

CHAPTER V: HARDSHIP, FOOD SECURITY, AND WELL-BEING AMONG RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS

This chapter presents findings on hardship, food security, health care coverage, and other indicators of well-being among persons who were still off Food Stamps at the time of the surveys. The focus of the chapter is on how well the ABAWD leavers were doing in comparison to the period before they left Food Stamps. Comparisons are also made between the exempt and non-exempt counties. Results are presented for the following indicators:

- hardship and adverse events,
- food security,
- health care coverage, and
- comparisons to life on Food Stamps.

A. Objectives of the Analysis

The major goal of this chapter is to examine whether leavers in non-exempt counties were faring worse than exempt leavers in terms of a series of hardship indicators. In particular, the chapter compares leavers in the non-exempt counties and the leavers in counties exempt under the 15 percent provision. If non-exempt leavers were found to be doing much worse than other leavers, there might be cause for concern that persons subject to the ABAWD time limits and work requirements are not adequately prepared for life after Food Stamps.

B. Hardship and Adverse Events Reported by Respondents

- This section presents findings on hardships or adverse events that happened to respondents while on Food Stamps and after leaving Food Stamps to determine whether incidents of hardship increased after leaving.
- Respondents who were still off Food Stamps were asked whether specific adverse events had ever happened to them. If they indicated that an event had ever happened, they were then asked whether the event occurred in the past 12 months, before the past 12 months, or in both time periods.
- The time period "in the past 12 months" was designed to correspond roughly to the time period since they left Food Stamps. It was decided not to ask respondents whether the event had happened "since you left Food Stamps," because we were concerned that this might bias the results.

Adverse Events Among the Overall Sample

- Exhibit V-1 shows the results for the overall sample of respondents who were still off Food Stamps at the time of the survey. The data show the percentage of

respondents who reported whether specific events had happened to them in the last year and before the past year.

- As indicated in the exhibit, 17.2 percent of the 1998-1999 respondents reported that they had fallen behind in rent payments or other housing payments in the past 12 months. In contrast, 11.0 percent of the respondents reported that they had fallen behind in rent payments before the last 12 months. In the 1999-2000 sample, similar results were found.
- About 12 percent of the 1998-1999 respondents reported that they had to move in the past 12 months because they could not afford housing. This compares to 9.8 percent who reported having this problem before the last 12 months. Again, similar results were found for the 1999-2000 sample.
- The data show considerable mobility among members of the two samples in the year since leaving Food Stamps. Overall, 43.2 percent of the 1998-1999 sample and 39.2 percent of the 1999-2000 sample had moved in the past year for financial or other reasons.
- About 22.0 percent of the 1998-1999 respondents reported that they had fallen behind in utility payments in the last 12 months, compared to only 9.1 percent before the past 12 months. Similar results were found for the 1999-2000 sample.
- Almost 22 percent of the 1998-1999 respondents reported that their telephones had been cut off in the past 12 months. In contrast, only 14.5 percent reported that their telephones had been cut off before the past 12 months. The percentages for the 1999-2000 sample were 14.9 percent and 25.6 percent, respectively.
- In the 1999-2000 sample, there was an increase in the percentage of respondents who had heat, water, or electricity cut off since leaving Food Stamps. However, the prevalence of these problems was relatively low in both time periods.
- Very few respondents reported that they had moved into a homeless shelter in either time period.
- About 11 percent of the 1998-1999 respondents and 16 percent of the 1999-2000 respondents reported that there had been times in the past year when someone in their home had been sick or hurt but could not get medical care. These percentages were both increases from the period before respondents left Food Stamps.

- About 48 percent of the 1998-1999 respondents reported that none of the events listed above had happened to them in the last year, a slight increase from the period before they left Food Stamps. Among the 1999-2000 respondents, the percentage who reported none of the listed hardships declined substantially from 66 percent to 35 percent.

Exhibit V-1 Adverse Events That Had Happened to Respondents

Adverse Events	1998-1999 Leavers (N = 240)		1999-2000 Leavers (N = 242)	
	Before Last Year	During Last Year	Before Last Year	During Last Year
Got behind in paying for rent or other housing	11.0%	17.2%*	10.8%	19.0%*
Had to move because could not pay for housing	9.8%	12.0%	7.5%	11.6%
(Moved for reasons other than money in last 12 months)	NA	31.2%	NA	27.6%
Got behind on a utility bill	9.1%	22.0%*	12.0%	26.9%*
Went without electricity	8.7%	9.1%	7.0%	12.8%*
Went without heat	4.0%	7.9%	4.6%	9.1%*
Had water cut off	5.4%	4.3%	3.3%	8.7%*
Had to go to a homeless shelter	2.9%	0.7%	2.0%	2.0%
Had telephone cut off	14.5%	21.8%*	14.9%	25.6%*
Children had to live with someone else because could not afford to take care of them	2.5%	3.1%	1.6%	3.3%
Needed a regular babysitter or child care service but could not find it	3.1%	5.6%	5.0%	7.9%
Had a car or truck taken away because could not pay for it	5.2%	2.0%	7.0%	2.5%*
Had a child who got in trouble with police	3.0%	4.1%	3.3%	1.2%
Needed a regular babysitter or child care service but could not pay for it	8.3%	12.5%	4.6%	9.5%*
Had someone in your home who got sick or hurt and could not get medical care	9.7%	11.1%	8.3%	16.1%*
None of the above	44.2%	47.9%	66.1%	35.5%*

* Differences between “before” and “during” statistically significant at the .05 level

Adverse Events by Type of County

- Exhibit V-2 shows the percentage of respondents who reported adverse events, by type of county. For the 1998-1999 sample, the data show that 23.7 percent of the respondents in non-exempt counties reported getting behind in rent in the past year, compared to only 6 percent who reported getting behind in rent before the least year. In the same sample, respondents from the two types of exempt counties did not show a similar increase in the percentage who reported getting behind in rent in the past year. Also, the percentage who had fallen behind in rent payments since leaving Food Stamps was much higher in the non-exempt counties than the exempt counties.

- In the 1999-2000 sample however, respondents from both the exempt counties and the non-exempt counties showed an increase in the percentage who had fallen behind in rent.
- In the 1998-1999 sample, almost 13 percent of the respondents in non-exempt counties had moved in the past year because they could not afford housing – an increase from 9.4 percent who reported having to move before the past year for financial reasons. In contrast, respondents from exempt counties did not show much of a change in the percentage who had to move because they could not afford to pay for housing.
- In the 1999-2000 sample, respondents from the exempt counties showed an increase in the percentage who had moved for financial reasons in the past year, while there was not much change in the non-exempt counties.
- Among the 1998-1999 sample, there was more than a threefold increase in the non-exempt counties in the percentage of respondents who reported getting behind on a utility bill – from 6 percent before the past year to 21.4 percent in the past year. However, almost 28 percent of the respondents from the counties exempt due to high unemployment got behind on a utility bill in the past year, an increase from 8.8 percent for the period before the past year. There was relatively little increase among respondents from counties exempt due to the 15 percent provision.
- In the 1999-2000 sample, respondents from exempt counties and non-exempt counties had major increases in the percent who had fallen behind on a utility bill.
- In the 1998-1999 sample, the percentage of respondents in the non-exempt counties who reported going without electricity at some time increased from 3.4 percent for the period before the last year to 10.3 percent in the past year. For the respondents in the exempt counties, there was a decrease. The same pattern was observed in terms of the percent of respondents who had their water cut off. In the 1999-2000 sample, there was an overall increase in the percentage of respondents who had had utilities cut off, regardless of type of county.
- For the 1998-1999 sample, respondents in exempt counties were more likely to have had their telephone cut off in the last 12 months than before the last 12 months. There was no change for respondents from non-exempt counties. In the 1999-2000 sample, respondents from the exempt and non-exempt counties had comparable increases in the percentage who had had their telephones cut off.
- Very few respondents in either type of county reported having to go to a homeless shelter at any time.

- Among the 1998-1999 respondents, there was an increase in the non-exempt counties in the percentage of respondents who reported that someone in their home had been sick or injured at some time but could not get medical care – from 8.6 percent before the past year to 12.0 percent during the past year. An even larger increase occurred among cases exempt under the 15 percent provision. There was a decrease among cases from the counties exempt due to high unemployment.
- Among the 1999-2000 sample, the percentage who reported health care access problems increased from 4.2 percent to 13.3 percent in the non-exempt counties. There were smaller increases among respondents from the exempt counties.

Exhibit V-2-A
Adverse Events That Had Happened to Respondents,
by Type of County, 1998-1999 Leavers Still Off Food Stamps

	Exempt- 15 Percent (N = 60)		Exempt- Unemployment (N = 77)		Non-Exempt (N = 101)	
	Before Last Year	During Last Year	Before Last Year	During Last Year	Before Last Year	During Last Year
Got behind in paying for rent or other housing	20.3%	16.9%	10.3%	10.3%	6.0%	23.7%*
Had to move because could not pay for housing	11.3%	10.9%	10.3%	11.8%	9.4%	12.9%
(Moved for reasons other than money in last 12 months)	N/A	18.4%	N/A	19.1%	N/A	24.0%
Got behind on a utility bill	14.6%	18.8%	8.8%	27.9%*	6.0%	21.4%*
Went without electricity	9.4%	3.8%	16.2%	11.8%	3.4%	10.3%
Went without heat	5.6%	7.5%	4.4%	7.4%	2.6%	7.7%
Had water cut off	9.0%	5.2%	7.4%	1.5%	1.7%	6.0%
Had to go to a homeless shelter	1.9%	0.0%	2.9%	0.0%	3.4%	1.7%
Had telephone cut off	13.2%	23.1%	16.2%	27.9%	16.0%	16.3%
Children had to live with someone else because could not afford to take care of them	1.9%	1.4%	2.9%	2.9%	1.7%	4.3%
Needed a regular babysitter or child care service but could not find it	5.6%	5.6%	2.9%	8.8%	1.7%	5.1%
Had a car or truck taken away because could not pay for it	5.6%	1.4%	5.9%	2.9%	4.3%	1.7%
Had a child who got in trouble with police	3.8%	3.8%	2.9%	2.9%	2.6%	6.0%
Needed a regular babysitter or child care service but could not pay for it	14.2%	12.3%	8.8%	13.2%	3.4%	12.9%
Had someone in your home who got sick or hurt and could not get medical care	8.5%	14.2%	13.2%	8.8%	8.6%	12.0%
None of the above	49.5%	49.5%	38.2%	44.1%	43.7%	49.7%

* Differences between “before” and “during” statistically significant at the .05 level

Exhibit V-2-B
Adverse Events That Had Happened to Respondents,
by Type of County, 1999-2000 Leavers Still Off Food Stamps

	Exempt- 15 Percent (N = 46)		Exempt- Unemployment (N = 76)		Non-Exempt (N = 120)	
	Before Last Year	During Last Year	Before Last Year	During Last Year	Before Last Year	During Last Year
Got behind in paying for rent or other housing	13.0%	21.7%	11.8%	19.7%	9.2%	17.5%
Had to move because could not pay for housing	6.5%	15.2%	5.3%	10.5%	9.2%	10.8%
(Moved for reasons other than money in last 12 months)	N/A	27.0%	N/A	34.4%	N/A	23.5%
Got behind on a utility bill	10.9%	34.8%*	11.8%	27.6%*	12.5%	23.3%*
Went without electricity	8.7%	15.2%	5.3%	6.6%	7.5%	15.8%*
Went without heat	8.7%	15.2%	5.3%	7.9%	2.5%	7.5%
Had water cut off	2.2%	6.5%	6.6%	10.5%	1.7%	8.3%
Had to go to a homeless shelter	4.3%	8.7%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	0.8%
Had telephone cut off	19.6%	28.3%	19.7%	30.3%	10.0%	21.7%*
Children had to live with someone else because could not afford to take care of them	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.9%	3.3%	4.2%
Needed a regular babysitter or child care service but could not find it	0.0%	2.2%	5.3%	11.8%	6.7%	7.5%
Had a car or truck taken away because could not pay for it	8.7%	2.2%	6.6%	2.6%	6.7%	2.5%
Had a child who got in trouble with police	2.2%	0.0%	3.9%	2.6%	3.3%	0.8%
Needed a regular babysitter or child care service but could not pay for it	0.0%	6.5%	5.3%	9.2%	5.8%	10.8%
Had someone in your home who got sick or hurt and could not get medical care	13.0%	17.4%	11.8%	19.7%	4.2%	13.3%*
None of the above	60.9%	41.3%	65.8%	26.3%*	68.3%	39.2%*

* Differences between “before” and “during” statistically significant at the .05 level

Adverse Events by Employment Status

- Exhibit V-3 shows the percentage of respondents who reported adverse events in the past year, by current employment status.
- The 1998-1999 respondents who were working at the time of follow-up were less likely to have moved in the last 12 months because they could not pay for housing (8.5 percent) than respondents who were not working (16.3 percent). However, respondents who were working were more likely to report that they had moved in the last 12 months for any reason (46.6 percent) than respondents who were not working (36.7 percent). Similar patterns were found for the 1999-2000 sample.

- The 1998-1999 respondents who were **not** working were more likely to have gone without electricity, heat, and water in the past 12 months than respondents who were working. Among the 1999-2000 respondents, the pattern was less clear.
- The 1998-1999 respondents who were working (24.4 percent) were more likely to have had their telephone cut off than respondents who were not working (18.7 percent). The pattern was reversed for the 1999-2000 sample.
- About 5.3 percent of non-working 1998-1999 respondents reported that there were times in the past year when they had to send their children to live with someone else, compared to only 1.3 percent of working respondents. This pattern, however, did not hold for the 1999-2000 respondents.
- About 13 percent of 1998-1999 non-working respondents reported that someone in their home had encountered problems with access to medical care in the past 12 months, compared to only 9.6 percent of working respondents. In the 1999-2000 sample, non-working respondents were slightly more likely than working respondents to report a problem.
- Surprisingly, 57 percent of the 1998-1999 non-working respondents reported that none of the events listed above had happened to them in the past year, compared to only 40 percent of working respondents. In the 1999-2000 sample, there was little difference between working and non-working respondents.

Exhibit V-3
Adverse Events That Had Happened to Respondents in the Past 12 Months,
by Current Employment Status

Adverse Events	1998-1999 Leavers		1999-2000 Leavers	
	Working (N = 131)	Not Working (N = 107)	Working (N = 122)	Not Working (N = 120)
Got behind in paying for rent or other housing	17.1%	17.4%	18.9%	19.2%
Had to move because could not pay for housing	8.5%	16.3%	10.6%	12.5%
(Moved for reasons other than money in last 12 months)	38.1%*	20.1%*	31.0%	24.2%
Got behind on a utility bill	22.7%	21.6%	29.6%	24.1%
Went without electricity	7.9%	10.7%	12.3%	13.3%
Went without heat	3.9%*	12.8%*	10.7%	7.5%
Had water cut off	2.2%	7.0%	4.9%*	12.5%*
Had to go to a homeless shelter	0.0%	1.6%	1.6%	2.5%
Had telephone cut off	24.4%	18.7%	22.1%	29.2%
Children had to live with someone else because could not afford to take care of them	1.3%	5.3%	4.1%	2.5%
Needed a regular babysitter or child care service but could not find it	6.5%	4.5%	7.4%	8.4%
Had a car or truck taken away because could not pay for it	1.5%	2.7%	3.3%	1.7%
Had a child who got in trouble with police	4.6%	3.5%	0.0%	2.5%
Needed a regular babysitter or child care service but could not pay for it	9.6%	16.0%	11.5%	7.5%
Had someone in your home who got sick or hurt and could not get medical care	9.6%	13.1%	14.8%	17.5%
None of the above	40.2%*	57.2%*	34.4%	36.7%

* Differences between “working” and “not working” statistically significant at the .05 level

C. Food Security

- Respondents who were still off Food Stamps were asked a series of questions about access to food. For the 1999-2000 surveys, the questions included all of the six items from the short version of the USDA food security index. Both rounds of surveys also included other questions about food security.
- We begin by presenting the results for individual questions. Next, we show the overall scores for the food security index.
- Finally, we present the results of a multiple regression analysis designed to determine whether type of county had a significant impact upon food security when controlling for respondent characteristics.

Cutting the Size of Meals or Skipping Meals, by Type of County

- Exhibit V-4 shows the percentage of respondents who reported that they or any family members had cut the size of meals or skipped meals because of lack of money to buy food.
- As shown in the exhibit, almost 23 percent of all 1998-1999 respondents reported that they had cut the size of meals or skipped meals in the past year, compared to only 9.3 percent before the past year. For 1999-2000 respondents, there was somewhat less of an increase -- the percentages were 18.1 percent and 27.2 percent, respectively.
- Among the 1998-1999 sample, respondents residing in counties exempt under the 15 percent provision were much more likely to have cut the size of meals or skipped meals in the past year (31.2 percent) than respondents in non-exempt counties and respondents in counties exempt due to high unemployment. The same overall pattern held true for the 1999-2000 sample but with a smaller difference between the types of counties.
- In both exempt and non-exempt counties, respondents were much more likely to have cut the size of meals or skipped meals in the last year than before the last year. Also, the proportional increase was greater in the non-exempt counties compared to the exempt counties.

Exhibit V-4 **Did You or Your Family Ever Cut The Size of Meals** **or Skip Meals Because There Was Not Enough** **Money to Buy Food?**

Sample	Exempt- 15 Percent		Exempt- Unemployment		Non-Exempt		Total	
	Before Last Year	During Last year	Before Last Year	During Last year	Before Last Year	During Last Year	Before Last Year	During Last Year
1998-1999 Leavers (N = 240)	14.7%*	31.2%*	11.8%	19.1%	3.4%*	18.8%*	9.3%*	22.8%*
1999-2000 Leavers (N = 242)	21.7%	36.9%	25.0%	27.6%	12.5%*	23.3%*	18.1%*	27.2%*

* Differences between "before" and "during" statistically significant at the .05 level

Cutting the Size of Meals or Skipping Meals, by Other Respondent Characteristics

- Exhibit V-5 shows the percentage of respondents who reported that they or any family members had cut the size of meals or skipped meals in the past year, by selected characteristics.
- The data indicate that respondents who were working at the time of the survey were somewhat less likely than respondents who were not working to report having had a problem in the past year.
- In the 1998-1999 sample, there was not a major difference between blacks and whites in the percentage of respondents who reported problems in the past year. In the 1999-2000 sample, blacks were somewhat more likely to report a problem.
- In terms of age, the 1998-1999 respondents who were most likely to have had problems with food security in the past year were the youngest age group (18-24) and the oldest age groups (35 and older). In the 1999-2000 sample, a very large percentage of respondents aged 40 and older reported having a problem.

Exhibit V-5

Percentage Reporting That They Had Cut the Size of Meals or Skipped Meals in the Past Year Due to Lack of Money, by Selected Characteristics

Characteristics	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers
<i>N</i>	242	240
<i>Employment Status</i>		
Currently working	21.8%	23.8%
Not working	24.0%	30.8%
<i>Gender</i>		
Female	26.4%	27.4%
Male	19.3%	27.2%
<i>Education</i>		
Did not complete high school or GED	22.0%	26.5%
Completed high school or GED	24.0%	28.0%
<i>Ethnicity</i>		
Black	23.3%	28.6%
White	21.3%	21.6%
<i>Age</i>		
18-24	24.6%	21.8%
25-29	12.8%	26.0%
30-34	9.5%	14.3%
35-39	22.4%	36.4%
40+	25.2%	53.1%

Frequency of Cutting the Size of Meals or Skipping Meals

- Respondents who reported having to cut the size of meals or skip meals were asked how often this had happened in the past year and before the past year.
- For the 1998-1999 sample, Exhibit V-6 shows that 35.7 percent of the respondents who reported having a problem in the past year stated that the problem happened almost every month. In contrast, only 19.2 percent of those who reported a problem before the past 12 months stated that it happened every month. The 1999-2000 respondents showed a slightly smaller increase – from 27.3 percent to 36.4 percent.
- Among 1998-1999 respondents who reported a problem in the last 12 months, persons residing in exempt counties were more likely than respondents in non-exempt counties to report that the problem occurred every month (39.3 percent compared to 30.8 percent of the respondents in non-exempt counties). In the 1999-2000 sample, however, the pattern was reversed.
- In the 1998-1999 sample, the percentage who reported that the problem occurred almost every month about doubled between the two time periods in both the exempt and non-exempt counties.

Exhibit V-6
How Often Did You or Your Family Cut the Size of Meals
or Skip Meals Because There Was Not Enough
Money to Buy Food?

Response	1998-1999 Leavers					
	Exempt (N = 31)		Non-Exempt (N = 23)		Total (N = 54)	
	Before Last Year	During Last year	Before Last Year	During Last Year	Before Last Year	During Last Year
Almost every month	20.0%	39.3%	16.7%	30.8%	19.2%	35.7%
Some months but not every month	66.7%*	39.3%*	50.0%	38.5%	62.8%*	38.9%*
Only one or two months	13.3%	21.4%	33.3%	30.8%	18.0%	25.3%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Response	1999-2000 Leavers					
	Exempt (N = 38)		Non-Exempt (N = 28)		Total (N = 44)	
	Before Last Year	During Last year	Before Last Year	During Last Year	Before Last Year	During Last Year
Almost every month	20.7%	26.3%	40.0%	50.0%	27.3%	36.4%
Some months but not every month	34.5%	26.3%	6.7%	21.4%	25.0%	24.2%
Only one or two months	44.8%	47.4%	53.3%	28.6%	47.7%	39.4%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Differences between “before” and “during” statistically significant at the .05 level

Actions Taken by Respondents

- Respondents who reported that they had to cut the size of meals or skip meals were asked what actions they took to address the situation.
- As shown in Exhibit V-7, almost 74 percent of the 1998-1999 respondents who reported that they had skipped meals in the past year dealt with the situation by getting food or money from family or friends. This was about the same percentage as for those who had experienced problems before the past year. In the 1999-2000 sample, the percentages were 65.6 percent and 64.3 percent, respectively.
- The data indicate that 12.3 percent of the 1998-1999 respondents who reported that they had skipped meals in the past year dealt with the situation by getting meals or food at a shelter/pantry. In contrast, none of the 1998-1999 respondents reported the receipt of meals or food at a shelter/pantry before the past year.

- Of the 1999-2000 respondents who reported a problem in the past year, 16.7 percent had used food pantries in the past year, compared to 12.5 percent for the period before the past year.
- About 19 percent of the 1998-1999 respondents who reported problems buying food **before the last year** said that they went hungry. Applying this to the 9.3 percent who reported having to cut the size of meals (Exhibit V-7), we find that 1.8 percent of the 1998-1999 respondents had gone hungry before the past 12 months. The data show that 10.5 percent of the 1998-1999 respondents who reported problems buying food **in the past year** said that they went hungry. Applying this to the 22.8 percent who reported having to skip meals in the past year (Exhibit V-7), we find that 2.4 percent of the respondents reported going hungry in the past year.
- In the 1999-2000 sample, a very small percentage of the respondents who reported problems buying food said they went hungry, either before the last year or in the last year. This was true for both the exempt and non-exempt counties.
- For the 1998-1999 sample, 13.6 percent of the respondents in non-exempt counties who reported problems paying for food **in the past year** said that they went hungry, compared to only 7.9 percent of the respondents from exempt counties.
- Combining the data from Exhibit V-4 and Exhibit V-8, we find that 2.9 percent of the respondents from non-exempt counties reported going hungry in the past year, compared to 1.9 percent of the respondents from exempt counties. The percentage of respondents who reported going hungry increased from 1.6 percent to 2.9 percent in the non-exempt counties, and from 1.7 percent to 1.9 percent in the exempt counties.

Exhibit V-7
**What Did You Do When You or Your Family Did Not Have
Enough Money for Food?**

	1998-1999 Leavers					
	Exempt		Non-Exempt		Total	
Response	Before Last Year	During Last year	Before Last Year	During Last Year	Before Last Year	During Last Year
Went hungry	13.3%	7.9%	33.3%	13.6%	19.1%	10.5%
Got meals or food at shelter/pantry	0.0%	13.2%	0.0%	13.6%	0.0%	12.3%
Got meals/food or money for food from church	13.3%	7.9%	0.0%	4.5%	9.5%	7.0%
Were given food or money for food from friends or relatives	73.3%	71.1%	66.7%	68.2%	71.4%	73.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%*	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	1999-2000 Leavers					
	Exempt		Non-Exempt		Total	
Response	Before Last Year	During Last year	Before Last Year	During Last Year	Before Last Year	During Last Year
Went hungry	2.7%	2.0%	0.0%	2.5%	1.8%	2.2%
Got meals or food at shelter/pantry	10.8%	14.0%	15.8%	20.0%	12.5%	16.7%
Got meals/food or money for food from church	24.3%	16.0%	15.8%	15.0%	21.4%	15.6%
Were given food or money for food from friends or relatives	62.2%	68.0%	68.4%	62.5%	64.3%	65.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* N < 10 ** N sizes in the exhibit too small for testing

Eating Less Due to Lack of Money

- Respondents were asked whether they had ever eaten less than they felt they should because there was not enough money to buy food.
- As indicated in Exhibit V-8, about 18 percent of 1998-1999 respondents reported that in the past year, they had eaten less on occasion than they felt they should. This compares to 9 percent who reported having a similar problem before the past year.
- For the 1999-2000 sample, 26 percent reported eating less on occasion in the past year, compared to about 15 percent before the last year.
- In both samples, persons living in counties exempt under the 15 percent provision were the most likely to report a problem during the last year.

Exhibit V-8
Did You Ever Eat Less Than You Felt You Should Because
There Was Not Enough Money to Buy Food?

Sample	Exempt- 15 Percent		Exempt- Unemployment		Non-Exempt		Total	
	Before Last Year	During Last Year	Before Last Year	During Last Year	Before Last Year	During Last Year	Before Last Year	During Last Year
1998-1999 Leavers (N = 240)	14.6%	21.7%	5.8%	16.1%	8.6%	18.0%	9.3%*	18.4%*
1999-2000 Leavers (N = 242)	19.9%	32.6%	13.1%	23.7%	14.1%*	25.8%*	14.9%*	26.5%*

* Differences between “before” and “during” statistically significant at the .05 level

Not Eating When Hungry

- Respondents were asked whether they were ever hungry but did not eat because they could not afford food.
- Exhibit V-9 indicates that 11.7 percent of the 1998-1999 respondents reported having this problem in the past year, compared to 5.2 percent before the past year. In the 1999-2000 sample, the percentage increased from 10.4 percent to 17.4 percent.
- In the 1998-1999 sample, the percentage who reported that they had been hungry in the past year but could not afford food was about the same in 15 percent exempt counties (13.1 percent) as in the non-exempt counties (12.9 percent). In the 1999-2000 sample the percentage was higher in the 15 percent exempt counties.
- In the non-exempt counties in the 1998-1999 sample, the percentage of respondents who reported not eating because they could not afford food increased from 2.6 percent to 12.9 percent. This was greater than the increase for exempt counties.

Exhibit V-9

Were You Ever Hungry But Didn't Eat Because You Couldn't Afford Food?

Sample	Exempt- 15 Percent		Exempt- Unemployment		Non-Exempt		Total	
	Before Last Year	During Last year	Before Last Year	During Last year	Before Last Year	During Last Year	Before Last Year	During Last Year
1998-1999 Leavers (N = 240)	10.8%	13.1%	3.0%	8.9%	2.6%	12.9%	5.2%*	11.7%*
1999-2000 Leavers (N = 242)	10.9%	23.9%	11.8%	15.8%	9.1%*	15.8%*	10.4%*	17.4%*

* Differences between "before" and "during" statistically significant at the .05 level

Food Not Lasting

- Respondents were asked the question "The food that I bought just didn't last, and I didn't have money to get more. Was that often true, sometimes true, or never true for you?" For the 1998-1999 leavers, this question was asked only about the last 12 months.
- As shown in Exhibit V-10, 11.4 percent of all 1998-1999 respondents reported that this was often true for them in the past year, while another 40.2 percent said it was sometimes true. Respondents in counties exempt under the 15 percent provision were the most likely to report that the situation was often true.
- For the 1999-2000 survey, the question was asked about the past year and for the year before the last 12 months. As indicated in Exhibit V-11, the percentage who said it was often true or sometimes true in the past year was largely unchanged from the period before the past year.

Exhibit V-10

The Food That I Bought Just Did Not Last and I Did Not Have Money to Get More -- How Often True? -- 1998-1999 Leavers

Response	Exempt- 15 Percent (N = 131)	Exempt- Unemployment (N = 77)	Non- Exempt (N = 101)	Total (N = 238)
Often true	16.9%	7.4%	10.3%	11.4%
Sometimes true	37.8%	47.1%	39.1%	40.2%
Never true	45.3%	45.6%	50.6%	48.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* None of the differences between types of county statistically significant at the .05 level

Exhibit V-11
The Food That I Bought Just Did Not Last and I Did Not Have Money
to Get More -- How Often True? -- 1999-2000 Leavers

Response	Exempt- 15 Percent (N = 46)		Exempt- Unemployment (N = 76)		Non-Exempt (N = 120)		Total (N = 242)	
	Before Last Year	During Last year	Before Last Year	During Last year	Before Last Year	During Last year	Before Last Year	During Last year
Often true	17.4%	15.2%	18.4%	18.4%	14.2%	16.7%	16.1%	16.9%
Sometimes true	26.1%	30.4%	34.2%	35.5%	25.8%	26.7%	28.5%	30.2%
Never true	56.5%	54.3%	47.4%	46.1%	60.0%	56.7%	55.4%	52.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* None of the differences between “before” and “during” statistically significant at the .05 level

Eating Balanced Meals

- Respondents were asked the question "We couldn't afford to eat balanced meals. Was this often true, sometimes true, or never true for you?" For the survey of 1998-1999 leavers, this was asked only for the past 12 months.
- As indicated in Exhibit V-12, 11.2 percent of all 1998-1999 respondents reported that this was often true in the past year, while 28.2 percent said that it was sometimes true. Respondents living in the 15 percent exempt counties were much more likely than other respondents to report that it was often true.
- For the 1999-2000 sample, the question was asked for the last 12 months and for the year before the last 12 months. As shown in Exhibit V-13, 14.5 percent reported that it was often true in the past year, and 22.3 percent reported that it was sometimes true. These percentages were largely unchanged from the period before the past year.
- In the 1999-2000 sample, there was little difference between the different types of counties.

Exhibit V-12
I/We Could Not Afford to Eat Balanced Meals
How Often True? -- 1998-1999 Leavers

Response	Exempt- 15 Percent (N = 131)	Exempt- Unemployment (N = 77)	Non- Exempt (N = 101)	Total (N = 238)
Often true	20.3%*	7.4%*	8.6%*	11.2%
Sometimes true	20.7%	36.8%	25.4%	28.2%
Never true	59.0%	55.9%	66.0%	60.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Differences between “exempt–15 percent” and other counties statistically significant at the .05 level

Exhibit V-13
I/We Could Not Afford to Eat Balanced Meals
How Often True? -- 1999-2000 Leavers

Response	Exempt- 15 Percent (N = 46)		Exempt- Unemployment (N = 76)		Non-Exempt (N = 120)		Total (N = 242)	
	Before Last Year	During Last year	Before Last Year	During Last year	Before Last Year	During Last year	Before Last Year	During Last year
Often true	17.4%	17.4%	14.5%	14.5%	11.7%	13.3%	13.6%	14.5%
Sometimes true	26.1%	23.9%	25.0%	21.1%	20.8%	22.5%	23.1%	22.3%
Never true	56.5%	58.7%	60.5%	64.5%	67.5%	64.2%	63.2%	63.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* Differences between “before” and “during” NOT statistically significant at the .05 level

Overall Food Security

- Exhibit V-14 presents the scores of the 1999-2000 respondents on the six-item USDA Food Security Index.
- As indicated, about 60 percent of the 1999-2000 respondents were food secure in the past 12 months, while 22.7 percent were food insecure without hunger, and 16.9 percent were food insecure with hunger.
- The percentage who were food insecure with hunger was higher in the 15 percent exempt counties (21.7 percent) than in the non-exempt counties (15.8 percent).

Exhibit V-14
Food Security in the Past 12 Months, by Location,
1999-2000 Respondents

Food Security	Exempt- 15 Percent (N = 46)	Exempt- Unemployment (N = 76)	Non-Exempt (N = 120)	Total (N =242)
Food secure	58.7%	60.5%	60.8%	60.3%
Food insecure with no hunger evident	19.6%	23.7%	23.3%	22.7%
Food insecure with hunger evident	21.7%	15.8%	15.8%	16.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* Differences between types of county not statistically significant at the .05 level

Food Security by Gender

- Exhibit V-15 shows that males (21.1 percent) were more likely than females (13.3 percent) to have been food insecure with hunger in the past 12 months.

Exhibit V-15
Food Security in the Past 12 Months, by Gender,
1999-2000 Respondents

Food Security	Female (N = 128)	Male (N = 114)
Food secure	64.1%	56.1%
Food insecure with no hunger evident	22.7%	22.8%
Food insecure with hunger evident	13.3%	21.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

*Differences between female and male NOT statistically significant at the .05 level

Food Security by Age

- Exhibit V-16 shows that food insecurity with hunger was much higher among respondents aged 35 and older than among younger respondents. About 34 percent of respondents aged 40 and older were food insecure with hunger in the past 12 months.

Exhibit V-16
Food Security in the Past 12 Months, by Age,
1999-2000 Respondents

Food Security	18-24 (N = 151)	25-29 (N = 23)	30-34 (N = 14)	35-39 (N = 22)	40+ (N = 32)
Food secure	67.5%	52.2%	64.3%	45.5%	40.6%
Food insecure with no hunger evident	21.2%	26.1%	21.4%	27.3%	25.0%
Food insecure with hunger evident	11.3%	21.7%	14.3%	27.3%	34.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Food Security by Employment Status

- Exhibit V-17 shows that food insecurity with hunger was especially high (26.5 percent) among respondents who were not employed and were not living with an employed adult.
- In contrast, food insecurity with hunger was relatively low among employed persons and among persons who were unemployed but living with an employed adult.

Exhibit V-17
Food Security in the Past 12 Months, by Employment Status of
Respondent and Other Adults, 1999-2000 Respondents

Food Security	Respondent Employed (N = 122)	Respondent Not Employed, But Living With Employed Adult (N = 52)	Respondent Not Employed, and Not Living with Employed Adult (N = 68)
Food secure	61.5%	71.2%*	50.0%*
Food insecure with no hunger evident	25.4%	15.4%	23.5%
Food insecure with hunger evident	13.1%*	13.5%	26.5%*
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* Differences statistically significant at the .05 level

Multiple Regression Analysis of Food Security: Overview

- A multiple regression analysis was used to examine the impact of county type upon food security while controlling for the effects of respondent characteristics. The basic approach used in the multiple regression analysis was described earlier in Chapter IV of the report in the section on employment outcomes.
- In conducting the analysis, we used two different outcome variables, as follows:
 - whether or not the respondent experienced food insecurity with hunger; and
 - whether the respondent experienced food insecurity with or without hunger.

Multiple Regression Results for the 1998-1999 Leavers

- For the 1998-1999 leavers, Exhibit V-18 shows the results for food insecurity with hunger present. The data indicate that county type was the only variable that was significantly related to overall food insecurity. Respondents in counties that were exempt under the 15 percent provision were significantly more likely to report overall food insecurity than respondents in other counties. This is the opposite of what might be expected if the ABAWD provisions were creating food security problems for leavers.

Exhibit V-18 Results of Logistic Regression for Food Insecurity with Hunger (1998-1999 Leavers)

Logistic Regression Results		
Dependent Variable = Food Insecure with Hunger (1)		
Variable	Coefficient	Wald Statistic
Constant	-1.914*	5.676
Exempt- 15 percent	1.091*	3.915
Non-exempt	-0.043	0.006
Gender	0.214	0.256
Ethnicity	0.265	0.203
Education	0.286	0.457
Age	-0.490	1.290
Other adults	-0.825	3.696
Model Chi-square [df]	11.395 [7]	
Percent correct predictions	87.8	
McFadden's R ² **	0.065	
* 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) = 176.402 and LL(a,B) = 165.007.		

- For the 1998-1999 leavers, Exhibit V-19 indicates that none of the variables in the equation was significantly related to overall food insecurity.

Exhibit V-19
Results of Logistic Regression for Overall Food Insecurity
(1998-1999 Leavers)

Logistic Regression Results		
Dependent Variable = Food Insecure (1)		
Variable	Coefficient	Wald Statistic
Constant	-0.166	0.110
Exempt- 15 percent	0.358	0.947
Non-exempt	-0.375	1.406
Gender	0.374	1.793
Ethnicity	0.091	0.067
Education	-0.041	0.022
Age	-0.119	0.165
Other adults	-0.231	0.607
Model Chi-square [df]	6.781 [7]	
Percent correct predictions	59.2	
McFadden's R ² **	0.021	
* 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) = 326.146 and LL(a,B) = 319.365.		

Multiple Regression Results for the 1999-2000 Leavers

- For the 1999-2000 leavers, Exhibit V-20 indicates that age was the only variable that was significantly related to food security with hunger present. Specifically, respondents aged over 25 were significantly more likely to report food insecurity with hunger than younger respondents.
- Exhibit V-21 shows similar results for overall food security.

Exhibit V-20
Results of Logistic Regression for Food Insecurity with Hunger,
1999-2000 Leavers

Logistic Regression Results		
Dependent Variable = Food Insecure with Hunger (1)		
Variable	Coefficient	Wald Statistic
Constant	-1.436*	4.909
Exempt- 15 percent	0.283	0.319
Non-exempt	0.083	0.039
Gender	-0.370	1.032
Ethnicity	0.326	0.504
Education	-0.376	1.019
Age	-1.035*	7.332
Other adults	0.556	7.770
Model Chi-square [df]	14.70 [7]	
Percent correct predictions	83.1	
McFadden's R ² **	0.067	
* 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) = 220.204 and LL(a,B) = 205.445.		

Exhibit V-21
Results of Logistic Regression for Overall Food Insecurity,
1999-2000 Leavers

Logistic Regression Results		
Dependent Variable = Food Insecure (1)		
Variable	Coefficient	Wald Statistic
Constant	0.153	0.101
Exempt- 15 percent	-0.048	0.015
Non-exempt	-0.037	0.014
Gender	-0.268	0.947
Ethnicity	0.231	0.461
Education	-0.042	0.024
Age	-0.790*	7.385
Other adults	-0.131	0.194
Model Chi-square [df]	10.232 [7]	
Percent correct predictions	60.7	
McFadden's R ² **	0.031	
* 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) = 325.078 and LL(a,B) = 314.846		

D. Access to Health Care

Health Insurance Coverage

- Respondents were asked whether they, or the people who lived with them, had some type of health insurance coverage, including Medicaid. As shown in Exhibit V-22, slightly less than 50 percent of the 1998-1999 respondents answered "yes" to this question, while the other 50 percent of respondents did not have health insurance. The percentage of respondents with health coverage was about the same for exempt and non-exempt counties.
- For the 1999-2000 respondents, almost 61 percent indicated that they had some type of health coverage. The percentage was slightly higher in the exempt counties.

Exhibit V-22

Do You or Other People Who Live With You Have Some Kind of Health Insurance, Including Medicaid?

	1998-1999 Leavers		
Response	Exempt (N = 131)	Non-Exempt (N = 108)	Total (N = 238)
Yes	49.6%	48.8%	49.2%
No	50.4%	51.2%	50.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	1999-2000 Leavers		
Response	Exempt (N = 122)	Non-Exempt (N = 120)	Total (N = 242)
Yes	63.1%	58.3%	60.7%
No	36.9%	41.7%	39.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Type of Health Coverage

- Respondents who reported that they or a household member had some type of health coverage were asked what types of coverage they had.
- As indicated in Exhibit V-23, about 77 percent of the 1998-1999 respondents and 72 percent of the 1999-2000 respondents reported that the coverage was through Medicaid.

- In the 1998-1999 sample, this percentage was the same for exempt and non-exempt counties. In the 1999-2000 sample, the percentage covered by Medicaid was slightly higher in the exempt counties.
- About 25 percent of the 1998-1999 respondents with health coverage said that the coverage was through private insurance. This also did not vary greatly between exempt and non-exempt counties. About 36 percent of the 1999-2000 respondents with health coverage had private coverage.

Exhibit V-23
What Type of Medical Coverage Do You Have?

	1998-1999 Leavers			1999-2000 Leavers		
Response	Exempt (N = 68)	Non- Exempt (N = 59)	Total (N = 100)	Exempt (N = 77)	Non- Exempt (N = 70)	Total (N = 147)
Medicaid	77.2%	77.0%	77.1%	75.3%	68.6%	72.1%
Medicare	1.8%	4.9%	3.2%	3.9%	4.3%	4.1%
CHAMPUS	1.8%	1.6%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Private Insurance	24.6%	26.2%	25.3%	31.2%	41.4%	36.1%

E. Life Since Leaving Food Stamps

Respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with a series of statements reflecting the quality of their lives since leaving Food Stamps.

Results for the Overall Sample

- As indicated in Exhibit V-24, almost 81 percent of all 1998-1999 respondents agreed with the statement that "you feel better about yourself now than a year ago." Respondents residing in non-exempt counties were somewhat more likely to agree with this statement (84.8 percent) than respondents residing in exempt counties (77.4 percent).
- The 1999-2000 sample showed similar overall findings.
- Almost 55 percent of the 1998-1999 respondents and 57 percent of the 1999-2000 respondents agreed with the statement that "you worry more about your family now than a year ago." There was not a major difference between the exempt and non-exempt counties.
- About 55 percent of both samples disagreed with the statement that "you feel more stress now than you did a year ago." In the 1998-1999 sample, there was

not a major difference between exempt and non-exempt counties in the percentage of respondents reporting more stress than a year ago. In the 1999-2000 sample, respondents from exempt counties were much more likely to agree that they felt more stress.

Exhibit V-24
View of Life Since Leaving Food Stamps,
by Type of County

	1998-1999 Leavers (N = 238)			
Statement	Response	Exempt	Non-Exempt	Total
You feel better about yourself now than a year ago	Agree	77.4%	84.8%	80.8%
	Disagree	22.6%	15.2%	19.2%
You worry more about your family now than a year ago	Agree	53.0%	56.8%	54.7%
	Disagree	47.0%	43.2%	45.3%
You feel more stress now than you did a year ago	Agree	44.3%	46.4%	45.3%
	Disagree	55.7%	53.6%	54.7%
	1999-2000 Leavers (N = 242)			
Statement	Response	Exempt	Non-Exempt	Total
You feel better about yourself now than a year ago	Agree	73.8%	85.8%	79.8%
	Disagree	26.2%	14.2%	20.2%
You worry more about your family now than a year ago	Agree	60.7%	54.2%	57.4%
	Disagree	39.3%	45.8%	42.6%
You feel more stress now than you did a year ago	Agree	51.6%	37.5%	44.6%
	Disagree	48.4%	62.5%	55.4%

Life Since Leaving Food Stamps, by Employment Status

- Exhibit V-25 compares working and non-working respondents in terms of whether they agreed or disagreed with the statements about their life since leaving Food Stamps.
- Respondents who were working were more likely to agree with the statement "You feel better about yourself now than a year ago" than respondents who were not working. However, about 70 percent of unemployed respondents thought that life was better.
- Non-working respondents were more likely than working respondents to agree with the statements "you worry more about your family now than a year ago" and "you feel more stress now than a year ago."

Exhibit V-25
View of Life Since Leaving Food Stamps,
by Employment Status

Statement	Response	1998-1999 Leavers		1999-2000 Leavers	
		Working (N = 133)	Not Working (N = 106)	Working (N = 122)	Not Working (N = 120)
You feel better about yourself now than a year ago	Agree	89.1%*	70.5%*	88.5%*	70.8%*
	Disagree	10.9%	29.5%	11.5%	29.2%
You worry more about your family now than a year ago	Agree	52.0%	58.1%	54.9%	60.0%
	Disagree	48.0%	41.9%	45.1%	40.0%
You feel more stress now than you did a year ago	Agree	42.6%	48.5%	39.3%	50.0%
	Disagree	57.4%	51.5%	60.7%	50.0%

* Differences between “working” and “not working” statistically significant at the .05 level

E. Discussion of the Findings

The survey data indicate that there was an increase in the percentage of respondents who reported experiencing minor hardships since leaving Food Stamps, such as having trouble with housing payments or utility bills. The data for the 1998-1999 sample showed that the increase was generally greater in the non-exempt counties than in the counties exempt under the 15 percent provision. In the 1999-2000 sample, however, the difference between the two types of counties was not as clear-cut.

The surveys showed, however, that relatively few respondents in any of the three types of counties experienced the more serious types of hardship, such as having utilities cut off or being homeless. In addition, the respondents from non-exempt counties were no more likely than other respondents to have experienced these more serious types of hardship since leaving Food Stamps.

With regard to food security, the percentage of respondents who reported problems getting enough food was higher in the period after they left Food Stamps. However, the percentage of respondents who reported experiencing problems since leaving Food Stamps was lower in the non-exempt counties than in the counties exempt under the 15 percent provision. Despite these findings, the data do show that a small but significant percentage of ABAWD leavers were experiencing food security problems after leaving Food Stamps. Of particular concern are persons who were not working and not living with an employed adult. Of the 1999-2000 respondents who fell into this category, slightly more than a quarter could be classified as food insecure with hunger evident in the past year.

The data on health care coverage indicate that about half of the 1998-1999 respondents and 40 percent of the 1999-2000 respondents did not have any coverage for themselves. This probably reflects the fact that many of the leavers were not eligible for Medicaid and did not have coverage through employers.