felt likely to reapply for cash assistance in the future, and why or why not. Those respondents who were receiving cash assistance at the time they were interviewed were asked to describe the main reason they re-applied for assistance after having been off it.

9.3.1 Respondents' main reasons for leaving W-2

Of those respondents who were not on W-2 cash assistance when interviewed, approximately one-third (34.3%) reported that their main reason for having left W-2 cash assistance was that they found work. An additional 14.4% cited other work-related reasons, such as being job-ready or feeling they could earn more by working than by remaining on W-2.

	<i>All Leavers (n=1054)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=732)</i>	<i>Returners (n=322)</i>
Got a job	34.3%	35.1%	32.5%
Was no longer eligible	19.0%	22.5%	11.1%
Preferred independent work	14.4%	14.9%	13.1%
Did not want or need welfare	8.5%	7.8%	10.2%
Did not like program, rules	7.4%	5.3%	12.0%
Noncompliance /sanctioned	5.7%	4.5%	8.5%
Other	3.7%	3.9%	3.2%
Problems with caseworkers	2.5%	2.0%	3.4%
Felt time limit approaching	1.7%	1.0%	3.1%
Welfare was not helping	1.3%	1.1%	1.5%
Spouse/partner got job	1.0%	1.2%	0.6%
Going to school	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%

^a Sample = only respondents *not on W-2 cash assistance when interviewed*, minus 53 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded "don't know," or who were recorded as offering "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

About one-quarter (24.7%) indicated that they left W-2 either because they were sanctioned for noncompliance with a program rule or because they no longer met an eligibility requirement. Slightly more than 10% cited problems either with the program and its rules or with W-2 caseworkers as main reasons for leaving. As might be expected at this early stage in the W-2 program, only a small percentage (1.8%) reported having left because they were nearing (or believed they were nearing) a time limit.

Continuous leaver and returner respondents appeared similar in the rates at which they reported having left W-2 for a job. However, larger percentages of returner respondents than of continuous leavers reported having left W-2 either because they disliked program rules or because they were sanctioned for noncompliance with one or another of those rules.

9.3.2 Respondents' predictions of likelihood of returning to W-2

Just under 62% of respondents who were not on W-2 cash assistance when interviewed said they either "definitely" or "probably" would not reapply for W-2 cash assistance in the future. A smaller percentage of returner respondents than of continuous leaver respondents "definitely" ruled out any future return to W-2 cash assistance.

	<i>All Leavers (n=1083)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=750)</i>	<i>Returners (n=333)</i>
Definitely would return to W-2	3.8%	3.1%	5.4%
Probably would return to W-2	19.0%	15.2%	27.4%
Probably would not return	31.9%	33.8%	27.5%
Definitely would not return	29.7%	32.9%	22.7%
Did not know	15.6%	15.0%	17.0%

^a Sample = only respondents *not on W-2 cash assistance when interviewed*, minus 24 respondents for whom data were missing or who were recorded as supplying "no response."

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

In an open-ended follow-up question, respondents were invited to give reasons why they felt they would or would not return to cash assistance. Among the reasons respondents gave for not expecting to return, the largest percentage (40.3%) fell into a category of personal reasons that included a general dislike of “welfare,” a general preference for “independence,” or a sense that W-2 was “not worth the hassle.” The next largest set of reasons (reported by a total of 35.3%) was financial or job-related, including a sense of security in having a job or a feeling that pay under W-2 was insufficient. Less than one-fifth (17.4%) of respondents cited specific W-2 program or eligibility issues, but those who did mentioned caseworker problems, worry about time limits, W-2 work requirements, or the lack of any eligible children as reasons not to reapply.

Table 9.3.2.2 Respondents’ reasons for believing they would not reapply to W-2

	<i>All Leavers (n=666)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=500)</i>	<i>Returners (n=166)</i>
Personal reasons	40.3%	39.4%	43.1%
Not worth the hassle	23.4%	22.1%	27.2%
Preferred independence	13.8%	13.8%	13.5%
Welfare belittling	3.2%	3.5%	2.5%
Financial/job-related	35.3%	36.1%	33.0%
Had job, felt secure	20.7%	21.2%	19.2%
W-2 payment not enough	8.2%	7.5%	10.3%
Did not need assistance	6.4%	7.4%	3.5%
W-2 program-related^b	17.4%	17.1%	18.3%
Other reasons^c	7.0%	7.5%	5.6%

^a Sample = only respondents *not on W-2 cash assistance when interviewed* and who *said they probably or definitely would not return to W-2*, minus 2 respondents for whom data were missing or who were recorded as supplying “no response.”

^b Includes respondents who cited problems with caseworkers, work requirements, incipient time limits, or a perception of W-2 as “too nosy” as reasons not to reapply. This category also includes those who said they were no longer eligible for some reason, such as not having young children at home, as well as those who mentioned being on SSI or SSDI, as this represented an eligibility issue.

^c Includes respondents recorded as responding “don’t know,” as well as those offering responses whose connection with a decision not to reapply for W-2 was unclear. This includes several responses more typical of respondents predicting that they would reapply (see table 9.3.2.3). It also includes those who said they were moving or had moved, or who said they were in school.

NOTE: Items in bold are main headings to which non-bolded items immediately beneath and indented should sum. Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding column percentages may not sum to 100%.

Among the reasons a smaller number of respondents offered for predicting that they might reapply for W-2, the largest single category (reported by a total of 65% of respondents) encompassed financial or job-related rationales: a lack of adequate resources, worries about the job market, or the need for assistance finding or training for a job. The next largest set of reasons (reported by a total of 18%) involved child-care or medical assistance needs, including a pregnancy or recent newborn, the need for medical or child-care assistance, or an illness or disability (the respondent's own or that of a family member). Slightly more than 10% cited a personal sense that "life is unpredictable" or that they had "no choice" but to reapply.

Table 9.3.2.3 Respondents' reasons for believing they might reapply to W-2

	<i>All Leavers (n=246)^a</i>	<i>Continuous (n=138)</i>	<i>Returners (n=108)</i>
Financial or job-related	65.0%	61.6%	69.4%
Job market worries	27.9%	23.1%	33.9%
Not enough money	27.6%	29.0%	25.9%
Need help to find job	6.8%	6.8%	6.9%
Want job training	2.8%	2.7%	2.8%
Child/health-related	18.0%	22.1%	12.9%
Pregnant/newborn	9.5%	11.2%	7.3%
To get health coverage	3.2%	2.8%	3.7%
Ill/disability (self or others)	3.3%	4.5%	1.9%
To get child-care assistance	2.0%	3.6%	0.0%
Personal reasons^b	10.3%	10.5%	10.0%
Other reasons^c	6.7%	5.9%	7.7%

^a Sample = only respondents *not on W-2 cash assistance when interviewed* and who *said they definitely or probably will reapply for W-2*, minus 1 respondent for whom data were missing or who was recorded as supplying "no response."

^b Includes respondents who cited a general perception that "life is unpredictable" or that they had "no choice."

^c Includes respondents recorded as responding "don't know," as well as those offering responses whose connection with a decision not to reapply for W-2 was unclear. This includes several responses more typical of respondents predicting that they would not reapply (see table 9.3.2.2).

NOTE: Items in bold are main headings to which non-bolded items immediately beneath and indented should sum. Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

9.3.3 Main reasons respondents reapplied for W-2 cash assistance

As noted in Chapter 5, 130 respondents said they were actually on cash assistance at the time of the interview. Of these, about two-thirds cited general financial need as the main reason for being back on assistance. This included 32.5% who reported that they reapplied because they did not have sufficient income to support their families and 31.7% who reported that unemployment prompted them to return to assistance. The next most prevalent single reason for being back on assistance was pregnancy, cited by 13.7% (or about 1% of the survey sample as a whole). About 15% identified a desire for one of several specific program services as their reason for being back on assistance, including respondents who claimed they had returned to take advantage of medical assistance, child-care assistance, or training and job search assistance.

Meaningful comparisons between continuous leavers and returners are not possible because only three “continuous” leavers were included in this subset of respondents. Even these three may not be truly continuous leavers, but rather may merely reflect misreporting by the respondent or a lag between the moment a respondent applies for cash assistance and the moment that respondent becomes a “returner” by receiving a W-2 payment.

	<i>All Leavers (n=118)^a</i>	<i>Returners (n=115)</i>
Insufficient income	32.5%	32.5%
Unemployed	31.7%	32.6%
Other reasons^b	34.1%	32.9%
• Pregnant	13.7%	13.2%
• Wanted training, job search help	6.3%	5.3%
• Illness or injury to self	5.8%	5.8%
• Wanted child-care assistance	4.3%	4.5%
• Wanted medical assistance	4.0%	4.1%
Did not actually reapply	1.7%	1.8%

^a Sample = only respondents *receiving W-2 cash assistance when interviewed*, minus 12 respondents for whom data were missing, who responded “don’t know,” or who were recorded as offering “no response.” Note that all but three respondents were identified independently as “returners.” The three “continuous leavers” who reported being on cash assistance when interviewed may reflect a time lag or misreporting.

^b Bulleted items below “Other reasons” are subtotals of that category; percentages should sum to the “Other reasons” total in **bold**. That and other **bold** percentages should sum to 100%.

NOTE: Because of the rounding of weighted numbers, the sum of continuous leavers, returners, and missing may not equal total. Because of rounding, column percentages may not sum to 100%.

APPENDIX A: ADMINISTRATIVE DATA

**WISCONSIN March 22, 2001
Commonly Reported Administrative Data Outcomes for Leavers**

Single-Parent Leavers ¹ (1) N= 1,247*	Qtr before Exit	Quarter of Exit	1 st Qtr after Exit	2 nd Qtr after Exit	3 rd Qtr after Exit	4 th Qtr after Exit	(5) Ever empl. over 4 Qtrs
Employment Outcomes:							
(2) Employment Rate (% with any earnings over quarter) (%)	55.01%	67.76%	66.64%	64.64%	66.80%	67.36%	81.88%
(3) Mean Quarterly Earnings (across those with earnings)	N=686 1169.535	N=845 2024.701	N=831 2271.893	N=806 2362.118	N=833 2278.155	N=840 2561.108	N=1021 (*) 7679.573
(4) Median Quarterly Earnings (across those with earnings)	810	1831	2081	2219.5	2020	2433	(*) 6393
	3 mos (1Q) before Exit	Month (Q)of Exit	3 mos(1Q) after Exit	6 mos (2 Q) after Exit	9 mos (3 Q) after Exit	12 mos(4 Q) after Exit	(7) Ever on over 4 Qs
Recidivism (reported by month or quarter)							
(6) Receiving TANF(%)	90.38%	63.03%	18.52%	22.05%	21.81%	19.73%	35.53%
Other Program Benefits (reported by month or quarter)							
(8a) Participating in Medicaid (%)	95.5%	90.7%	80.3%	78.7%	77.9%	75.9%	87.4%
(8b). Participating in Medicaid (Children) (%)	90.3%	90.3%	86.0%	83.3%	82.1%	80.3%	89.7%
(9). Receiving Food Stamps (%)	84.3%	78.9%	69.6%	67.4%	64.5%	62.9%	83.2%

* N=1,247 is Sample Respondents, not entire caseload. For line 8b the count of participants is 1,243 - see footnote below.

(*) If available, report annual earnings (i.e., sum of earnings over 4 quarters) for those with any earnings in first 4 quarters.

8a - Participant must be an Eligible Adult in an MA case (N=1,247)

8b - A Related Child must be an Eligible Child in an MA case (N=2,936 Participants' related children in 1st or 2nd month. prior to exit month. Four (4) cases not included due to lack of children - see documentation below. Number of participants for whom children were known=1,243.)

9 - Participant must be an Eligible Adult in a Food Stamps case (N=1,247)

¹Single-parent cases that are closed and remain off cash assistance for a minimum of two months. See reverse for further definitions of each of the nine measures. Note that table may be repeated for two-parent cases or other sub-groups of interest. **SINGLE PARENT CASES NOT DETERMINED but 95-98% probably one-parent.**