

CHAPTER IV: EMPLOYMENT, HOUSEHOLD INCOME, AND POVERTY STATUS

This chapter presents findings on employment, earnings patterns, and total household income among the survey respondents at the time of the surveys. Comparisons are drawn among leavers from the three major types of counties:

- counties exempt under the 15 percent provision;
- counties exempt due to unemployment; and
- non-exempt counties.

A. Introduction and Objectives

One of the major goals of the study was to examine how ABAWD leavers were doing in terms of employment earnings, and poverty status after leaving the Food Stamp program. A major area of concern of the study is whether the ABAWD leavers in non-exempt counties were ready to obtain stable employment and adequate earnings after leaving Food Stamps. These ABAWD leavers were subject to the time limits and work requirements under the 1996 legislation.

To examine this issue, we present findings from the follow-up surveys on the employment status, earnings, and incomes of persons who had left Food Stamps in the different counties. We begin by showing the overall Food Stamp and employment status of the respondents. Then, we focus on the employment, earnings, and incomes of persons who were still off Food Stamps when the surveys were conducted.

B. Overall Food Stamp and Employment Status of the Respondents at the Time of the Follow-Up Surveys

- Survey respondents were asked whether they were working for pay at the time of the interviews, and if they worked for an employer or were self-employed. They were also asked if they were still off Food Stamps.
- Exhibit IV-1 shows the overall Food Stamp and employment status of the survey respondents at the time of the follow-up surveys. The exhibit compares three types of counties: exempt under the 15 percent provision, exempt due to high unemployment, and non-exempt.
- The data show that, of the 1998-1999 leavers, 46 percent were still off Food Stamps and working at the time of the surveys. Another 37 percent were still off Food Stamps but not working. The remaining 16 percent were back on Food Stamps.

- Among the 1999-2000 leavers, 43 percent were still off Food Stamps and working, 42 percent were still off Food Stamps and not working, and 14.5 percent were back on Food Stamps. Among the 1998-1999 leavers, respondents from counties exempt due to high unemployment were slightly more likely than other respondents to be still off Food Stamps and working.
- There was not a major difference between the non-exempt counties and the counties exempt under the 15 percent provision in terms of the percentage still off Food Stamps and employed.
- Among the 1999-2000 leavers, the percentage who were still off Food Stamps and employed was slightly higher in the non-exempt counties than in the counties exempt under the 15 percent provision.
- Respondents from counties exempt due to high unemployment were the least likely to be still off Food Stamps and working.
- In terms of statistically significant differences, persons from non-exempt counties in the 1999-2000 sample were significantly less likely to be back on Food Stamps than persons from counties exempt due to high unemployment.

Exhibit IV-1 Overall Food Stamp and Employment Status of the Respondents at the Time of the Surveys

	1998-1999 Leavers			
	Exempt- 15 Percent (N = 73)	Exempt- Unemployment (N = 90)	Non-Exempt (N = 122)	Total (N = 284)
Off Food Stamps, working	46.1%	49.4%	44.4%	46.4%
Off Food Stamps, not working	36.7%	36.7%	38.3%	37.4%
Back on Food Stamps	17.2%	13.9%	17.2%	16.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	1999-2000 Leavers			
	Exempt- 15 Percent (N = 54)	Exempt- Unemployment (N = 97)	Non-Exempt (N = 132)	Total (N = 283)
Off Food Stamps, working	42.6%	37.1%	47.7%	43.1%
Off Food Stamps, not working	42.6%	41.2%	43.2%	42.4%
Back on Food Stamps	14.8%	21.6%*	9.1%*	14.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* Difference between the types of counties was statistically significant at the .05 level

C. Employment Status of Persons Still Off Food Stamps at the Time of the Follow-Up Surveys

In this section, we examine the employment status of the respondents who were still off Food Stamps at the time of the surveys. After presenting findings on the overall employment status of respondents in the three types of counties, we present data on employment rates by respondent characteristics. Next, we present the results of a multiple regression analysis designed to determine whether type of county had an impact upon employment rates when controlling for respondent characteristics.

1. Overall Employment Status of Persons Still Off Food Stamps

- Exhibit IV-2 shows the employment rates among respondents who were still off Food Stamps at the time of the surveys.
- The data indicate that there was not a major difference between respondents from non-exempt counties and respondents from counties exempt under the 15 percent provision.
- In the 1998-1999 sample, the employment rate was somewhat higher than average for respondents from counties exempt due to high unemployment. In the 1999-2000 sample, however, the employment rate for these respondents was slightly lower than average.
- None of the differences among the three types of county was statistically significant at the .05 level.

**Exhibit IV-2
Respondents Still off Food Stamps at Follow-Up – Percent Employed**

County Type	1998-1999 Leavers
Exempt- 15 Percent (N = 60)	55.7%
Exempt- Unemployment (N = 77)	57.4%
Non-exempt (N = 101)	53.7%
Total (N = 238)	55.4%
County Type	1999-2000 Leavers
Exempt- 15 Percent (N = 46)	50.0%
Exempt- Unemployment (N = 76)	47.4%
Non-exempt (N = 120)	52.5%
Total (N = 242)	50.4%

* None of the differences between the types of counties was statistically significant at the .05 confidence level

2. Employment Status by Gender

- For respondents still off Food Stamps, Exhibit IV-3 indicates that, among 1998-1999 respondents, males (64.1 percent) were much more likely to be working at the time of follow-up than females (45.8 percent). Among 1999-2000 respondents, however, there was not a major difference between males and females.
- In the 1998-1999 sample, females residing in exempt counties were more likely to be employed than females in non-exempt counties.
- Conversely, males in non-exempt counties were more likely to be employed than males in exempt counties.

**Exhibit IV-3
Percent of Respondents Working for Pay at Follow-Up, by Gender**

	1998-1999 Leavers	
County Type	Female	Male
Exempt*	51.7% (N = 66)	59.6% (N = 65)
Non-exempt	38.3% ** (N = 52)	69.2% ** (N = 56)
Total	45.8% ** (N = 118)	64.1% ** (N = 121)
	1999-2000 Leavers	
County Type	Female	Male
Exempt*	49.2% (N = 63)	47.5% (N = 59)
Non-exempt	49.2% (N = 65)	56.4% (N = 55)
Total	49.2% (N = 128)	51.8% (N = 114)

* Differences between exempt and non-exempt counties NOT statistically significant at the .05 level

** Differences between females and males statistically significant at the .05 level

3. Employment Status by Ethnicity

- For respondents still off Food Stamps, Exhibit IV-4 shows that, among 1998-1999 respondents, blacks and whites were employed at about the same rate at the time of the surveys.

- Among 1999-2000 respondents, however, almost 67 percent of whites were employed, compared to only 46 percent of blacks. The difference between whites and blacks was apparent in both the exempt and non-exempt counties.

Exhibit IV-4
Percent of Respondents Working for Pay at Follow-Up, by Ethnicity

County Type	1998-1999 Leavers	
	Black	White
Exempt*	55.2% (N = 96)	57.9% (N = 19)
Non-exempt	54.2% (N = 96)	53.6% (N = 28)
Total	54.8% (N = 192)	55.6% (N = 47)
County Type	1999-2000 Leavers	
	Black	White
Exempt*	45.5% (N = 99)	63.6% (N = 22)
Non-exempt	46.7% ** (N = 90)	69.0% ** (N = 29)
Total	46.0% ** (N = 189)	66.7% ** (N = 51)

* Differences between exempt and non-exempt counties **NOT** statistically significant at the .05 confidence level

** Differences between blacks and whites statistically significant at the .05 level

4. Employment Status by Education

- For respondents still off Food Stamps, Exhibit IV-5 indicates that education did not have a clear or consistent impact on employment rates.
- In the 1998-1999 sample, 56.6 percent of respondents who had not completed high school were working at follow-up, compared to 53.1 percent of respondents who had completed high school.
- However, in the 1999-2000 sample, respondents who had completed high school were more likely to be employed (55.2 percent) than respondents who had not completed high school (45.3 percent).

**Exhibit IV-5
Percent of Respondents Working for Pay at Follow-Up,
by Education**

	1998-1999 Leavers	
County Type	Did Not Complete High School	Completed High School
Exempt	54.7% (N = 73)	56.9% (N = 58)
Non-exempt	58.7% (N = 65)	48.0% (N = 43)
Total	56.6% (N = 138)	53.1% (N = 101)
	1999-2000 Leavers	
County Type	Did Not Complete High School	Completed High School
Exempt	43.1% (N = 58)	53.1% (N = 64)
Non-exempt	47.5% (N = 59)	57.4% (N = 61)
Total	45.3% (N = 117)	55.2% (N = 125)

* Differences between exempt and non-exempt counties NOT statistically significant at the .05 confidence level

Differences between drop-outs and high school completers NOT statistically significant at the .05 level

5. Multiple Regression Analysis of Employment Status

- A multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine whether the employment status of the respondents off Food Stamps varied by county type when controlling for various demographic variables. An additional goal of the analysis was to identify characteristics that might be predictive of employment outcomes.
- To control for the differences in demographics, a binary logistic regression model was used to describe the relationship between employment status and a set of demographic characteristics, including county type. Exhibit IV-6 describes the variables that were used in the logistic regression model.
- For county type, we created two dichotomous variables: exempt 15 percent (yes, no), and non-exempt (yes, no). In a regression analysis, this is the standard way to use nominal variables with three values.

**Exhibit IV-6
Variables Used in the Logistic Regression**

Variable	Description
Working	Response to the question "Are you now working at a job that pays you money?" 1 = Working, 0 = Not working
Exempt- 15 percent	Indicator variable of county type. 1 = exempt- 15 percent county, 0 = not Exempt- 15 percent county
Non-Exempt	Indicator variable of county type. 1 = non-exempt, 0 = not non-exempt
Gender	Gender of the respondent. 1 = female, 0 = male
Ethnicity	Ethnicity of the respondent. 1 = non-white, 0 = white.
Education	Education of the respondent. 1 = did not complete high school, 0 = completed high school
Age	Age of respondent. 1 = 18-24 years old, 0 = 25+ years old
Other Adults	Presence of other adults in household. 1 = 1+ adults, 0 = no other adults

- The dependent variable measures the employment status of respondents at the time of the survey: 1 if the respondent was currently working for pay and 0 if the respondent was not working. Because the dependent variable is discrete, a linear regression model may predict values out of the range (0,1). Therefore, a logistic regression model was used to estimate the factors that influence employment status.

Results for the 1998-1999 Leavers

- The results from the logistic regression model for the 1998-1999 leavers are shown in Exhibit IV-7. The data show that county type was not a significant factor in the employment status of respondents.
- The only variable that was significantly related to employment was gender. Males were significantly more likely to be employed than females.

**Exhibit IV-7
Results of Logistic Regression for Employment Status
(1998-1999 Leavers)**

Logistic Regression Results		
Dependent Variable = Working (1)		
Variable	Coefficient	Wald Statistic
Constant	1.230*	5.729
Exempt- 15 percent	-0.033	0.008
Non-Exempt	-0.246	0.587
Gender	-0.631*	5.149
Ethnicity	-0.066	0.035
Education	0.003	0.000
Age	-0.348	1.386
Other adults	-0.425	2.005
Model Chi-square [df]	11.905 [7]	
Percent correct predictions	60.5	
McFadden's R ² **	0.036	
* Indicates that the coefficient is statistically significant at, at least, the .05 level		
**McFadden's R ² = 1 - (LL(a,B)/LL(a)), where LL(a,B) = the unconstrained model that includes all the independent variables, and LL(a) = the constrained model that includes only the constant. In this model, LL(a) = 327.514 and LL(a,B) = 315.609.		

Results for the 1999-2000 Leavers

- The results from the logistic regression model for the 1999-2000 leavers are shown in Exhibit IV-8. The data show that county type was not a significant factor in the employment status of respondents for the 1999-2000 leavers.
- The model shows that employment status has some relationship to the ethnicity of the respondent. The coefficient on the ethnicity variable is significant at the .05 level (95% confidence level). The coefficient for the ethnicity variable is negative, which indicates that white respondents were more likely to be employed than non-white respondents. This is consistent with the findings presented above in Exhibit IV-4 for the 1999-2000 leavers.
- The coefficient for the presence of other adults is also statistically significant. This means that respondents who were living with other adults were less likely to be working than respondents not living with other adults.

**Exhibit IV-8
Results of Logistic Regression for Employment Status,
1999-2000 Leavers**

Logistic Regression Results		
Dependent Variable = Working (1)		
Variable	Coefficient	Wald Statistic
Constant	1.385*	7.859
Exempt- 15 percent	-0.008	0.000
Non-Exempt	0.072	0.056
Gender	-0.219	0.645
Ethnicity	-0.848*	6.037
Education	-0.466	2.928
Age	0.018	0.004
Other adults	-0.587*	3.944
Model Chi-square [df]	14.360 [7]	
Percent correct predictions	58.7	
McFadden's R ² **	0.043	
* Indicates that the coefficient is statistically significant at, at least, the .05 level		
**McFadden's R ² = 1 - (LL(a,B)/LL(a)), where LL(a,B) = the unconstrained model that includes all the independent variables, and LL(a) = the constrained model that includes only the constant. In this model, LL(a) = 335.467 and LL(a,B) = 321.106.		

Length of Time in Current Job Among Persons Still Off Food Stamps

- For 1998-1999 leavers who were still off Food Stamps, Exhibit IV-9 indicates that about 52 percent of currently employed respondents had been in their job for 6 months or less, while 48 percent had been in their current job for more than 6 months. Persons residing in non-exempt counties were somewhat more likely to have held their jobs for more than six months (51.5 percent) than persons from exempt counties (45.4 percent).
- Among employed 1999-2000 leavers, a relatively large percentage – 61 percent – had been in their jobs for 6 months or more, including 43 percent who had been in their jobs for 12 months or longer. It is not clear why the 1999-2000 respondents had been in their current jobs longer than the 1998-1999 respondents.

**Exhibit IV-9
Length of Time in Current Job Among Respondents Still Off Food Stamps,
by County Type**

Time in Job	1998-1999 Leavers		
	Exempt (N = 64)	Non- Exempt (N = 68)	Total (N = 131)
One month or less	18.8%	11.8%	15.6%
More than 1 month but less than 6 months	35.9%	36.8%	36.3%
More than 6 months but less than 12 months	26.6%	35.3%	30.5%
12 months or more	18.8%	16.2%	17.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Median months	6.0	7.5	6.0
Time in Job	1999-2000 Leavers		
	Exempt (N = 59)	Non- Exempt (N = 53)	Total (N = 122)
One month or less	11.9%	14.3%	13.1%
More than 1 month but less than 6 months	33.9%	17.5%	25.4%
More than 6 months but less than 12 months	15.3%	20.6%	18.0%
12 months or more	39.0%	47.6%	43.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Median months	6.0	8.0	7.0

* Differences between exempt and non-exempt counties NOT statistically significant at the .05 percent level

D. Work Hours and Non-Traditional Schedules of Persons Still off Food Stamps

Hours Worked Per Week

- Exhibit IV-10 shows that among 1998-1999 respondents who were employed and still off Food Stamps at follow-up, 56.3 percent were working 40 or more hours per week, and another 24.0 percent were working 30-39 hours per week. In combination, 80.3 percent of employed respondents were working 30 or more hours per week.
- Of the 1999-2000 employed respondents, 59 percent were working 40 or more hours per week, and almost 83 percent were working 30 or more hours per week.

- In the 1998-1999 sample, almost 62 percent of employed respondents in the non-exempt counties were working 40 or more hours per week, compared to 51 percent of employed persons in counties exempt under the 15 percent provision.
- The same pattern was true for the 1999-2000 sample.

**Exhibit IV-10
Total Hours Worked Per Week by
Employed Respondents Still Off Food Stamps**

	1998-1999 Leavers			
Hours Per Week	Exempt-15 Percent (N = 34)	Exempt-Unemployment (N = 44)	Non-Exempt (N = 54)	Total (N = 132)
40+	50.9%	53.8%	61.7%	56.3%
30-39	23.7%	28.2%	20.8%	24.0%
20-29	19.5%	17.9%	11.2%	15.6%
1-19	6.0%	0.0%	6.4%	4.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean hours	35.6	38.2	36.2	36.7
	1999-2000 Leavers			
Hours Per Week	Exempt-15 Percent (N = 23)	Exempt-Unemployment (N = 36)	Non-Exempt (N = 63)	Total (N = 122)
40+	47.8%	61.1%	61.9%	59.0%
30-39	30.4%	22.2%	22.2%	23.8%
20-29	8.7%	16.7%	12.7%	13.1%
1-19	13.0%	0.0%	3.2%	4.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean hours	32.9	36.2	35.9	35.4

* Differences between types of counties in mean hours **NOT** statistically significant at the .05 level

Non-Traditional Daily Work Schedules

- As indicated in Exhibit IV-11, about 34 percent of employed respondents in the 1998-1999 sample and 31 percent of the employed 1999-2000 respondents were working at least part of their workday outside normal business hours.
- Employed respondents in non-exempt counties were somewhat more likely to be working outside normal business hours than employed respondents in exempt counties.

**Exhibit IV-11
Percent of Employed Respondents Who Worked Non-Traditional
Daily Work Schedules**

	1998-1999 Leavers		
Work Hours	Exempt (N = 64)	Non-Exempt (N = 68)	Total (N = 131)
Usually begin work between 4 p.m. and 5 a.m.	3.4%	19.4%	10.6%
Usually end work after 6 p.m. and before 8 a.m.	28.1%	34.4%	30.9%
Usually begin work between 4 p.m. and 5 a.m. or end work after 6 p.m. and before 8 a.m.	29.8%	39.3%	34.1%
	1999-2000 Leavers		
Work Hours	Exempt (N = 54)	Non-Exempt (N = 58)	Total (N = 112)
Usually begin work between 4 p.m. and 5 a.m.	13.0%	19.0%	16.1%
Usually end work after 6 p.m. and before 8 a.m.	25.9%	29.3%	27.7%
Usually begin work between 4 p.m. and 5 a.m. or end work after 6 p.m. and before 8 a.m.	29.6%	32.8%	31.3%

Differences between exempt and non-exempt counties NOT statistically significant at the .05 level

Working on Weekends

- Exhibit IV-12 shows that 41 percent of employed 1998-1999 respondents and 45 percent of employed 1999-2000 respondents were working all or most weekends.

**Exhibit IV-12
Percent of Employed Respondents Who Worked Weekends**

	1998-1999 Leavers		
Work Weekends?	Exempt (N = 64)	Non-Exempt (N = 68)	Total (N = 131)
Work every weekend	18.8%	17.6%	18.3%
Work most weekends	23.4%	22.1%	22.8%
Occasionally work weekends	25.0%	19.1%	22.4%
Rarely/never work weekends	32.8%	41.2%	36.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	1999-2000 Leavers		
Work Weekends?	Exempt (N = 59)	Non-Exempt (N = 63)	Total (N = 122)
Work every weekend	10.2%	12.7%	11.5%
Work most weekends	40.7%	27.0%	33.6%
Occasionally work weekends	18.6%	14.3%	16.4%
Rarely/never work weekends	30.5%	46.0%	38.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Differences between exempt and non-exempt counties NOT statistically significant at the .05 level

E. Types of Jobs Held by Respondents Still Off Food Stamps

Types of Occupations

- Exhibit IV-13 indicates that almost 27 percent of the employed respondents from the 1998-1999 sample and 23 percent of the employed respondents from the 1999-2000 sample were working in assembly/production/packing.
- Other common occupations were cashier/sales clerk, trades/construction, office/clerical, and restaurant worker.

Exhibit IV-13

Types of Jobs Held by Employed Respondents Still Off Food Stamps

Type of Job	1998-1999 Leavers			1999-2000 Leavers		
	Exempt (N = 64)	Non- Exempt (N = 68)	Total (N = 131)	Exempt (N = 69)	Non- Exempt (N = 63)	Total (N = 122)
Assembly/production/packing	28.1%	24.7%	26.6%	18.6%	27.0%	23.0%
Cashier/sales clerk	13.5%	12.9%	13.2%	11.9%	12.7%	12.3%
Trades/construction	18.0%	5.4%	12.4%	15.3%	11.1%	13.1%
Restaurant worker	12.4%	10.8%	11.6%	8.5%	3.2%	5.7%
Office/clerical	9.0%	12.9%	10.7%	11.9%	12.7%	12.3%
Housekeeper/janitor	9.0%	8.6%	8.8%	10.2%	9.5%	9.8%
“Other services”	2.2%	7.5%	4.6%	11.9%	3.2%	7.4%
Nurse/nurse's aide	1.1%	4.3%	2.5%	5.1%	9.5%	7.4%
Bus driver	1.1%	2.2%	1.6%	1.7%	3.2%	2.5%
Child care	2.2%	0.0%	1.2%	1.7%	3.2%	2.5%
Teacher/teachers aide	0.0%	1.1%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other professional	0.0%	1.1%	0.5%	3.4%	4.8%	4.1%

* Differences between exempt and non-exempt counties not statistically significant at the .05 level

Types of Employers

- Exhibit IV-14 shows that almost 20 percent of the 1998-1999 employed respondents were working in retail stores or groceries. This compares to almost 16 percent of employed 1999-2000 respondents.
- Manufacturers provided almost 19 percent of the jobs held by employed 1998-1999 respondents and 21 percent of the jobs held by employed 1999-2000 respondents.

- Restaurants provided 15 percent of the jobs held by employed 1998-1999 respondents, but less than 6 percent of the jobs held by employed 1999-2000 respondents.

Exhibit IV-14
Types of Employers for Whom Respondents
Were Working

Type of Employer	1998-1999 Leavers			1999-2000 Leavers		
	Exempt (N = 64)	Non-Exempt (N = 68)	Total (N = 131)	Exempt (N = 68)	Non-Exempt (N = 54)	Total (N = 122)
Retail/grocery	20.2%	19.4%	19.8%	18.6%	12.7%	15.6%
Factory/manufacturing	19.1%	18.3%	18.7%	15.3%	27.0%	21.3%
Restaurant	15.7%	14.0%	15.0%	8.5%	3.2%	5.7%
Construction firm	9.0%	11.8%	10.3%	13.6%	7.9%	10.7%
Other services	11.2%	8.6%	10.1%	20.3%	11.1%	15.6%
Professional services	6.7%	5.4%	6.1%	10.2%	14.3%	12.3%
Hospital/Health care	2.2%	8.6%	5.1%	6.8%	9.5%	8.2%
School/college	4.5%	5.4%	4.9%	5.1%	1.6%	3.3%
Self-employed	4.5%	1.1%	3.0%	1.7%	6.3%	4.1%
Government Agency	2.2%	1.1%	1.7%	0.0%	3.2%	1.6%
Farm	0.0%	2.2%	1.0%	0.0%	3.2%	1.6%

F. Earnings Patterns Among Employed Respondents Still off Food Stamps

Overall Earnings Among the Sample

- As indicated in Exhibit IV-15, almost 63 percent of employed 1998-1999 respondents and 60 percent of employed 1999-2000 respondents were earning more than \$1,000 per month.
- In both samples, employed persons from the non-exempt counties had higher earnings than employed persons in counties exempt under the 15 percent provision. However, the differences were not statistically significant due to small sample sizes.

**Exhibit IV-15
Total Monthly Earnings Among Employed Respondents Still
Off Food Stamps**

Monthly Earnings	1998-1999 Leavers			
	Exempt- 15 Percent (N = 32)	Exempt- Unemployment (N = 43)	Non- Exempt (N = 51)	Total (N = 125)
\$1 - \$500	9.9%	2.6%	5.1%	5.5%
\$501 - \$750	18.0%	18.4%	8.5%	14.6%
\$751 - \$1,000	13.5%	13.2%	23.9%	17.6%
\$1,001 - \$1,250	28.7%	26.3%	22.2%	25.3%
\$1,251 - \$1,500	13.5%	13.2%	18.1%	15.3%
\$1,500 +	16.3%	26.3%	22.2%	22.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Median	\$1,059.41	\$1,136.63	\$1,125.80	\$1,090.50
Mean	\$1,077.61	\$1,207.37	\$1,340.11	\$1,228.55
Monthly Earnings	1999-2000 Leavers			
	Exempt- 15 Percent (N = 23)	Exempt- Unemployment (N = 36)	Non- Exempt (N = 56)	Total (N = 115)
\$1 - \$500	13.0%	5.6%	8.9%	8.7%
\$501 - \$750	13.0%	11.1%	8.9%	10.4%
\$751 - \$1,000	21.7%	33.3%	12.5%	20.9%
\$1,001 - \$1,250	17.4%	16.7%	28.6%	22.6%
\$1,251 - \$1,500	17.4%	16.7%	21.4%	19.1%
\$1,500 +	17.4%	16.7%	19.6%	18.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Median	\$1,082.50	\$1,017.55	\$1,203.74	\$1,082.50
Mean	\$1,004.51	\$1,265.16	\$1,189.80	\$1,176.33

*Differences between the three types of counties in mean earnings NOT statistically significant at the .05 confidence level

Monthly Earnings by Education

- Exhibit IV-16 indicates that in the 1998-1999 sample, employed respondents who had completed high school were much more likely to be earning more than \$1,250 (41.9 percent) than employed respondents who did not complete high school (33.8 percent). In the 1999-2000 sample, however, only 35 percent of the employed persons who had completed high school were earning more than \$1,250 per month, compared to 40 percent of high school drop-outs.
- In the 1998-1999 sample, employed respondents who had not completed high school had higher median monthly earnings (\$1,126) than employed respondents who completed high school only (\$1,039). The same pattern was true for employed 1999-2000 respondents.

Exhibit IV-16
Total Monthly Earnings Among Employed Respondents, by Education

Monthly Earnings	1998-1999 Leavers		1999-2000 Leavers	
	Did Not Complete High School (N = 78)	Completed High School (N = 54)	Did Not Complete High School (N = 53)	Completed High School (N = 69)
\$1 - \$500	5.2%	6.1%	8.0%	9.2%
\$501 - \$750	12.2%	17.9%	8.0%	12.3%
\$751 - \$1,000	20.7%	15.7%	26.0%	16.9%
\$1,001 - \$1,250	28.1%	18.4%	18.0%	26.2%
\$1,251 - \$1,500	13.5%	16.2%	22.0%	16.9%
\$1,501 +	20.3%	25.7%	18.0%	18.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Median	\$1,125.80	\$1,039.20	\$1,104.15	\$1,082.50
Mean	\$1,288.28	\$1,144.79	\$1,109.39	\$1,227.83

*Differences between the educational groups in mean earnings NOT statistically significant at the .05 confidence level

Monthly Earnings by Gender

- Exhibit IV-17 shows that, in the 1998-1999 sample, males had somewhat higher median monthly earnings than females. Almost 64 percent of employed males were earning more than \$1,000 per month, compared to 58 percent of females.
- In the 1999-2000 sample, males had much higher earnings than females.

Exhibit IV-17
Total Monthly Earnings Among Employed Respondents, by Gender

Monthly Earnings	1998-1999 Leavers		1999-2000 Leavers	
	Female (N = 54)	Male (N = 78)	Female (N = 63)	Male (N = 59)
\$1 - \$500	6.4%	4.9%	5.1%	12.5%
\$501 - \$750	17.7%	12.2%	13.6%	7.1%
\$751 - \$1,000	17.8%	19.2%	30.5%	10.7%
\$1,001 - \$1,250	25.8%	22.8%	16.9%	28.6%
\$1,251 - \$1,500	11.3%	17.1%	25.4%	12.5%
\$1,501 +	21.0%	23.7%	8.5%	28.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Median	\$1,039.20	\$1,136.63	\$1,039.20	\$1,212.40
Mean	\$1,158.92	\$1,283.06	\$1,071.87	\$1,286.40

*Differences between females and males in mean earnings NOT statistically significant at the .05 confidence level

Hourly Wage Rates

- As indicated in Exhibit IV-18, three-quarters of employed respondents in the 1998-1999 sample were working in jobs that paid \$6 per hour or more. Almost 38 percent of employed respondents were working in jobs that paid \$7 per hour or more. About 34 percent of employed respondents in exempt counties were working in jobs that paid more than \$7 per hour, compared to 42.6 percent of respondents in non-exempt counties.
- In the 1999-2000 sample, 74 percent of the employed respondents were working in jobs paying more than \$6 per hour. About 56 percent were working in jobs paying \$7 per hour or more. There was no difference in the median hourly wage rate between the exempt and non-exempt counties.

Exhibit IV-18 Hourly Wage Rates in Primary Job

Hourly Wages	1998-1999 Leavers			1999-2000 Leavers		
	Exempt (N = 64)	Non- Exempt (N = 68)	Total (N = 131)	Exempt (N = 59)	Non- Exempt (N = 56)	Total (N = 115)
Less than \$6.00	25.8%	23.0%	24.6%	33.9%	17.9%	26.1%
\$6.00 - \$6.99	40.3%	34.4%	37.8%	15.3%	19.6%	17.4%
\$7.00 - \$7.99	19.4%	18.0%	18.8%	20.3%	28.6%	24.3%
\$8.00 - \$8.99	3.2%	13.1%	7.5%	15.3%	16.1%	15.7%
\$9.00 - \$9.99	3.2%	4.9%	4.0%	8.5%	3.6%	6.1%
\$10.00+	8.1%	6.6%	7.4%	6.8%	14.3%	10.4%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
MEDIAN	\$6.75	\$7.00	\$6.84	\$7.00	\$7.00	\$7.00

*Differences between exempt and non-exempt counties NOT statistically significant at the .05 level

Median Earnings by Occupation

- As shown in Exhibit IV-19, median monthly earnings varied considerably by occupation. In the 1998-1999 sample, median monthly earnings were highest for “other services,” trades workers, and office/clerical workers. Earnings were lowest for restaurant workers and child care workers.
- In the 1999-2000 sample, earnings were highest among trades workers and assembly workers, and lowest among restaurant workers and child care workers.

**Exhibit IV-19
Median Monthly Earnings by Primary Occupation**

Type of Job	1998-1999 Leavers (N = 131)	1999-2000 Leavers (N = 122)
“Other services”	\$1,484	\$1,039
Trades/construction	\$1,461	\$1,212
Office/clerical	\$1,366	\$970
Assembly/production/packaging	\$1,140	\$1,212
Housekeeper/janitor	\$1,039	\$892
Cashier/sales clerk	\$987	\$1,002
Teacher’s aide	\$797	-
Restaurant worker	\$779	\$650
Child care	\$706	\$472

Hourly Wage Rates by Occupation

- As indicated in Exhibit IV-20, median hourly wage rates also varied considerably by occupation. Median hourly wage rates in the 1998-1999 sample were highest for “other services,” trades workers, production workers, and office workers. Hourly wage rates were lowest for child care workers and teacher’s aides.
- In the 1999-2000 sample, hourly wage rates were highest among office workers and lowest among child care and restaurant workers.

**Exhibit IV-20
Median Hourly Wage in Primary Job,
by Occupation**

Type of Job	1998-1999 Leavers (N = 131)	1999-2000 Leavers (N = 122)
“Other services”	\$8.05	\$6.55
Trades/construction	\$7.50	\$7.25
Assembly/production/packaging	\$7.02	\$7.25
Office/clerical	\$7.00	\$8.00
Housekeeper/janitor	\$6.70	\$6.00
Restaurant worker	\$6.11	\$5.75
Cashier/sales clerk	\$6.00	\$6.25
Teacher’s aide	\$4.60	-
Child care	\$4.08	\$5.28

G. Respondents Still off Food Stamps but Not Currently Working

Reasons for Not Working

- As indicated in Exhibit IV-21, the reason most often given by unemployed 1998-1999 respondents for not working was "physical or mental illness or injury" (20.2 percent), followed by "can't find a job" (16.0 percent), "in full/part time education" (13.1 percent), and "laid off from job" (13.1 percent).
- About 6.4 percent of the unemployed respondents indicated that they were not working because they were pregnant.
- Persons in exempt counties were much more likely than persons in non-exempt counties to mention physical or mental illness as the reason for not working (25.5 percent compared to 14 percent).
- Exhibit IV-22 shows that, among the 1999-2000 sample, the reasons most often given for not working were "can't find a job," and transportation problems. Persons in non-exempt counties were more likely to mention problems finding jobs, but were less likely to mention being laid off from a job.

Exhibit IV-21

Unemployed Respondents – Reasons Not Working Now, 1998-1999 Leavers

Reason Not Working	Exempt (N = 51)	Non-Exempt (N = 57)	Total (N = 108)
Physical/mental illness/injury(self)	25.5%	14.0%	20.2%
Can't find job	17.6%	14.0%	16.0%
In full/part time education	13.7%	12.3%	13.1%
Laid off from job	13.7%	12.3%	13.1%
Fired from job	3.9%	7.0%	8.3%
Have no transportation	5.9%	8.8%	7.2%
Currently or recently pregnant	5.9%	7.0%	6.4%
Do not have experience/skills	5.9%	0.0%	3.2%
Quit job	3.9%	1.8%	2.9%
Lack child care	0.0%	3.5%	1.6%
Want to stay home with children	0.0%	3.5%	1.6%
Couldn't get along with co-workers/boss	2.0%	0.0%	1.1%
Too old to work	2.0%	0.0%	1.1%
Physical/mental illness/injury(other)	0.0%	1.8%	0.8%

Exhibit IV-22
Unemployed Respondents – Reasons Not Working Now, 1999-2000 Leavers

Reason Not Working	Exempt (N = 63)	Non-Exempt (N = 57)	Total (N = 120)
Can't find job	28.6%	45.6%	36.7%
Have no transportation	30.2%	31.6%	30.8%
Laid off from job	30.2%	8.8%	20.0%
Don't have skills/experience	17.5%	17.5%	17.5%
Physical/mental illness/injury(self)	17.5%	17.5%	17.5%
Can't find job that pays enough	17.5%	14.0%	15.8%
Quit job	7.9%	21.1%	14.2%
Fired from job	12.7%	0.0%	6.7%
In full/part time education	6.3%	5.3%	5.8%
In job training	4.8%	5.3%	5.0%
Lack child care	6.3%	1.8%	4.2%
Physical/mental illness/injury(other)	4.8%	1.8%	3.3%
Want to stay home with children	1.6%	5.3%	3.3%
Can't get to a job on time	3.2%	3.5%	3.3%
Lose benefits if working	1.6%	5.3%	3.3%
Currently or recently pregnant	1.6%	1.8%	2.5%
Couldn't get along with co-workers/boss	1.6%	3.5%	2.5%
Other	7.9%	8.8%	8.3%

Work History of Unemployed Respondents

- The data in Exhibit IV-23 indicate that 48.7 percent of unemployed respondents in the 1998-1999 sample had worked for pay in the previous 12 months. Almost 47 percent of unemployed respondents in the 15 percent exempt counties had worked for pay in the previous 12 months, compared to 50 percent of unemployed respondents in non-exempt counties.
- In the 1999-2000 sample, 58 percent of unemployed respondents had worked in the previous 12 months, including 56 percent of respondents in the 15 percent exempt counties and about 54 percent in the non-exempt counties.

**Exhibit IV-23
Percentage of Unemployed Respondents Who Had Worked
for Pay in the Past 12 Months**

Type of County	1998-1999 Leavers
Exempt- 15 Percent (N = 27)	46.7%
Exempt- Unemployment (N = 33)	48.3%
Non-exempt (N = 47)	50.0%
Total (N = 106)	48.7%
Type of County	1999-2000 Leavers
Exempt- 15 Percent (N = 23)	56.5%
Exempt- Unemployment (N = 40)	65.0%
Non-exempt (N = 57)	54.4%
Total (N = 120)	58.3%

*Differences between types of counties NOT statistically significant at the .05 level

Hours Worked in Most Recent Job

- Currently unemployed respondents who had worked in the past 12 months were asked how many hours per week they had worked in their most recent job.
- As indicated in Exhibit IV-24, almost 84 percent of these respondents in the 1998-1999 sample reported working 30 or more hours per week in their most recent job. Unemployed respondents residing in non-exempt counties were somewhat more likely to have worked 30 or more hours per week in their last job (88.4 percent) than unemployed respondents in exempt counties (80.0 percent).
- Among the 1999-2000 sample, 84 percent of the currently unemployed respondents who had worked in the last 12 months had worked 30 hours or more in the last job.

Exhibit IV-24
Unemployed Respondents Who Had Worked in the Past 12 Months
-- Total Hours Worked Per Week

Hours Per Week	1998-1999 Leavers			1999-2000 Leavers		
	Exempt (N =25)	Non- Exempt (N = 26)	Total (N = 51)	Exempt (N = 41)	Non- Exempt (N = 29)	Total (N = 70)
40+	48.0%	53.8%	50.6%	64.1%	51.6%	58.6%
30-39	32.0%	34.6%	33.2%	23.1%	29.0%	25.7%
20-29	20.0%	7.7%	14.5%	7.7%	12.9%	10.0%
1-19	0.0%	3.8%	1.7%	5.1%	6.5%	5.7%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*Differences between exempt and non-exempt counties NOT statistically significant at the .05 level

Earnings and Wage Rates in Most Recent Job

- As shown in Exhibit IV-25, almost 53 percent of the 1998-1999 unemployed respondents who had worked in the previous 12 months had earned \$1,000 or more per month in their most recent job. For the 1999-2000 sample, the percentage was 50 percent.
- In the 1998-1999 sample, unemployed respondents residing in non-exempt counties were more likely to have earned \$1,000 or more per month (56 percent) than respondents residing in exempt counties (50 percent). The reverse was true for the 1999-2000 sample.

Exhibit IV-25
Total Monthly Earnings in Most Recent Job Among
Unemployed Respondents

Monthly Earnings	Year			1999-2000 Leavers		
	Exempt (N =25)	Non- Exempt (N = 26)	Total (N = 51)	Exempt (N = 41)	Non- Exempt (N = 29)	Total (N = 70)
\$1 - \$500	8.3%	12.0%	10.0%	7.7%	16.1%	11.4%
\$501 - \$750	16.7%	4.0%	11.0%	15.4%	9.7%	12.9%
\$751 - \$1,000	25.0%	28.0%	26.3%	17.9%	35.5%	25.7%
\$1,001 - \$1,250	37.5%	36.0%	36.8%	15.4%	19.4%	17.1%
\$1,251 - \$1,500	4.2%	12.0%	7.6%	25.6%	12.9%	20.0%
\$1,501 +	8.3%	8.0%	8.2%	17.9%	6.5%	12.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Median	\$1,012.14	\$1,082.50	\$1,039.20	\$1,136.63	\$909.30	\$1,012.14

*Differences between exempt and non-exempt counties NOT statistically significant at the .05 level

H. Presence of Other Employed Adults – Respondents Still Off Food Stamps

- As indicated previously in Chapter III, 65.6 percent of all 1998-1999 respondents and 65.7 percent of 1999-2000 respondents were living with at least one other adult. In the 1998-1999 sample, 15.9 percent were living with a spouse or partner. The percentage for the 1999-2000 sample was 15.2 percent.

Employment of Spouse/Partner

- Exhibit IV-26 shows that 8.5 percent of all 1998-1999 respondents were living with an employed spouse or partner, and that 9.1 percent were living with an unemployed spouse or partner. Respondents living in non-exempt counties were slightly more likely to be living with an employed spouse or partner (10.4 percent) than respondents living in exempt counties (7.0 percent).
- In the 1999-2000 sample, 9.1 percent of respondents were living with an employed spouse or partner, with a slightly higher percentage for respondents in exempt counties.

**Exhibit IV-26
Percent of Respondents Living With an Employed
Spouse or Partner - Respondents Still Off Food Stamps**

Status	1998-1999 Leavers		
	Exempt (N = 115)	Non-Exempt (N = 125)	Total (N = 240)
Not living with spouse/partner	84.3%	80.0%	82.4%
Spouse/partner present and employed	7.0%	10.4%	8.5%
Spouse/partner present and not employed	8.7%	9.6%	9.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Status	1999-2000 Leavers		
	Exempt (N = 122)	Non-Exempt (N = 120)	Total (N = 242)
Not living with spouse/partner	79.5%	90.0%	84.7%
Spouse/partner present and employed	11.5%	6.7%	9.1%
Spouse/partner present and not employed	9.0%	3.3%	6.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Differences between exempt and non-exempt counties NOT statistically significant at the .05 level

Percent of Respondents Employed or Living with an Employed Spouse/Partner

- Exhibit IV-27 combines the data on the respondent's employment situation and the employment of the spouse/partner to highlight the respondent's overall situation.
- The data show that 59.3 percent of all 1998-1999 respondents were either employed or living with an employed spouse or partner, including 60 percent of those in exempt counties and 58.4 percent of those in non-exempt counties.
- In the 1999-2000 sample, 53.7 percent of respondents were either employed or living with an employed adult, including 53.3 percent of respondents in exempt counties and 54.2 percent of respondents in non-exempt counties.

**Exhibit IV-27
Employment Status of Respondents and
Spouses/Partners**

	1998-1999 Leavers		
Status	Exempt (N = 115)	Non- Exempt (N = 125)	Total (N = 240)
Respondent employed	55.7%	54.4%	55.1%
Respondent not employed, but living with employed spouse/partner	4.3%	4.0%	4.2%
Respondent not employed, and not living with employed spouse/partner	40.0%	41.6%	40.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	1999-2000 Leavers		
Status	Exempt (N = 122)	Non- Exempt (N = 120)	Total (N = 242)
Respondent employed	48.4%	52.5%	50.4%
Respondent not employed, but living with employed spouse/partner	4.9%	1.7%	3.3%
Respondent not employed, and not living with employed spouse/partner	46.7%	45.8%	46.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Differences between exempt and non-exempt counties NOT statistically significant at the .05 confidence level

Percent of Respondents Employed or Living with an Employed Adult

- Exhibit IV-28 combines data on the respondent's employment situation and the employment of any other adult in the household, including a spouse/partner or any unrelated adult.
- As indicated, 72.8 percent of 1998-1999 respondents and 71.9 percent of 1999-2000 respondents were either employed or living with an employed adult.
- In both samples, there was little difference between the exempt counties and non-exempt counties.

**Exhibit IV-28
Employment Status of Respondents and Other Adults**

	1998-1999 Leavers		
Status	Exempt (N = 115)	Non-Exempt (N = 125)	Total (N = 240)
Respondent employed	55.7%	54.4%	55.1%
Respondent not employed, but living with employed adult	16.5%	19.2%	17.7%
Respondent not employed, and not living with employed adult	27.8%	26.4%	27.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	1999-2000 Leavers		
Status	Exempt (N = 122)	Non-Exempt (N = 120)	Total (N = 242)
Respondent employed	48.4%	52.5%	50.4%
Respondent not employed, but living with employed adult	20.5%	22.5%	21.5%
Respondent not employed, and not living with employed adult	31.1%	25.0%	28.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Differences between exempt and non-exempt counties NOT statistically significant at the .05 confidence level

Other Income Among Persons Not Employed and Not Living with an Employed Adult

- For the 1998-1999 respondents who were not working and not living with an employed adult, Exhibit IV-29 shows that 85 percent were not receiving any child support or SSI. The other 15 percent consisted of 13.7 percent who were receiving SSI, and 1.3 percent who were receiving both SSI and child support. In the 1999-2000 sample, 68 percent of the persons who were not employed and not living with an employed adult were not receiving SSI or child support.

- Combining this with the data above, we find that 76.9 percent of all 1998-1999 respondents were working, living with an employed adult, or receiving child support or SSI. The percentage for the 1999-2000 respondents was 81 percent.

**Exhibit IV-29
Receipt of Child Support and/or SSI, by Employment Status
of Respondents and Other Adults**

	1998-1999 Leavers				
Status	No Child Support or SSI	SSI Only	Child Support Only	Both Child Support and SSI	Total
Respondent employed (N = 131)	90.4%	4.8%	3.9%	0.9%	100.0%
Respondent not employed, but living with employed adult (N = 42)	86.5%	2.0%	11.5%	0.0%	100.0%
Respondent not employed, and not living with employed adult (N = 65)	85.0%	13.7%	0.0%	1.3%	100.0%
Total (N = 240)	88.2%	6.7%	4.2%	0.8%	100.0%
	1999-2000 Leavers				
Status	No Child Support or SSI	SSI Only	Child Support Only	Both Child Support and SSI	Total
Respondent employed (N = 122)	91.8%	4.1%	4.1%	0.0%	100.0%
Respondent not employed, but living with employed adult (N = 52)	88.5%	3.8%	3.8%	3.8%	100.0%
Respondent not employed, and not living with employed adult (N = 68)	67.6%	14.7%	11.8%	5.9%	100.0%
Total (N = 242)	84.3%	7.0%	6.2%	2.5%	100.0%

I. Total Household Income Among Respondents Still off Food Stamps

Total Household Income by County Type

- Respondents were asked "About how much money do you have coming into the household each month, including everyone's earnings, as well as child support, unemployment benefits, and SSI, but not including cash assistance or Food Stamps?"
- In cases where the reported household income was less than the amounts reported on the earnings questions, we used the earnings data to compute household income.
- As shown in Exhibit IV-30, about 5.5 percent of all 1998-1999 respondents reported that they had no income coming into the household, and another 5.7 percent reported income of \$1 to \$499 per month. In the 1999-2000 sample,

7.4 percent reported no income and another 7.4 percent reported income of \$1 to \$499 per month.

- In the 1998-1999 sample, mean income for persons who reported their household incomes was \$1,002 in the non-exempt counties, compared to only \$767 in the counties exempt under the 15 percent provision, a statistically significant difference. In the 1999-2000 sample, mean income for persons who reported their household incomes was \$1,051 in the non-exempt counties, compared to \$838 in the counties exempt under the 15 percent provision.

Exhibit IV-30
Total Monthly Household Income Among Respondents Still Off Food Stamps,
by County Type

1998-1999 Leavers				
Monthly Income	Exempt- 15 Percent (N = 60)	Exempt- Unemployment (N = 77)	Non-Exempt (N = 101)	Total (N = 238)
None	7.1%	5.9%	4.3%	5.5%
\$1-\$499	8.5%	2.9%	5.1%	5.7%
\$500-\$999	33.0%	22.1%	26.6%	26.8%
\$1,000-\$1,499	29.7%	26.5%	32.3%	29.2%
\$1,500-\$1,999	7.1%	17.6%	10.3%	11.5%
\$2,000 or more	7.1%	10.3%	14.6%	11.7%
Don't know/refused	7.5%	14.7%	6.9%	9.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean income	\$767.46*	\$880.95	\$1,001.75*	\$905.21
1999-2000 Leavers				
Monthly Income	Exempt- 15 Percent (N = 46)	Exempt- Unemployment (N = 76)	Non-Exempt (N = 120)	Total (N = 242)
None	13.0%	7.9%	5.0%	7.4%
\$1-\$499	8.7%	5.3%	8.3%	7.4%
\$500-\$999	26.1%	25.0%	22.5%	24.0%
\$1,000-\$1,499	17.4%	19.7%	18.3%	18.6%
\$1,500-\$1,999	2.2%	7.9%	5.8%	5.8%
\$2,000 or more	6.5%	5.3%	9.2%	7.4%
Don't know/refused	26.1%	28.9%	30.8%	29.3%
Mean income	\$838.24	\$990.74	\$1,051.20	\$989.77
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Difference statistically significant at the .05 confidence level

Total Household Income by Education

- Exhibit IV-31 shows that 6.2 percent of the 1998-1999 respondents who had not completed high school reported no household income, compared to 4.5 percent of respondents who had completed high school. In the 1999-2000 sample, the percentages were 11.1 percent for drop-outs and 4.0 percent for completers.
- Mean income was about the same for the two groups in the 1998-1999 sample. In the 1999-2000 sample, mean income was higher among the persons who had completed high school.

Exhibit IV-31 Total Monthly Household Income, by Education

Monthly Income	1998-1999 Leavers		1999-2000 Leavers	
	Did not Complete High School (N = 138)	Completed High School (N = 101)	Did not Complete High School (N = 117)	Completed High School (N = 125)
None	6.2%	4.5%	11.1%	4.0%
\$1-\$499	5.7%	5.7%	6.8%	8.0%
\$500-\$999	25.1%	29.1%	21.4%	26.4%
\$1,000-\$1,499	30.3%	27.7%	20.5%	16.8%
\$1,500-\$1,999	11.9%	11.0%	4.3%	7.2%
\$2,000 or more	12.4%	10.7%	6.0%	8.8%
Don't know/refused	8.3%	11.3%	29.9%	28.8%
Mean income	\$900.58	\$911.58	\$917.68	\$1,056.18
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Differences between drop-outs and completers NOT statistically significant at the .05 confidence level

Primary Sources of Household Income

- As indicated in Exhibit IV-32, 87.5 percent of 1998-1999 respondents and 83 percent of 1999-2000 respondents reported that earnings from a job were a primary source of household income. In both cohorts, the percentage who reported earnings as a primary source of income was somewhat higher in the exempt counties.
- About 14 percent of the 1998-1999 respondents and 22 percent of the 1999-2000 respondents identified SSI or Social Security as a primary source of income. In non-exempt counties, the percentage was almost 30 percent.

**Exhibit IV-32
Primary Sources of Household Income, by County Type**

Primary Source	1998-1999 Leavers			1999-2000 Leavers		
	Exempt (N = 74)	Non- Exempt (N = 73)	Total (N = 146)	Exempt (N = 86)	Non- Exempt (N = 67)	Total (N = 153)
Earnings from a job	89.2%	85.7%	87.5%	86.8%	79.2%	83.0%
Child support	1.5%	4.8%	3.1%	7.9%	6.5%	7.2%
SSI or Social Security	13.8%	14.3%	14.1%	17.1%	27.3%	22.2%
Help with utilities	3.1%	2.4%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Friends-family help	1.5%	1.2%	1.4%	2.6%	2.6%	2.6%
Unemployment	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.7%
Other	0.0%	4.8%	2.4%	1.3%	0.0%	0.7%

*Differences between types of counties NOT statistically significant at the .05 confidence level

J. Poverty Status of Persons Still off Food Stamps

This section examines the poverty status of persons who were still off Food Stamps, based on reported earnings and household income. Two separate analyses are presented:

- an analysis based on the reported earnings of the respondents and spouse/partners, counting the respondent, the spouse/partner, and all children in the calculation of household size;
- an analysis based on total household income reported by respondents, factoring in all adults and children in the calculation of household size.

Normally, only the second analysis would be used in a poverty analysis. However, we decided to use both approaches because of concerns about the limitations of the reported data on household income. One of these limitations is that the respondents may not know the exact incomes of other members of the household, especially in the case of unrelated adults. A second limitation is that household income may be under-reported out of privacy concerns.

A third limitation of the household income data is that respondents were allowed to report their total household income within broad ranges rather than being asked to give a specific dollar amount. This approach was designed to encourage respondents to report their household income and to avoid having to make complicated calculations in cases where the household had multiple sources of income. The income ranges were those shown above in the section on household income.

It should also be noted that, because of the nature of the population, the children in the household were not typically the children of the respondent. The results of the poverty analysis must be interpreted with this in mind.

1. Poverty Analysis Based On Reported Earnings

The data in this section provide an analysis of the poverty status of families based on the reported earnings of the respondents and spouses/partners. Family size was calculated by adding the number of children, the respondent, and the spouse/partner if present.

Poverty Status by County Type

- As shown in Exhibit IV-33, about 37 percent of the families in the 1998-1999 sample had earnings that placed them at 130 percent of poverty or higher. This was also true for the 1999-2000 respondents.
- Among the 1998-1999 sample, 34 percent of respondents in non-exempt counties had earnings at 130 percent of poverty or higher – about the same as on the 15 percent exempt counties. The percentage in the counties exempt due to high unemployment was much higher at 42.6 percent.
- For the 1999-2000 sample, the percentage with earnings at 130 percent of poverty or higher was higher in the non-exempt counties (35 percent) than in the 15 percent exempt counties (30 percent). As in the 1998-1999 sample, the percentage was highest in the counties exempt due to high unemployment (43.4 percent).
- The data suggest, therefore, that 63 percent of the respondents in both samples might meet the gross income test for Food Stamps based solely on the earnings of respondents and their spouses/partners. For the 1998-1999 sample, this includes 66 percent of the respondents in non-exempt counties, 66 percent of the respondents in counties exempt under the 15 percent provision, and 57 percent of counties exempt due to high unemployment. For the 1999-2000 sample, it includes 65 percent of the respondents in non-exempt counties, 70 percent of the respondents in counties exempt under the 15 percent provision, and 57 percent of the respondents in counties exempt due to high unemployment.
- Overall, the data show that about 52 percent of respondents and their spouse/partners had earnings above the poverty level, while 48 percent had earnings below the 100 percent poverty level. Among the 1998-1999 respondents, there was not much difference between the exempt and non-exempt counties on this measure. Among the 1999-2000 respondents, respondents in counties exempt due to high unemployment were somewhat less likely to be living below the poverty level than respondents in other counties.

**Exhibit IV-33
Poverty Status of Families Still off Food Stamps, Based on Earnings of
Respondents and Spouses/Partners**

	1998-1999 Leavers			
Percent of Poverty	Exempt- 15 Percent (N = 60)	Exempt- Unemployment (N = 77)	Non-Exempt (N = 101)	Total (N = 238)
0 percent	23.1%	25.0%	25.7%	25.6%
1-49 percent	1.9%	2.9%	0.9%	1.8%
50-99 percent	25.5%	17.6%	21.1%	20.7%
Percent below poverty	50.5%	45.5%	47.7%	48.1%
100-129 percent	15.1%	11.8%	18.0%	14.4%
130 percent or higher	34.4%	42.6%	34.3%	37.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	1999-2000 Leavers			
Percent of Poverty	Exempt- 15 Percent (N = 54)	Exempt- Unemployment (N = 97)	Non-Exempt (N = 132)	Total (N = 235)
0 percent	21.7%	15.8%	23.0%	20.4%
1-49 percent	8.7%	6.6%	2.7%	5.1%
50-99 percent	21.7%	21.1%	23.9%	22.6%
Percent below poverty	52.1%	43.5%	49.6%	48.1%
100-129 percent	17.4%	13.2%	15.0%	14.9%
130 percent or higher	30.4%	43.4%	35.4%	37.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Differences between types of counties in percent below poverty NOT statistically significant at the .05 confidence level

Poverty Status by Education

- As indicated in Exhibit IV-34, education had little impact on the percentage of cases living below 130 percent of poverty.
- In the 1998-1999 sample, however, about 54 percent of the respondents who had completed high school were living below the poverty level, compared to only 43 percent of the respondents who had not completed high school.

Exhibit IV-34
Poverty Status of Families Still Off Food Stamps, Based on Earnings of Respondents and Spouses/Partners, by Education of the Respondent

	1998-1999 Leavers	
Percent of Poverty	Did not Complete High School/GED (N = 137)	Completed High School/GED (N = 101)
0 percent	24.9%	26.6%
1-49 percent	2.3%	1.1%
50-99 percent	16.1%	26.8%
Percent below poverty	43.3%	54.5%
100-129 percent	19.0%	8.2%
130 percent or higher	37.7%	37.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%
	1999-2000 Leavers	
Percent of Poverty	Did not Complete High School/GED (N = 114)	Completed High School/GED (N = 121)
0 percent	23.7%	17.4%
1-49 percent	5.3%	5.0%
50-99 percent	19.3%	25.6%
Percent below poverty	48.3%	48.0%
100-129 percent	14.0%	15.7%
130 percent or higher	37.7%	36.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

*Differences between educational groups in percent below poverty NOT statistically significant at the .05 confidence level

Analysis of Poverty by the Reason for No Longer Being on Food Stamps -- Overview

- Exhibits IV-35 and IV-36 show that 32.8 percent of the 1998-1999 respondents and 40.9 percent of the 1999-2000 respondents reported that they were no longer on Food Stamps because they had obtained a job or had increased their earnings. In the 1998-1999 sample, employment or earnings were identified by 36.4 percent of the respondents in exempt counties and 28.6 percent of the respondents in non-exempt counties. To some extent, this confirms the theory that persons in non-exempt counties might be more likely to leave the Food Stamp program before they have a job available. However, the difference is not very large. In the 1999-2000 sample, there was little difference between exempt and non-exempt counties in the percentage of respondents who identified employment and earnings as a reason for no longer being on Food Stamps.
- The data for the 1998-1999 sample indicate that 21 percent of the 1998-1999 respondents did not know why they were no longer on Food Stamps, including 25 percent of the respondents from non-exempt counties. One explanation for

this may be that some of the non-exempt cases were being closed from Food Stamps due to the ABAWD rules without the respondent fully understanding what was happening. However, it should be noted that about 18 percent of the respondents from exempt counties also did not know why they were no longer getting benefits. In addition, in the 1999-2000 sample, there was little difference between exempt and non-exempt counties.

- About 13 percent of the 1998-1999 respondents and 12 percent of 1999-2000 respondents reported that they were no longer on Food Stamps because of the “hassles” involved, or because of such factors as pride or dignity.
- About 7.4 percent of the 1998-1999 respondents reported that they had turned 18 and stopped receiving Food Stamps, including 7.3 percent of the respondents from exempt counties. It is possible that some of these respondents may have moved to non-exempt counties after they left Food Stamps. It is also possible that some had simply left home at 18 and lost their eligibility for that reason. Almost 6 percent of the 1999-2000 respondents in non-exempt counties reported that they left Food Stamps because of turning 18.
- Relatively few of the respondents reported that they were no longer on Food Stamps because of factors specifically related to the ABAWD work requirements or time limits. However, some of the respondents who left Food Stamps for employment may have been responding to the new rules.

Exhibit IV-35 Reasons Given for No Longer Receiving Food Stamps, by County Type, 1998-1999 Leavers

Reason	Exempt (N = 125)	Non-Exempt (N = 103)	Total (N = 228)
Employment/earnings	36.4%	28.6%	32.8%
Did not know why case closed	18.2%	25.2%	21.4%
Hassle/pride/simply did not want to be on Food Stamps	12.7%	14.3%	13.4%
Change in household composition	9.1%	5.9%	7.6%
Turned 18	7.3%	7.6%	7.4%
Never received Food Stamps	4.5%	6.7%	5.5%
Moved out of parents house	3.6%	3.4%	3.5%
Didn't follow work requirements	2.7%	2.5%	2.6%
Assets too high	1.8%	1.7%	1.8%
Reached time limit	0.0%	2.5%	1.1%

**Exhibit IV-36
Reasons Given for No Longer Receiving Food Stamps,
by County Type, 1999-2000 Leavers**

Reason	Exempt (N = 122)	Non-Exempt (N = 120)	Total (N = 242)
Employment/earnings	41.0%	40.8%	40.9%
Do not know, mother/relative applied	13.9%	17.5%	15.7%
Does not know why case was closed	14.8%	12.5%	13.6%
Hassle/pride/did not want to be on Food Stamps	12.3%	11.7%	11.9%
Change household/lost eligibility	11.5%	5.8%	8.7%
Moved out of state	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%
Too much money, not from job	1.6%	1.7%	1.7%
Incarcerated	1.6%	1.7%	1.7%
Got married/live with partner	1.6%	0.8%	1.2%
Got training/education	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%
Child support income too much	0.0%	0.8%	0.4%
Had a problem with caseworker	0.0%	0.8%	0.4%
Turned 18	2.5%	5.8%	4.1%
Other	4.9%	6.7%	5.8%

Poverty Rates by Reasons for Leaving Food Stamps – Results of the Analysis

- Exhibit IV-37 shows that 60 percent of the families in the 1998-1999 sample who were no longer on Food Stamps due to hassles, requirements, or pride/dignity had earnings that placed them below the 130 percent poverty level. In addition, 40 percent of these families had earnings below the 100 percent poverty level. In the 1999-2000 sample, 64 percent of these families were below 130 percent of poverty, and 40 percent were below 100 percent of poverty.
- In contrast, only 52 percent of the 1998-1999 families who were off Food Stamps due to employment and earnings had incomes that placed them below 130 percent of poverty, and only 32.5 percent had earnings below the 100 percent poverty level. In the 1999-2000 sample, the percentages were 59.6 percent and 43.8 percent.
- The group that was most likely to be living under the poverty level were those who were no longer on Food Stamps for other reasons – almost 59 percent of the 1998-1999 sample and 50 percent of the 1999-2000 sample.

Exhibit IV-37
Poverty Status of Families Still off Food Stamps, Based on Earnings of Respondents and Spouses/Partners, by Reason for No Longer Receiving Food Stamps

	1998-1999 Leavers		
Percent of Poverty	Employment and Earnings (N = 69)	Hassles, Requirements, Pride/Dignity (N = 28)	Other Reasons (N = 116)
0 percent	11.9%	15.9%	35.6%
1-49 percent	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%
50-99 percent	20.6%	24.4%	19.8%
Percent below poverty	32.5%*	40.3%	58.6%*
100-129 percent	19.9%	19.6%	10.2%
130 percent or higher	47.7%	40.1%	31.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	1999-2000 Leavers		
Percent of Poverty	Employment and Earnings (N = 89)	Hassles, Requirements, Pride/Dignity (N = 25)	Other Reasons (N = 131)
0 percent	13.5%	20.0%	23.7%
1-49 percent	6.7%	0.0%	4.6%
50-99 percent	23.6%	20.0%	22.1%
Percent below poverty	43.8%	40.0%	50.4%
100-129 percent	15.7%	24.0%	13.0%
130 percent or higher	40.4%	36.0%	36.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Difference statistically significant at the .05 percent confidence level

Limitations of the Analysis

- The major limitation of the analysis presented above is that it does not factor in non-wage income received by respondents, such as child support and SSI. Specific data were not gathered on the amounts of child support, SSI, or other income received by respondents. Also, as noted, other household members besides the respondents and their spouses/partners are not considered in terms of income or family size.

Conclusions from the Analysis

- Because of the above limitations, the analyses presented in this section provide only an exploratory estimate of the percentage of ABAWD leavers who might still meet the income criteria for Food Stamps.

- Another factor to consider is the assets of household members. Data from the surveys (see Chapter VI) show that at least 29 percent of the 1998-1999 respondents from exempt counties owned a vehicle, and that at least 37 percent of the respondents from non-exempt counties owned a vehicle. For the 1999-2000 sample, the percentages were 34 percent and 32 percent, respectively. The value of these vehicles is unknown.
- Overall, the analysis suggests that respondents who are staying off Food Stamps for reasons unrelated to employment and earnings are more likely than other respondents to be eligible for continued benefits.

2. Poverty Analysis Based on Total Household Income

2.1 Approach to the Analysis

- The data in this section provide an analysis of the poverty status of respondents based on total household income reported by respondents. Household size was calculated by adding the number of children, the respondent, the spouse/partner if present, and all other unrelated adults living in the household.
- Respondents were asked to report their monthly household income based on the following categories: \$0, \$1-499, \$500-999, \$1,000-1499, \$1,500-1999, and \$2,000 or higher.
- To conduct the poverty analysis, the mid-points of the ranges were used, as follows: \$0, \$250, \$750, \$1,250, and \$1,750. Respondents who reported household income of \$2,000 or higher were assigned an income of \$2,250.
- Cases where the respondents refused to provide information, or said that they did not know the incomes of other household members, were taken out of the analysis, and the percentages for other respondents were adjusted proportionally.

2.2 Results by County Type

- Exhibit IV-38 presents the results of the analysis. The data show that 63 percent of the households in the 1998-1999 sample had income that placed them below 130 percent of the poverty level. This was about the same as the results based on the analysis of earnings. For the 1999-2000 respondents, 69 percent had household incomes that placed them below 130 percent of the poverty level.
- Among the 1998-1999 sample, 59 percent of the respondents from non-exempt counties were in households with incomes below 130 percent of poverty,

compared to 70 percent of the respondents from the 15 percent exempt counties. For the 1999-2000 sample, the percentages were 72 percent and 70 percent.

- About 46 percent of the 1998-1999 respondents were in households with incomes below the poverty level, including almost 55 percent of the respondents from the 15 percent exempt counties, but only 40 percent of the respondents from non-exempt counties. In the 1999-2000 sample, 49 percent of the respondents were in households with incomes below the poverty level, including 54 percent of the respondents in the 15 percent exempt counties and almost 47 percent of the respondents in non-exempt counties.

Exhibit IV-38
Poverty Status of Households Still off Food Stamps,
Based on Total Household Income

	1998-1999 Leavers			
Percent of Poverty	Exempt- 15 Percent (N = 60)	Exempt- Unemployment (N = 77)	Non-Exempt (N = 101)	Total (N = 238)
0 percent	7.7%	6.9%	4.6%	6.1%
1-49 percent	7.2%	5.2%	5.5%	5.8%
50-99 percent	39.8%	36.2%	30.0%	34.4%
Percent below poverty	54.7%	48.3%	40.1%	46.3%
100-129 percent	15.8%	13.8%	19.3%	16.7%
130 percent or higher	29.6%	37.9%	40.5%	36.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	1999-2000 Leavers			
Percent of Poverty	Exempt- 15 Percent (N = 54)	Exempt- Unemployment (N = 97)	Non-Exempt (N = 132)	Total (N = 235)
0 percent	15.2%	15.8%	17.5%	16.5%
1-49 percent	13.0%	6.6%	7.5%	8.3%
50-99 percent	26.1%	27.6%	21.7%	24.4%
Percent below poverty	54.3%	50.0%	46.7%	49.2%
100-129 percent	15.2%	13.2%	25.8%	19.8%
130 percent or higher	30.4%	36.8%	27.5%	31.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Differences between types of counties in percent below poverty level NOT statistically significant at the .05 percent confidence level

2.3 Multiple Regression Analysis of Poverty Status

- To further isolate the impact of county type on the poverty status of the respondents, we conducted a multiple regression analysis using the same overall approach as the one used for examining employment status. The dependent variable in the analysis was whether the household was above or below the poverty level.
- The results for the 1998-1999 respondents are shown in Exhibit IV-39. As indicated, county type was not a statistically significant factor in the poverty status of households.
- The only variable that was statistically significant was age – respondents aged 18-24 were significantly more likely to be in households above the poverty level than older respondents.
- The results for the 1999-2000 respondents are presented in Exhibit IV-40. The data indicate that females, non-whites, and persons living with other adults were significantly more likely than other respondents to be in poverty.

**Exhibit IV-39
Results of Logistic Regression for Poverty Level
(1998-1999 Leavers)**

Logistic Regression Results		
Dependent Variable = Above Poverty Level (1)		
Variable	Coefficient	Wald Statistic
Constant	-0.324	0.376
Exempt- 15 percent	-0.163	0.170
Non-exempt	0.418	1.493
Gender	-0.201	0.455
Ethnicity	0.368	1.004
Education	-0.123	0.177
Age	0.678*	4.755
Other adults	-0.412	1.701
Model Chi-square [df]	12.438 [7]	
Percent correct predictions	59.3	
McFadden's R ² **	0.042	
* Indicates that the coefficient is statistically significant at, at least, the .05 level		
**McFadden's R ² = 1 - (LL(a,B)/LL(a)), where LL(a,B) = the unconstrained model that includes all the independent variables, and LL(a) = the constrained model that includes only the constant. In this model, LL(a) = 297.938 and LL(a,B) = 285.500.		

**Exhibit IV-40
Results of Logistic Regression for Poverty Level
(1999-2000 Leavers)**

Logistic Regression Results		
Dependent Variable = Above Poverty Level (1)		
Variable	Coefficient	Wald Statistic
Constant	1.664*	10.824
Exempt- 15 percent	-0.313	0.629
Non-exempt	-0.026	0.007
Gender	-0.622*	4.999
Ethnicity	-0.779*	5.026
Education	-0.449	2.656
Age	0.315	1.142
Other adults	-0.864*	8.124
Model Chi-square [df]	19.082 [7]	
Percent correct predictions	59.9	
McFadden's R ² **	0.057	
* Indicates that the coefficient is statistically significant at, at least, the .05 level		
**McFadden's R ² = 1 - (LL(a,B)/LL(a)), where LL(a,B) = the unconstrained model that includes all the independent variables, and LL(a) = the constrained model that includes only the constant. In this model, LL(a) = 335.417 and LL(a,B) = 316.336.		

2.4 Poverty Status by Reasons for Being Off Food Stamps

- Exhibit IV-41 shows that only 36 percent of the 1998-1999 respondents who were off Food Stamps due to employment or earnings were living in households with incomes below the poverty level. This compares to 39 percent of those who were no longer on Food Stamps due to hassles and pride/dignity, and 53 percent of those who were off Food Stamps for other reasons.
- In the 1999-2000 sample, only 38 percent of the respondents who were off Food Stamps due to employment and earnings were living in households below the poverty level, compared to 50 percent of those who were off Food Stamps due to hassles or pride/dignity.
- In the 1998-1999 sample, about 61 percent of the respondents who were off Food Stamps because of hassles and related factors had household incomes below 130 percent of poverty. The percentage for the 1999-2000 sample was 69 percent.
- Almost 68 percent of the 1998-1999 respondents who were off Food Stamps for “other” reasons had household incomes below 130 percent of poverty. This compares to 70 percent for the 1999-2000 sample.

**Exhibit IV-41
Poverty Status of Families Still off Food Stamps, Based on Total Household
Income -- By Reason for No Longer Receiving Food Stamps**

	1998-1999 Leavers		
Percent of Poverty	Employment and Earnings (N = 69)	Hassles, Requirements, Pride/Dignity (N = 28)	Other Reasons (N = 116)
0 percent	0.0%	6.1%	9.7%
1-49 percent	5.7%	0.0%	8.1%
50-99 percent	30.6%	33.4%	35.2%
Percent below poverty	36.3%*	39.5%	53.0%*
100-129 percent	16.0%	21.2%	15.4%
130 percent or higher	47.7%	39.3%	31.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	1999-2000 Leavers		
Percent of Poverty	Employment and Earnings (N = 89)	Hassles, Requirements, Pride/Dignity (N = 25)	Other Reasons (N = 131)
0 percent	9.8%	15.4%	20.1%
1-49 percent	7.6%	11.5%	7.5%
50-99 percent	20.7%	23.1%	26.1%
Percent below poverty	38.1%*	50.0%	53.7%*
100-129 percent	26.1%	19.2%	16.4%
130 percent or higher	35.9%	30.8%	29.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Differences statistically significant at the .05 percent confidence level

K. Discussion of the Findings

The findings from the study have a number of potential policy implications. First, the study found that there was not a major difference between the non-exempt counties and the counties exempt under the 15 percent provision in terms of the key employment outcomes for the leavers. This indicates that the ABAWD leavers who were actually subject to the work requirements and time limits (i.e., the non-exempt cases) were doing as well as the leavers who were not subject to the ABAWD provisions, controlling for economic conditions.

As noted previously, one of the major concerns of policymakers is that the persons who are subject to the ABAWD time limits and work requirements may leave the Food Stamp program before they are ready for stable employment. A related concern is that the non-exempt leavers may have trouble meeting their financial and nutritional needs in the absence of Food Stamp benefits.

The fact that the ABAWD leavers in the non-exempt counties were doing as well as the leavers in the counties exempt under the 15 percent provision suggests that these concerns may

not be warranted. The study suggests, therefore, that the ABAWD time limits and work requirements did not create undue hardships for the non-exempt leavers in terms of employment outcomes when compared with what they would have experienced had they been exempt.

The data on poverty rates provide confirmation of this overall finding. Leavers from the non-exempt counties actually had a somewhat lower poverty rate at the time of the surveys than leavers from the counties that were exempt under the 15 percent provision.

In terms of policy implications, the results from the study would not justify any modification to the basic rules regarding time limits and work requirements for ABAWDs.

A second significant finding from the study is that, despite the overall conclusion presented in the previous section, the study showed that many of the ABAWD leavers – both in the exempt and non-exempt counties – were having problems finding stable employment and adequate earnings. Of the non-exempt leavers, about 40 percent were still off Food Stamps but not working at the time of the surveys. Of the non-exempt leavers who were still off Food Stamps, between 46 and 50 percent were unemployed. Of the employed leavers in the non-exempt counties, almost 14 percent were earning \$750 per month or less. Between 40 and 47 percent of the non-exempt leavers who were still off Food Stamps were below the poverty level.

These findings may partly be attributable to the large percentage of young people among the ABAWD leavers. As noted previously, about one-third of the ABAWD leavers in the non-exempt counties were aged 18 to 19, and 60-65 percent were aged under 25. It is possible that the labor force problems being experienced by the ABAWD leavers were partly the result of a lack of work experience. Over time, these leavers may find more stable employment and higher earnings.

Despite this qualification, the findings suggest that more intensive services may be needed to help ABAWDs prepare for the job market, especially in the non-exempt counties, but also in the exempt counties. The large percentage of high school drop-outs in the ABAWD population is also a factor that may have to be considered in addressing barriers to employment.

A third important finding is that many of the ABAWD leavers were apparently still eligible for Food Stamp benefits based on household income, including leavers in both the exempt and non-exempt counties. In addition, persons who were off Food Stamps because they did not want to deal with the paperwork and other administrative hassles were more likely than other respondents to still be eligible for program benefits. This finding suggests that more steps may be needed to facilitate access to the Food Stamp program and to minimize the administrative barriers to obtaining benefits.