

CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE MAJOR FINDINGS

This chapter presents the major findings from the surveys of Diversion Assistance recipients in the seven sample counties. The findings are organized under the following topic areas:

- characteristics of the families in the sample;
- welfare use prior to receiving Diversion Assistance;
- reasons for coming to the social services agency;
- employment status prior to receiving Diversion Assistance;
- employment status at the time of the follow-up survey;
- employment characteristics and earnings;
- receipt of public assistance and other benefits at follow-up;
- use of child care;
- receipt of child support;
- health care and health insurance;
- deprivation, overall financial situation, and future needs;
- likelihood of reapplying for welfare; and
- satisfaction with the diversion decision.

At the end of each section, we present a brief discussion of the major findings. Most of the analyses are presented by individual county. Because of the small number of cases in three of the counties, the cases for these counties are grouped together in the tables under “Other.”

A. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FAMILIES IN THE SAMPLE

This section present data on the demographic and household characteristics of the 242 families who were surveyed for the study. Comparisons are drawn among each of the counties in the study.

Exhibit II-1 shows the gender of the caseheads in the families. As indicated, about 11.2 percent of the caseheads were male. The percentage of male caseheads was relatively high in County A, County C, and County D, and relatively low in County B and in the three “other” counties.

Exhibit II-2 presents data on the education of caseheads in the sample. As indicated, a relatively high percentage of the respondents had attended college (47.9 percent) and only about one-fifth had not completed high school or a GED. The percentage who had attended

**Exhibit II-1
GENDER OF THE RESPONDENT**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Female	84.2%	95.5%	85.7%	87.7%	92.9%	88.8%
Male	15.8%	4.5%	14.3%	12.3%	7.1%	11.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Exhibit II-2
EDUCATION OF THE RESPONDENT**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Did not complete HS/GED	31.6%	16.3%	11.4%	19.4%	35.7%	19.6%
Completed HS/GED Only	36.8%	32.6%	22.9%	35.7%	21.4%	32.5%
Attended college	31.6%	51.2%	65.7%	45.0%	42.9%	47.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

college varied considerably by county, with a high of 65.7 percent in County C and a low of 31.6 percent in County A.

Exhibit II-3 shows the ethnicity of the caseheads among the survey respondents. Overall, about 29 percent were white and 71 percent were non-white. Almost all of the non-white respondents were African-American. The percentage of whites in the sample was very high in County A (73.7 percent) and the three “other” counties (71.4 percent), and very low in County B (9.1 percent) and County C (11.4 percent).

In County D, the percentage of whites in the sample was much higher than the percentage in the TANF caseload. Among the diverters, 29.2 percent were white, compared to less than 18 percent of the TANF caseload. One of the reasons for the high percentage of whites in the diverter sample is that County D has been using the Diversion Assistance program to serve refugees. This was reported to MAXIMUS during our site visit to the county in March 1999 for the “process evaluation” of the Work First program. The refugee population includes persons from Eastern Europe.

Exhibit II-4 shows the age distribution of the caseheads in the sample. As noted in the exhibit, about 47.9 percent of the respondents were over 30. However, this was largely a

Exhibit II-3

ETHNICITY OF THE RESPONDENT

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
White	73.7%	9.1%	11.4%	29.2%	71.4%	28.9%
Non-White	26.3%	90.9%	88.6%	70.8%	28.6%	71.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Exhibit II-4
AGE OF THE RESPONDENT**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Less than 22	26.3%	4.5%	-	9.2%	7.1%	8.3%
22 to 25	21.1%	25.0%	28.6%	15.4%	28.6%	20.2%
26 to 30	-	36.4%	25.7%	21.5%	28.6%	23.6%
31 to 35	21.1%	18.2%	28.6%	25.4%	7.1%	23.1%
36 to 40	10.5%	11.4%	11.4%	17.7%	7.1%	14.5%
41 and over	21.1%	4.5%	5.7%	10.8%	21.4%	10.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

reflection of the situation in County D, where 53.9 percent of the respondents were over 30. County A had a relatively high percentage of very young persons (aged under 22) in the sample. As indicated below, this may reflect the fact that many of the diverters in County A were on maternity leave when they came in to inquire about assistance. County A, however, as well as the three “other” counties, had a relatively high percentage of older clients (41 and over). In County B, only 34.1 percent of the respondents were over 30.

Exhibit II-5 shows ethnicity by age among the respondents. As indicated, white respondents were generally older than non-white respondents. About 62.9 percent of whites were over 30, compared to 41.9 percent of non-whites.

Exhibit II-6 shows the number of children in the case, by county. About 70 percent of the families had one or two children and 30 percent had more than two children. Families with more than two children were more common in County B (34.9 percent) and County D (32.6 percent), and accounted for only 21.3 percent of families in County A and only 17.1 percent of families in County C.

**Exhibit II-5
AGE OF THE RESPONDENT, BY ETHNICITY**

	White	Non-White	Total
Less than 22	7.1%	8.7%	8.3%
22 to 25	18.6%	20.9%	20.2%
26 to 30	11.4%	28.5%	23.6%
31 to 35	31.4%	19.8%	23.1%
36 to 40	18.6%	12.8%	14.5%
41 and over	12.9%	9.3%	10.3%
Total	100.0% (N = 70)	100.0% (N = 172)	100.0% (N = 242)

**Exhibit II-6
NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN THE CASE**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
None	5.3%	-	-	-	-	.4%
One	36.8%	32.6%	37.1%	27.9%	42.9%	31.7%
Two	36.8%	32.6%	45.7%	39.5%	28.6%	38.3%
Three	5.3%	20.9%	11.4%	22.5%	14.3%	18.8%
Four+	15.8%	14.0%	5.7%	10.1%	14.3%	10.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Exhibit II-7 shows the percentage of respondents who reported that they were living with their spouse. The data indicate that respondents living with their spouse accounted for a relatively large percentage of families in County A (31.6 percent), County C (20.0 percent), and County D (23.1 percent). These percentages are also much higher than the proportion of two-parent cases in the TANF caseload.

Exhibit II-8 shows household size by county. Larger households (more than three persons) were more common in County B (51.2 percent), County D (52.0 percent), and the “other” counties combined (64.2 percent) than in County A (36.9 percent) and County C (25.8 percent).

Exhibit II-9 shows the number of other adults in the household, by county. ***Overall, 46.3 percent of the respondents reported that there was at least one other adult in the household.*** The percentages were particularly high for County A (61.2 percent), County D (49.6 percent), and the three “other” counties (64.3 percent).

**Exhibit II-7
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS LIVING WITH THEIR SPOUSE**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
--	----------	----------	----------	----------	-------	-------

Lives with spouse	31.6%	4.5%	20.0%	23.1%	14.3%	19.4%
Does not live with spouse	68.4%	95.5%	80.0%	76.9%	85.7%	80.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Exhibit II-8
HOUSEHOLD SIZE**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Two	15.8%	23.3%	25.7%	14.0%	21.4%	17.9%
Three	47.4%	25.6%	48.6%	34.1%	14.3%	34.6%
Four	15.8%	30.2%	14.3%	29.5%	21.4%	25.8%
Five	5.3%	14.0%	8.6%	8.5%	21.4%	10.0%
Six +	15.8%	7.0%	2.9%	14.0%	21.4%	11.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Exhibit II-9
NUMBER OF OTHER ADULTS IN THE HOUSEHOLD**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
None	36.8%	69.8%	62.9%	50.4%	35.7%	53.8%
One	57.9%	23.3%	37.1%	38.0%	28.6%	36.3%
2 or more	5.3%	7.0%	-	11.6%	35.7%	10.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Exhibit II-10 presents data on the number of other adults in the household, by the ethnicity of the respondent. As indicated, the percentage of whites who had at least one other adult in the household (72.4 percent) was much higher than the percentage of non-whites (35.6 percent).

**Exhibit II-10
NUMBER OF OTHER ADULTS IN THE HOUSEHOLD,
BY ETHNICITY**

	White	Non-White	Total
--	-------	-----------	-------

None	27.5%	64.3%	53.8%
One	53.6%	29.2%	36.3%
2 or more	18.8%	6.4%	10.0%
Total	100.0% (N =69)	100.0% (N = 171)	100.0% (N = 240)

For those who reported that there was another adult in the household, Exhibit II-11 shows the relationship of the other adult to the respondent. As indicated, 42.3 percent of the other adults were spouses and another 4.5 percent were partners. About 20.7 percent of the other adults were the mothers of the respondents and 8.1 percent were the respondents’ fathers. About 13.5 percent reported an unrelated adult in the household.

**Exhibit II-11
RELATIONSHIP OF THE OTHER ADULT
TO THE RESPONDENT**

	Count (N=111)	Percentage
Spouse	47	42.3%
Partner/significant other	5	4.5%
Mother	23	20.7%
Father	9	8.1%
Grandmother	2	1.8%
Daughter	2	1.8%
Son	9	8.1%
Sister	11	9.9%
Brother	4	3.6%
Aunt	2	1.8%
Uncle	1	.9%
Cousin	2	1.8%
Unrelated adult	15	13.5%
Other relative	13	11.7%

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

On a preliminary basis, the findings presented in this section suggest the following overall conclusions:

- In most of the counties, the families who received Diversion Assistance appear to be different in important ways than the overall TANF caseload. Specifically, they are more likely to involve two-parent households, and the heads of household are generally older and more educated than persons in the overall TANF population. To some extent, this is to be expected in terms of the objectives of the Diversion Assistance program, which is supposed to be targeted to persons with a high likelihood of returning to work or accessing other types of income in the near future.

- The variations that exist among the counties appear to be affected by differences in the targeting of Diversion Assistance to specific types of applicants and do not simply reflect differences among counties in the characteristics of the low-income population.

In regard to the latter point, our site visits to the seven counties showed that they differed in their approaches to the Diversion Assistance program. Some counties were using the program very narrowly to focus assistance on persons with a consistent work history and definite prospects of returning to work in the near future. Other counties were taking a broader approach to the program. As noted, County D was using the program to provide assistance to refugees. We also found evidence that variations existed among individual eligibility workers in the same county in terms of the types of persons who might be considered appropriate for Diversion Assistance. To some extent, this was due to the fact that workers in some counties were unsure about the most appropriate situations for granting Diversion Assistance. In addition, there is evidence that some workers were unclear about the procedures for Diversion Assistance and preferred to process TANF applications rather than take on unfamiliar procedures.

B. WELFARE USE PRIOR TO RECEIVING DIVERSION ASSISTANCE

Exhibit II-12 presents data on prior welfare use by the respondents. As indicated, 44.6 percent of the respondents reported that they had been on cash assistance at some time in the past. The percentage was especially high in County B (48.8 percent), County C (48.6 percent) and the “other” counties combined (57.1 percent), but was also high in County A and County D at slightly more than 40 percent.

For those respondents who reported receiving cash assistance before, Exhibit II-13 shows the year when respondents began receiving cash assistance. As noted, 58.0 percent of

**Exhibit II-12
PRIOR WELFARE USE BY THE RESPONDENT**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
On welfare Before	42.1%	48.8%	48.6%	41.1%	57.1%	44.6%
Not on welfare before	57.9%	51.2%	51.4%	58.9%	42.9%	55.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Exhibit II-13
YEAR WHEN FIRST RECEIVED WELFARE**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Prior to 1991	12.5%	23.8%	5.9%	28.3%	37.5%	23.4%
1991 – 1995	25.0%	33.3%	35.3%	37.7%	25.0%	34.6%
1996 – 1998	62.5%	42.9%	58.8%	34.0%	37.5%	42.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

the respondents who had received welfare before had begun receiving assistance prior to 1996. The percentage was highest in County D (66.0 percent) and the “other” counties combined (62.5 percent) and lowest in County A (37.5 percent) and County C (41.2 percent).

Exhibit II-14 presents data on prior welfare use by education. As would be expected, persons who had not completed high school or a GED were more likely to have been on welfare before (55.3 percent) than persons who had completed only high school or a GED and persons who had attended college.

Exhibit II-15 presents data on prior welfare use by the age of the respondent. Persons between the ages of 22 and 30 were more likely to have been on welfare before (about 53 percent) than persons in other age groups. Respondents aged 41 and over were the least likely to have been on welfare before.

Exhibit II-16 shows prior welfare use by ethnicity. As indicated, about one-half (49.7 percent) of non-whites had been on welfare before, compared to slightly less than a third (31.9 percent) of whites.

**Exhibit II-14
PRIOR WELFARE USE, BY EDUCATION**

	Did not complete HS/GED	Completed HS/GED Only	Attended college	Total
On Welfare Before	55.3%	44.9%	40.0%	44.6%
Not on Welfare Before	44.7%	55.1%	60.0%	55.4%
Total	100.0% (N = 47)	100.0% (N = 78)	100.0% (N = 115)	100.0% (N = 240)

**Exhibit II-15
PRIOR WELFARE USE, BY AGE OF THE RESPONDENT**

	Less than 22	22 to 25	26 to 30	31 to 35	36 to 40	41 and over	Total
On Welfare Before	35.0%	53.1%	53.6%	42.9%	37.1%	29.2%	44.6%
Not on Welfare Before	65.0%	46.9%	46.4%	57.1%	62.9%	70.8%	55.4%
Total	100.0% (N = 20)	100.0% (N = 49)	100.0% (N = 56)	100.0% (N = 56)	100.0% (N = 35)	100.0% (N = 24)	100.0% (N = 240)

**Exhibit II-16
PRIOR WELFARE USE, BY ETHNICITY OF THE RESPONDENT**

	White	Non-White	Total
On Welfare Before	31.9%	49.7%	44.6%
Not on Welfare Before	68.1%	50.3%	55.4%
Total	100.0% (N = 69)	100.0% (N = 171)	100.0% (N = 240)

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

The findings presented in this section are somewhat surprising in terms of the relatively large percentage of persons who had been on welfare before, and the fact that many of them had begun receiving welfare several years earlier. Given the focus of the Diversion Assistance program, it might have been expected that relatively few of the participants would have been on welfare in the past. The variations among the counties may partly reflect the different approaches that counties have taken to targeting persons for Diversion Assistance. During our site visits, some counties reported that persons who have a prior history of long-term welfare spells are not generally considered appropriate candidates for diversion.

On the other hand, the large number of respondents with a prior history of welfare use may reflect positively on the Diversion Assistance program, suggesting that the program may be effective in encouraging persons with a history of welfare use to explore other options to going back on welfare. It should also be emphasized that prior welfare use does not necessarily mean that the respondents did not have a work history.

C. REASONS FOR COMING TO THE SOCIAL SERVICES AGENCY

Exhibit II-17 presents data on the specific reasons why respondents came to the local social services agency when seeking assistance. The respondents could select more than one

option from the list in the exhibit, so the percentages add to more than 100 percent. The first three reasons focus on job-related factors. About 21.5 percent indicated that they had been laid off from a job, 19.4 percent were on maternity leave from a job, and 14 percent lost their job due to illness or incapacity. Another 3.3 percent indicated that their spouse had lost a job.

The next most common reason cited by respondents was “new to area,” accounting for 12.8 percent of the cases. A small percentage of respondents mentioned “divorce or separation” and “loss of income due to spouse moving out of the household” as reasons. Although about 14 percent cited not being able to pay their rent or mortgage as a factor, this was usually cited in conjunction with the other reasons already mentioned. Although transportation problems such as car repairs have often been thought of as a primary reason why persons might receive diversion payments, only one respondent mentioned car problems as a reason for applying for assistance.

Exhibit II-18 shows the reasons why respondents came in to the social service agency, by county. As indicated, there is significant variation among the counties. Maternity leave accounted for about 41 percent of all the diversion cases in County B and almost one-third of the cases in County A, but only 11.5 percent of the cases in County D and none in the three “other” counties. Job layoffs accounted for only 10.5 percent of the cases in County but 23.8 percent in County D. Job loss due to illness or incapacity accounted for more than a third of the cases in the three “other” counties combined but for only 11 to 12 percent of cases in the three largest counties.

Divorce or separation was the reason cited by 21.4 percent of respondents in the three “other” counties combined, but was not cited by any respondents in the other counties, except for a few cases in County D. “New to area” was mentioned by 15.8 percent of the respondents in County A and 19.2 percent of the respondents in County D, but by very few respondents in the other counties. In the case of County D, the practice of giving

Exhibit II-17
REASONS FOR COMING TO THE SOCIAL SERVICES AGENCY

	Count (N= 242)	Percentage
Layoff from a job	52	21.5%
Went on maternity leave	47	19.4%
Lost job due to illness or incapacity	34	14.0%
Divorce or separation	7	2.9%
New child/pregnancy	18	7.4%
Loss of income due to person moving out of household	4	1.7%
Could not pay rent or mortgage	33	13.6%
Could not pay utilities	24	9.9%
Car broke down/no transportation	1	.4%
Could not pay for child care	17	7.0%
New to area	31	12.8%
Spouse lost job	8	3.3%
To ask about other assistance (e.g., MA, Food Stamps)	4	1.7%

Other	25	10.3%
-------	----	-------

diversion assistance to refugees may largely be responsible for this pattern. Another finding was that respondents in the three largest counties were more likely to mention problems paying rent and utilities than respondents in other counties. Child care was mentioned as a factor by 21 percent of the respondents in the three “other” counties combined but was not a significant factor in the other counties.

Exhibit II-19 shows the reasons for coming in to the social services agency, by education. The data show that persons who had attended college were more likely than other respondents to cite job layoffs as the reason for coming in. Persons who had not completed high school were less likely than other respondents to mention the first three job-related reasons in the exhibit, but were more likely to mention divorce or separation. These respondents were also more likely to mention child care affordability and “spouse lost job” as reasons.

Exhibit II-20 presents data on the reasons for seeking assistance, by ethnicity. The data show that there were no major differences between whites and non-whites in terms of the percentage citing job layoffs or job losses due to illness. However, non-whites were more than twice as likely as whites to mention maternity leave. In contrast, whites were far more likely to mention divorce or separation than non-whites. Non-whites were more likely than whites to cite problems with paying rent and utilities. Whites were much more likely to mention “new to area.” In fact, about 23 percent of the white respondents indicated that this was the reason for seeking assistance, compared to only 8.7 percent of non-whites. This pattern may partly reflect the fact that refugees were a significant part of the diverter population in County D.

Exhibit II-18
REASONS FOR COMING TO THE SOCIAL SERVICES AGENCY

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Layoff from a job	10.5%	18.2%	22.9%	23.8%	21.4%	21.5%
Went on maternity leave	31.6%	40.9%	22.9%	11.5%	-	19.4%
Lost job due to illness or incapacity	21.1%	11.4%	11.4%	12.3%	35.7%	14.0%
Divorce or separation	-	-	-	3.1%	21.4%	2.9%
New child/pregnancy	10.5%	15.9%	2.9%	5.4%	7.1%	7.4%
Loss of income due to person moving out of household	-	-	-	3.1%	-	1.7%
Could not pay rent or mortgage	5.3%	13.6%	11.4%	16.2%	7.1%	13.6%
Could not pay utilities	5.3%	9.1%	11.4%	10.8%	7.1%	9.9%
Car broke down/no transportation	-	-	-	.8%	-	.4%
Could not pay for child care	-	-	8.6%	8.5%	21.4%	7.0%

New to area	15.8%	2.3%	2.9%	19.2%	7.1%	12.8%
Spouse lost job	5.3%	2.3%	8.6%	2.3%	-	3.3%
To ask about other assistance (e.g., MA, Food Stamps)	5.3%	2.3%	-	1.5%	-	1.7%
Other	5.3%	11.4%	20.0%	7.7%	14.3%	10.3%

**Exhibit II-19
REASONS FOR COMING TO THE SOCIAL SERVICES AGENCY,
BY EDUCATION**

	Did not complete HS/GED (N=47)	Completed HS/GED Only (N=78)	Attended college (N=115)	Total (N=240)
Layoff from a job	17.0%	19.2%	25.2%	21.7%
Went on maternity leave	14.9%	24.4%	18.3%	19.6%
Lost job due to illness or incapacity	8.5%	20.5%	12.2%	14.2%
Divorce or separation	6.4%	1.3%	2.6%	2.9%
New child/pregnancy	6.4%	9.0%	7.0%	7.5%
Loss of income due to person moving out of household	-	1.3%	2.6%	1.7%
Could not pay rent or mortgage	10.6%	9.0%	18.3%	13.8%
Could not pay utilities	8.5%	9.0%	11.3%	10.0%
Car broke down/no transportation	-	1.3%	-	.4%
Could not pay for child	14.9%	5.1%	5.2%	7.1%

care				
New to area	14.9%	11.5%	13.0%	12.9%
Spouse lost job	8.5%	1.3%	2.6%	3.3%
To ask about other assistance (e.g., MA, Food Stamps)	2.1%	1.3%	.9%	1.3%
Other	8.5%	7.7%	12.2%	10.0%

**Exhibit II-20
REASONS FOR COMING TO THE SOCIAL SERVICES AGENCY,
BY ETHNICITY**

	White (N=70)	Non-White (N=172)	Total (N=242)
Layoff from a job	20.0%	22.1%	21.5%
Went on maternity leave	10.0%	23.3%	19.4%
Lost job due to illness or incapacity	14.3%	14.0%	14.0%
Divorce or separation	8.6%	.6%	2.9%
New child/pregnancy	4.3%	8.7%	7.4%
Loss of income due to person moving	4.3%	.6%	1.7%
Could not pay rent or mortgage	7.1%	16.3%	13.6%
Could not pay utilities	7.1%	11.0%	9.9%
Car broke down/no transportation	1.4%	-	.4%
Could not pay for child care	8.6%	6.4%	7.0%
New to area	22.9%	8.7%	12.8%
Spouse lost job	7.1%	1.7%	3.3%
To ask about other assistance	2.9%	1.2%	1.7%
Other	8.6%	11.0%	10.3%

Exhibit II-21 presents data on the reasons for coming in to the social services agency, by age. Maternity leave was the most common reason given by persons under 22 (45 percent) and persons aged 22 to 25 (30.6 percent). Job loss due to illness or incapacity was cited much more often by persons aged 36 and up than by younger age groups. Problems paying for child care were cited much more often by persons under 26 than by older respondents. “New to area” was mentioned more often by older respondents, accounting for almost one third of all cases

involving persons 41 and over. These respondents were also more likely than younger persons to cite “to ask for other types of assistance.”

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

Under Work First policy, counties have flexibility in determining how to structure and target their Diversion Assistance programs. The data presented in this section provide evidence of variation among the counties in how the program is being targeted. Our site visits to the counties revealed that some counties were targeting the program to persons who had recently lost a job or gone on leave, while other counties were using the program more broadly. When examining long-term employment patterns and other outcomes among persons who have received Diversion Assistance, it is important to keep in mind the differences among counties in who is being served by the program and the reasons why they were seeking assistance.

**Exhibit II-21
REASONS FOR COMING TO THE SOCIAL SERVICES AGENCY, BY
AGE**

	Less than 22 (N=20)	22 to 25 (N=49)	26 to 30 (N=57)	31 to 35 (N=56)	36 to 40 (N=35)	41 and over (N=25)	Total (N=242)
Layoff from a job	20.0%	12.2%	22.8%	30.4%	20.0%	20.0%	21.5%
Went on maternity leave	45.0%	30.6%	19.3%	17.9%	5.7%	-	19.4%
Lost job due to illness or incapacity	-	12.2%	8.8%	14.3%	28.6%	20.0%	14.0%
Divorce or separation	-	6.1%	5.3%	-	2.9%	-	2.9%
New child/pregnancy	5.0%	20.4%	7.0%	3.6%	2.9%	-	7.4%
Loss of income due to person moving	-	2.0%	-	1.8%	-	8.0%	1.7%
Could not pay rent or mortgage	15.0%	8.2%	22.8%	16.1%	8.6%	4.0%	13.6%
Could not pay utilities	15.0%	4.1%	17.5%	10.7%	2.9%	8.0%	9.9%
Car broke down/no transportation	-	-	-	1.8%	-	-	.4%
Could not pay for child care	15.0%	16.3%	3.5%	1.8%	5.7%	4.0%	7.0%
New to area	5.0%	12.2%	10.5%	7.1%	17.1%	32.0%	12.8%
Spouse lost job	5.0%	2.0%	-	7.1%	5.7%	-	3.3%
To ask about other assistance	-	-	1.8%	1.8%	-	8.0%	1.7%

Other	-	6.1%	17.5%	12.5%	8.6%	8.0%	10.3%
-------	---	------	-------	-------	------	------	-------

D. EMPLOYMENT STATUS PRIOR TO RECEIVING DIVERSION ASSISTANCE

Exhibit II-22 shows the employment status of respondents during the six months before they began receiving diversion assistance. The data show that 76.4 percent of all respondents were working for pay outside the home and an additional 1.7 percent were self-employed. The fact that 21.9 percent were not working during the six months before receiving assistance is somewhat surprising in view of the fact that diversion assistance is supposed to be targeted primarily at persons who have a recent attachment to the workforce.

**Exhibit II-22
EMPLOYMENT STATUS IN THE SIX MONTHS BEFORE
THE DIVERSION PAYMENT WAS RECEIVED**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Working for pay outside the home	78.9%	90.9%	82.9%	70.8%	64.3%	76.4%
Self-employed	5.3%	2.3%	-	1.5%	-	1.7%
Not working for pay	15.8%	6.8%	17.1%	27.7%	35.7%	21.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The data show that the percentage of persons who had been working varied considerably by county. In County B, fewer than 7 percent of the respondents had not been working or self-employed, compared to 27.7 percent of respondents in County D and 35.7 percent of the respondents in the three “other” counties combined. The latter finding may be related to the fact (noted previously in Exhibit II-18) that divorce and separation accounted for a relatively large percentage of the cases in the three “other” counties. The refugee population may account for the relatively large percentage of persons in County D who had not been working.

Exhibit II-23 shows the percentage who had been working, by education. The data indicate that persons who had not completed high school were somewhat less likely to have been working than more educated respondents. Exhibit II-24 shows the data by ethnicity. As indicated, non-white respondents were far more likely to have been working or self-employed (84.9 percent) than whites (61.4 percent). This finding possibly reflects the refugee situation in County D and the fact that job-related reasons for seeking assistance were not cited as frequently by persons in the three “other” counties. Exhibit II-25 shows the percentage who had been working, by age. Persons in the two youngest age groups were much more likely to have been working than persons in the two oldest age groups.

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

The findings in this section provide further confirmation of the variations that exist among counties in how the Diversion Assistance program is being targeted. Again, it is important to keep these variations in mind when analyzing data on the post-diversion employment and earnings patterns among program participants. In counties where a sizeable percentage of the participants have not been working in the period before receiving assistance, we are likely to find less favorable long-term employment outcomes than in counties where participants were typically in the workforce.

**Exhibit II-23
EMPLOYMENT STATUS IN THE SIX MONTHS BEFORE THE
DIVERSION PAYMENT WAS RECEIVED, BY EDUCATION**

	Did not complete HS/GED	Completed HS/GED Only	Attended college	Total
Working for pay outside the home	68.1%	80.8%	77.4%	76.7%
Self-employed	2.1%	-	1.7%	1.3%
Not working for pay	29.8%	19.2%	20.9%	22.1%
Total	100.0% (N = 47)	100.0% (N = 78)	100.0% (N = 115)	100.0% (N = 240)

**Exhibit II-24
EMPLOYMENT STATUS IN THE SIX MONTHS BEFORE THE
DIVERSION PAYMENT WAS RECEIVED, BY ETHNICITY**

	White	Non-White	Total
Working for pay outside the home	57.1%	84.3%	76.4%
Self-employed	4.3%	.6%	1.7%
Not working for pay	38.6%	15.1%	21.9%
Total	100.0% (N = 70)	100.0% (N = 172)	100.0% (N = 242)

**Exhibit II-25
EMPLOYMENT STATUS IN THE SIX MONTHS BEFORE THE
DIVERSION PAYMENT WAS RECEIVED, BY AGE**

	Less than 22	22 to 25	26 to 30	31 to 35	36 to 40	41 and over	Total
Working for pay outside home	90.0%	81.6%	71.9%	82.1%	65.7%	68.0%	76.4%
Self-employed	-	-	-	1.8%	5.7%	4.0%	1.7%
Not working for pay	10.0%	18.4%	28.1%	16.1%	28.6%	28.0%	21.9%
Total	100.0% (N = 20)	100.0% (N = 49)	100.0% (N = 57)	100.0% (N = 56)	100.0% (N = 35)	100.0% (N = 25)	100.0% (N = 242)

E. EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT THE TIME OF THE FOLLOW-UP SURVEY

Exhibit II-26 shows the employment status of respondents at the time when they were surveyed. The data indicate that 23.6 percent of the respondents were not working at the time of the survey. This finding is surprising in view of the fact that diversion assistance is designed largely for persons who have good prospects of employment in the short-term. The data show that the percentage of persons who were not working was highest in County A (36.8 percent), whereas only about 20-25 percent of respondents in the other counties were not working. Part of the explanation for this pattern is that relatively few of the respondents in County A were seeking assistance due to a job layoff (see Exhibit II-18). In addition, a relatively high percentage were seeking assistance due to being “new to the area” or because they had lost a job due to illness or incapacity. Finally, a relatively high percentage of County A respondents were seeking help because they had gone on maternity leave. It is possible that many of these clients were still on extended maternity leave at the time when they were surveyed.

**Exhibit II-26
EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT THE TIME OF THE FOLLOW-UP SURVEY,
BY COUNTY**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Working for pay outside the home	57.9%	70.5%	68.6%	76.9%	78.6%	73.1%
Self-employed	5.3%	2.3%	2.9%	.8%	-	1.7%
On medical leave without pay	-	6.8%	-	-	-	1.2%
Not working for pay	36.8%	20.5%	25.7%	22.3%	21.4%	23.6%
Not working for pay, starting new job in 2 weeks	-	-	2.9%	-	-	.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Exhibit II-27 shows the percentage of respondents who were working, by ethnicity. The data show that non-whites were more likely to be working than whites. Only 19.2 percent of the non-whites were *not* working, compared to 34.3 percent of the whites. This finding is consistent with the data presented previously in Exhibit II-24 showing that non-whites were much more likely than whites to have been working prior to seeking assistance.

**Exhibit II-27
EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT THE TIME OF THE FOLLOW-UP SURVEY,
BY ETHNICITY**

	White	Non-White	Total
Working for pay outside the home	62.9%	77.3%	73.1%
Self-employed	2.9%	1.2%	1.7%
On medical leave without pay	-	1.7%	1.2%
Not working for pay	34.3%	19.2%	23.6%
Not working for pay, starting new job in 2 weeks	-	.6%	.4%
Total	100.0% (N = 70)	100.0% (N = 172)	100.0% (N = 242)

Exhibit II-28 shows the percentage of persons who were working at follow-up, by education. As indicated, persons who had more education were slightly more likely to be working than persons with less education. Exhibit II-29 shows the percentage of persons who were working, by age. Persons aged under 22 were more likely to be working than persons in older age groups. Persons aged 41 and over were the least likely to be working.

**Exhibit II-28
EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT THE TIME OF THE FOLLOW-UP SURVEY,
BY EDUCATION**

	Did not complete HS/GED	Completed HS/GED Only	Attended college	Total
Working for pay outside the home	68.1%	73.1%	76.5%	73.8%
Self-employed	-	1.3%	1.7%	1.3%
On medical leave without pay	2.1%	2.6%	-	1.3%
Not working for pay	29.8%	23.1%	20.9%	23.3%
Not working for pay, starting new job in 2	-	-	.9%	.4%

weeks				
Total	100.0% (N = 47)	100.0% (N = 78)	100.0% (N = 115)	100.0% (N = 240)

**Exhibit II-29
EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT THE TIME OF THE FOLLOW-UP SURVEY,
BY AGE**

	Less than 22	22 to 25	26 to 30	31 to 35	36 to 40	41 and over	Total
Working for pay outside the home	85.0%	75.5%	77.2%	66.1%	77.1%	60.0%	73.1%
Self-employed	-	2.0%	-	1.8%	2.9%	4.0%	1.7%
On medical leave without pay	-	2.0%	-	-	5.7%	-	1.2%
Not working for pay	15.0%	18.4%	22.8%	32.1%	14.3%	36.0%	23.6%
Not working for pay, starting new job in 2 weeks	-	2.0%	-	-	-	-	.4%
Total	100.0% (N = 20)	100.0% (N = 49)	100.0% (N = 57)	100.0% (N = 56)	100.0% (N = 35)	100.0% (N = 25)	100.0% (N = 242)

Exhibit II-30 shows the percentage of persons who were working at follow-up, by the number of children in the case. Families with three children were the most likely to be working, but the data do not show a clear correlation between working and the number of children. Exhibit II-31 shows the percentage of persons who were working, by the age of the youngest child. Contrary to expectations, families in which the youngest child was 5 or under were as likely to be working as families in which the youngest child was school-age.

**Exhibit II-30
EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT THE TIME OF THE FOLLOW-UP SURVEY,
BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN THE CASE**

	None	One	Two	Three	More than 3	Total
Working for pay outside the home	100.0%	68.4%	75.0%	80.0%	73.1%	73.8%
Self-employed	-	1.3%	1.1%	-	3.8%	1.3%
On medical leave without pay	-	1.3%	2.2%	-	-	1.3%
Not working for pay	-	27.6%	21.7%	20.0%	23.1%	23.3%
Not working for	-	1.3%	-	-	-	.4%

pay, starting new job in 2 weeks						
Total	100.0% (N = 1)	100.0% (N = 76)	100.0% (N = 92)	100.0% (N = 45)	100.0% (N = 26)	100.0% (N = 240)

**Exhibit II-31
EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT THE TIME OF THE FOLLOW-UP SURVEY,
BY AGE OF THE YOUNGEST CHILD**

	Less than one year	1 to 2 years	3 to 5 years	6 to 8 years	Over 8 years	Total
Working for pay outside the home	76.6%	81.1%	73.9%	64.9%	69.0%	73.6%
Self-employed	-	-	2.2%	-	4.8%	1.3%
On medical leave without pay	1.3%	-	2.2%	-	2.4%	1.3%
Not working for pay	22.1%	18.9%	21.7%	32.4%	23.8%	23.4%
Not working for pay, starting new job in 2 weeks	-	-	-	2.7%	-	.4%
Total	100.0% (N = 77)	100.0% (N = 37)	100.0% (N = 46)	100.0% (N = 37)	100.0% (N = 42)	100.0% (N = 239)

Exhibit II-32 shows the employment status of respondents at follow-up, by their employment status in the six months before seeking assistance. Employment at follow-up is shown in the left-hand column of the exhibit. The data show that, of those who had been working for pay outside the home, only 18.4 percent were not working at follow-up. Among persons who had been self-employed (n = 4), one was not working at follow-up. Among persons who had *not* been working for pay before diverting, 41.5 percent were not working at follow-up.

Exhibit II-33 shows the percentage of persons who were working at follow-up, by their welfare history. The data indicate that 18.7 percent of persons who had been on welfare before were not working at follow-up, compared to 27.1 percent of persons who had not been on welfare. This apparently anomalous finding is probably related to the targeting of diversion assistance in the different counties. For example, in County D the respondents may include a number of refugees who probably had not been on welfare before and whose short-term employment prospects may not have been good. In County A, there were apparently a relatively large percentage of respondents who had not been on welfare before and who were seeking assistance because they were either new to the area or had lost a job due to illness or incapacity.

**Exhibit II-32
EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT THE TIME OF THE FOLLOW-UP SURVEY,
BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS IN THE SIX MONTHS BEFORE DIVERSION**

	Working for pay outside the home	Self- employed	Not working for pay	Total
Working for pay outside the home	78.4%	25.0%	58.5%	73.1%
Self-employed	1.1%	50.0%	-	1.7%
On medical leave without pay	1.6%	-	-	1.2%
Not working for pay	18.4%	25.0%	41.5%	23.6%
Not working for pay, starting new job in 2 weeks	.5%	-	-	.4%
Total	100.0% (N = 185)	100.0% (N = 4)	100.0% (N = 53)	100.0% (N = 242)

**Exhibit II-33
EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT THE TIME OF THE FOLLOW-UP SURVEY,
BY WELFARE HISTORY**

	On Welfare Before	Not on Welfare Before	Total
Working for pay outside the home	78.5%	69.9%	73.8%
Self-employed	1.9%	.8%	1.3%
On medical leave without pay	.9%	1.5%	1.3%
Not working for pay	18.7%	27.1%	23.3%
Not working for pay, starting new job in 2 weeks	-	.8%	.4%
Total	100.0% (N = 107)	100.0% (N = 133)	100.0% (N = 240)

For persons who reported being employed at the time of follow-up, Exhibit II-34 shows the number of jobs that respondents reported having had since they received diversion assistance. As noted, 71.6 percent of the respondents reported having had only one job, and 28.4 percent reported having had two or more jobs. Job turnover among the respondents was relatively high, therefore, given the short follow-up period.

Exhibit II-34

NUMBER OF PAID JOBS SINCE RECEIVING THE DIVERSION PAYMENT, PERSONS CURRENTLY EMPLOYED

Number of paid jobs	Count (N=183)	Percentage
One	131	71.6%
Two	45	24.6%
Three	7	3.8%

For persons *not* currently working at follow-up, Exhibit II-35 shows the percentage who had been in paid jobs since diverting. The data show that 41.4 percent of the currently unemployed respondents had been working at some time since receiving diversion assistance.

**Exhibit II-35
NUMBER OF PAID JOBS SINCE RECEIVING THE DIVERSION PAYMENT, PERSONS CURRENTLY NOT EMPLOYED**

Number of paid jobs	Count (N=58)	Percentage
One	19	32.8%
Two	4	6.9%
Three	1	1.7%
None	34	58.6%

For respondents *not* currently employed, Exhibit II-36 shows the reasons why they were not working. Respondents could check multiple answers to this question, so the percentages add up to more than 100 percent. The data indicate that “can’t find a job” and “can’t get a job” were the leading reasons given for not working. Disability or illness of the respondent or a family member was mentioned by 19 percent of unemployed respondents. Of the 7 respondents who reported a disability or illness, 6 indicated that it was expected to last more than one year. Child care problems were mentioned by 13.8 percent. *Of the persons who were not employed, 62.5 percent said that they were looking for work and 37.5 percent indicated they were not.*

For respondents who were working *before and after diverting*, Exhibit II-37 presents data on the percentage who were working in the same job as before. The data show that only 54.2 percent of these respondents were working at the same job as before diverting.

**Exhibit II-36
REASONS FOR NOT WORKING**

	Count	Percentage
--	-------	------------

	(N=58)	
Disability/illness of respondent	7	12.1%
Disability/illness of child	3	5.2%
Disability/illness of family member	1	1.7%
Pregnancy complications	1	1.7%
Prefer to stay home with my child	7	12.1%
I was fired or laid off	6	10.3%
Child care problems	8	13.8%
Jobs don't pay enough	2	3.4%
Transportation problems	5	8.6%
Work hours aren't convenient	1	1.7%
Jobs are short-term/seasonal	1	1.7%
I'm currently in school	3	5.2%
Can't find a job	16	27.6%
Can't get a job	8	13.8%
Other	6	10.3%

**Exhibit II-37
RESPONDENTS WORKING BEFORE AND AFTER DIVERTING --
PERCENTAGE EMPLOYED IN THE SAME JOB AS BEFORE**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Same Job	66.7%	67.6%	69.6%	41.6%	57.1%	54.2%
Not the same Job	33.3%	32.4%	30.4%	58.4%	42.9%	45.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Exhibit II-37 also shows that the percentage of persons who returned to their old jobs varied by county. Among persons employed both at follow-up and before diverting, only 41.6 percent of respondents in County D returned to their old jobs. In County A, County B, and County C, the percentages were between 66 and 70 percent. *Among the entire County D sample, only 24.6 percent had returned to the same jobs held before receiving diversion assistance.*

For persons who were working both at follow-up and before diverting, Exhibit II-38 shows the percentage of persons who had returned to their old jobs, by ethnicity. The data show that non-whites were somewhat more likely to have returned to their old jobs than whites.

**Exhibit II-38
RESPONDENTS WORKING BEFORE AND AFTER DIVERTING --
PERCENTAGE WORKING IN SAME JOB AS BEFORE, BY ETHNICITY**

	White	Non-white	Total
Same Job	48.5%	55.8%	54.2%

Not the same Job	51.5%	44.2%	45.8%
Total	100.0% (N = 33)	100.0% (N = 120)	100.0% (N = 153)

Exhibit II-39 shows the percentage of currently employed persons who had returned to their old jobs, by the age of respondents. In general, older respondents were less likely than younger respondents to have returned to their previous jobs. This is consistent with the earlier finding that younger respondents were more likely to have applied for assistance due to going on maternity leave.

**Exhibit II-39
RESPONDENTS WORKING BEFORE AND AFTER DIVERTING --
PERCENTAGE WORKING IN SAME JOB AS BEFORE, BY AGE**

	Less than 22	22 to 25	26 to 30	31 to 35	36 to 40	41 and over	Total
Same Job	52.9%	61.8%	50.0%	61.1%	43.5%	45.5%	54.2%
Not the same Job	47.1%	38.2%	50.0%	38.9%	56.5%	54.5%	45.8%
Total	100.0% (N = 17)	100.0% (N = 34)	100.0% (N = 32)	100.0% (N = 36)	100.0% (N = 23)	100.0% (N = 11)	100.0% (N = 153)

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

Given the fact that some of the respondents were surveyed relatively soon after receiving diversion assistance, it is possible that the next round of follow-up surveys may find a higher rate of employment among the sample. However, the fact that about 24 percent of the sample were not working at the initial follow-up raises some concerns. The 24 percent figure appears to be due mostly to the large percentage of respondents who were *not* working in the six months before they received Diversion Assistance. Among persons who had been working, 81.6 percent were working at follow-up or were due to return to their jobs. However, the data also suggest that many of the persons who did not have jobs at the time of the surveys were experiencing difficulties in finding employment and may require more extensive re-employment services.

F. EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS AND EARNINGS

Exhibit II-40 shows the occupations in which respondents were working at the time of the survey. The most common occupations were customer service, cashier/checker, office clerk, restaurant worker, assembly/production worker, bus driver, and child care worker/baby sitter, each of which accounted for more than 6 percent of the cases.

Exhibit II-40
OCCUPATIONS IN WHICH PERSONS WERE WORKING

	Count (N=184)	Percentage
Administrative assistant	4	2.2%
Assembly/production worker	15	8.2%
Bus driver (school/other)	13	7.1%
Cashier/checker	16	8.7%
Child care/babysitter	12	6.5%
Clerk, general office	15	8.2%
Data entry/clerk typist	5	2.7%
Farm worker/helper	1	.5%
Housekeeper (hospital)	4	2.2%
Housekeeper (motel/home)	5	2.7%
Janitor/maintenance worker	3	1.6%
Kitchen helper/dishwasher	1	.5%
Machinist	3	1.6%
Nurse (RN)	1	.5%
Nurse's aide	9	4.9%
Packager	4	2.2%
Restaurant worker/waiter	15	8.2%
Sales clerk	7	3.8%
Secretary	1	.5%
Security guard	1	.5%
Teacher (K-12/substitute)	1	.5%
Teacher's aide	3	1.6%
Customer Service	16	8.7%
Bank	6	3.3%
Construction	4	2.2%
Barber/Hairstylist	4	2.2%
Other	19	10.3%

Exhibit II-41 shows the number of hours that respondents were working per week in their jobs. The hours shown include hours from all jobs combined (only four respondents had more than one job). The data show that 62 percent of all respondents were working 40 hours per week or more, and that a total of 88.6 percent were working 30 hours per week or more. The percentage who were working 30 hours or more was highest in County B (94.4 percent), County D (90.1 percent), and the three “other” counties combined (90.9 percent) and lowest in County C (76.0 percent).

**Exhibit II-41
HOURS WORKED PER WEEK BY EMPLOYED PERSONS**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
40 hours or more	58.3%	51.4%	64.0%	64.4%	72.7%	62.0%
30 to 39 hours	25.0%	42.9%	12.0%	25.7%	18.2%	26.6%
20 to 29 hours	16.7%	5.7%	24.0%	6.9%	9.1%	9.8%
Less than 20 hours per week	-	-	-	3.0%	-	1.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Exhibit II-42 shows the usual work hours of respondents who were employed at the time of the survey. The data indicate that about 84 percent of respondents usually worked during regular business hours and only 16 percent worked evenings or nights. However, the percentage working evenings or nights was relatively high in County A (33.3 percent) and County C (28.0 percent).

**Exhibit II-42
USUAL WORK HOURS OF PERSONS EMPLOYED**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Between 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m.	66.7%	91.2%	72.0%	85.1%	100.0%	84.2%
Outside of 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.*	33.3%	8.8%	28.0%	14.9%	-	15.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* Begin before 6 a.m. or end after 6 p.m.

Exhibit II-43 shows the percentage of respondents who worked on weekends. *The data indicate that almost 39 percent of all employed respondents worked on weekends.* The percentage was very high in County B (44.1 percent) and County D (42.6 percent) and relatively low in County C and the three “other” counties combined.

**Exhibit II-43
PERCENT OF EMPLOYED PERSONS WORKING ON WEEKENDS**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
--	----------	----------	----------	----------	-------	-------

Working on weekends	33.3%	44.1%	28.0%	42.6%	18.2%	38.8%
Not working on weekends	66.7%	55.9%	72.0%	57.4%	81.8%	61.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Exhibit II-44 presents data on the monthly wages earned by respondents who were working, by county. The data show that 31.1 percent of the respondents were earning more than \$1,500 per month and that 75.9 percent were making more than \$1,000 per month. The percentage who were making more than \$1,000 per month was highest in County B (85.3 percent), County C (76.0 percent), and County D (75.3 percent).

**Exhibit II-44
MONTHLY WAGES OF EMPLOYED PERSONS**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Less than \$500	8.3%	2.9%		3.0%	-	2.7%
\$501 to \$1,000	25.0%	8.8%	24.0%	18.8%	36.4%	19.1%
\$1,001 to \$1,500	33.3%	58.8%	40.0%	40.6%	63.6%	44.8%
More than \$1,500	33.3%	26.5%	36.0%	34.7%	-	31.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Exhibit II-45 presents data on monthly wages by education. As expected, persons with more education had higher wages. Among persons who had attended college, 42.2 percent were making more than \$1,500 per month, compared to 18.2 percent of persons who had not completed high school. However, even among respondents who had not finished high school, 72.7 percent were making more than \$1,000 per month.

**Exhibit II-45
MONTHLY WAGES OF EMPLOYED PERSONS, BY EDUCATION**

	Did not complete HS/GED	Completed HS/GED Only	Attended college	Total
Less than \$500	-	3.3%	3.3%	2.7%
\$501 to \$1,000	27.3%	21.7%	14.4%	19.1%
\$1,001 to \$1,500	54.5%	50.0%	37.8%	44.8%
More than \$1,500	18.2%	21.7%	42.2%	31.1%
Total	100.0% (N=33)	100.0% (N=60)	100.0% (N=90)	100.0% (N=183)

Exhibit II-46 presents data on monthly wages by ethnicity. The data indicate that wages did not differ substantially by ethnicity. About 73.3 percent of whites were making more than \$1,000 per month, compared to 76.8 percent of non-whites.

**Exhibit II-46
MONTHLY WAGES OF EMPLOYED PERSONS, BY ETHNICITY**

	White	Non-White	Total
Less than \$500	2.2%	2.9%	2.7%
\$501 to \$1,000	20.0%	18.8%	19.1%
\$1,001 to \$1,500	40.0%	46.4%	44.8%
More than \$1,500	33.3%	30.4%	31.1%
Total	100.0% (N = 45)	100.0% (N = 138)	100.0% (N = 183)

Exhibit II-47 shows hourly wages by age. The data indicate that persons in the 22 to 30 age group and the 36 to 40 age group had the highest wages. For example, among persons aged 22 to 25, 78.1 percent reported earnings of more than \$1,000 per month. Among persons aged 26 to 30, 77.3 percent reported earnings of more than \$1,000 per month. Among persons aged 36 to 40, one-half reported earnings of more than \$1,500 per month.

Exhibit II-48 shows monthly earnings by occupation. The data indicate that the highest paying occupations were nurse, office clerk, construction, administrative assistant, bus driver, data entry, and bank worker, each of which averaged more than \$9 per hour. The lowest paying occupations were farmworker, child care/baby sitter, restaurant worker, and cashier/checker, each of which averaged less than \$7 per hour. Jobs in houseskeeping, packing, nurse’s aid, and maintenance averaged between \$7 and \$8 per hour.

**Exhibit II-47
MONTHLY WAGES OF EMPLOYED PERSONS, BY AGE**

	Less than 22	22 to 25	26 to 30	31 to 35	36 to 40	41 and over	Total
Less than \$500	-	-	-	5.3%	6.7%	6.7%	2.7%
\$501 to \$1,000	35.3%	10.3%	22.7%	26.3%	10.0%	13.3%	19.1%
\$1,001 to \$1,500	52.9%	66.7%	45.5%	31.6%	26.7%	46.7%	44.8%
More than \$1,500	11.8%	20.5%	31.8%	36.8%	50.0%	26.7%	31.1%
Total	100.0% (N = 17)	100.0% (N = 39)	100.0% (N = 44)	100.0% (N = 38)	100.0% (N = 30)	100.0% (N = 15)	100.0% (N = 183)

Exhibit II-48
HOURLY WAGES BY OCCUPATION

	Mean Wages	Count (N=182)
Nurse (RN)	14.00	1
Office clerk	10.71	15
Construction	10.38	4
Administrative assistant	10.35	4
Other	9.93	17
Bus driver (school/other)	9.77	13
Data entry/clerk typist	9.74	5
Bank	9.05	5
Barber/Hairstylist	8.87	4
Machinist	8.85	3
Customer Service	8.78	16
Secretary	8.50	1
Assembly/production worker	8.35	14
Nurse's aide	7.94	9
Housekeeper (motel/home)	7.90	5
Teacher's aide	7.78	2
Janitor/maintenance worker	7.76	3
Housekeeper (hospital)	7.40	4
Packer	7.30	4
Sales clerk	7.22	7
Security guard	7.00	1
Cashier/checker	6.74	16
Kitchen helper/dishwasher	6.50	1
Restaurant worker/waiter	6.10	15
Child care/babysitter	5.79	12
Farm worker/helper	5.50	1

Exhibit II-49 presents data on the percentage of employed respondents who had received a raise since starting their job, by county. The data indicate that 36.6 percent had received a raise. It should be noted that many of the respondents had returned to their old jobs after receiving diversion assistance, so many of the reported raises may have occurred *before* they received the diversion payment. Also, among persons who had obtained new jobs since diverting, there was little time to obtain pay raises, given the timing of our surveys. The percentage who had received an increase was highest in County C and County B, and lowest in County D. As noted earlier in Exhibit II-37, a relatively small percentage of the respondents in County D were working in the same job as before receiving diversion assistance.

Exhibit II-50 shows the percentage of employed respondents who had received a raise in their jobs, by education. The data show that only 21.2 percent of persons without a high school diploma or GED had received raises, compared to 41.7 percent of persons who had completed high school only and 38.9 percent of those who had attended college.

**Exhibit II-49
PERCENTAGE OF EMPLOYED PERSONS WHO HAD RECEIVED A
RAISE IN THEIR PRIMARY JOB**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Received raise	41.7%	50.0%	60.0%	24.8%	45.5%	36.6%
Did not receive raise	58.3%	50.0%	40.0%	75.2%	54.5%	63.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Exhibit II-50
PERCENTAGE OF EMPLOYED PERSONS WHO HAD RECEIVED A
RAISE IN THEIR PRIMARY JOB, BY EDUCATION**

	Did not complete HS/GED	Completed HS/GED Only	Attended college	Total
Received raise	21.2%	41.7%	38.9%	36.6%
Did not receive raise	78.8%	58.3%	61.1%	63.4%
Total	100.0% (N=33)	100.0% (N=60)	100.0% (N=90)	100.0% (N=183)

Exhibit II-51 presents data on the percentage of employed respondents who had received pay raises, by ethnicity. The data indicate that a slightly higher percentage of non-whites (38.4 percent) had received raises than whites (31.1 percent). This finding may be related to the data presented earlier in Exhibit II-38 showing that non-whites were more likely to have returned to their prior job than whites. In addition, as noted previously in Exhibit II-24, non-whites were much more likely than whites to have been working during the six months before receiving diversion assistance.

Exhibit II-52 shows the percentage of employed respondents who had received a raise, by age. The data show that the youngest and the oldest respondents were generally the least likely to have received a raise.

**Exhibit II-51
PERCENTAGE OF EMPLOYED PERSONS WHO HAD RECEIVED A
RAISE IN THEIR PRIMARY JOB, BY ETHNICITY**

	White	Non-White	Total
Received raise	31.1%	38.4%	36.6%
Did not receive raise	68.9%	61.6%	63.4%
Total	100.0% (N = 45)	100.0% (N = 138)	100.0% (N = 183)

**Exhibit II-52
PERCENTAGE OF EMPLOYED PERSONS WHO HAD RECEIVED A
RAISE IN THEIR PRIMARY JOB, BY AGE**

	Less than 22	22 to 25	26 to 30	31 to 35	36 to 40	41 and over	Total
Received raise	29.4%	38.5%	25.0%	50.0%	46.7%	20.0%	36.6%
Did not receive raise	70.6%	61.5%	75.0%	50.0%	53.3%	80.0%	63.4%
Total	100.0% (N = 17)	100.0% (N = 39)	100.0% (N = 44)	100.0% (N = 38)	100.0% (N = 30)	100.0% (N = 15)	100.0% (N = 183)

Exhibit II-53 shows the percentage of employed respondents who believed that there were opportunities to move up in their current job. The data show that 48.6 percent thought that there were advancement opportunities. The percentage was highest in County B, County D, and County C, and lowest in County A and the three “other” counties.

Exhibit II-54 presents data on the how satisfied the employed respondents were with their current jobs. The data indicate that 79.3 percent were very satisfied or somewhat satisfied. This percentage was lowest in County B (70.6 percent) and highest in the three “other” counties.

**Exhibit II-53
PERCENTAGE OF EMPLOYED PERSONS BELIEVING THAT THERE
WERE ADVANCEMENT OPPORTUNITIES IN THEIR PRIMARY JOB**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Advancement Opportunities	33.3%	58.8%	48.0%	50.5%	18.2%	48.6%
No Opportunities	66.7%	41.2%	52.0%	49.5%	81.8%	51.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Exhibit II-54
DEGREE OF SATISFACTION WITH PRIMARY JOB**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Very satisfied	25.0%	32.4%	40.0%	35.6%	72.7%	37.2%
Somewhat satisfied	66.7%	38.2%	40.0%	42.6%	27.3%	42.1%
Neutral/no opinion		14.7%	16.0%	7.9%	-	9.3%
Somewhat dissatisfied	8.3%	14.7%	4.0%	4.0%	-	6.0%
Very dissatisfied	-	-	-	9.9%	-	5.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Exhibit II-55 shows the percentage of employed respondents who thought that they would likely stay in their current jobs. Overall, almost half (48.2 percent) thought that they would very likely stay in their current jobs and another 25.1 percent thought they would probably stay. The percentage who thought that they would very likely or probably stay in their jobs was highest in County C (84.0 percent) and the three “other” counties (81.8 percent).

For persons who indicated that they might not stay or probably would not stay in their current jobs (n = 20), Exhibit II-56 shows the reasons why they might not stay. The most common reason was low pay.

**Exhibit II-55
LIKELIHOOD OF STAYING IN PRIMARY JOB**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Very likely will stay	33.3%	38.2%	52.0%	52.5%	54.5%	48.6%
Probably will stay	33.3%	32.4%	32.0%	19.8%	27.3%	25.1%
Not sure	33.3%	14.7%	4.0%	15.8%	18.2%	15.3%
Might not stay	-	8.8%	12.0%	2.0%	-	4.4%
Very likely will not stay	-	5.9%	-	9.9%	-	6.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Exhibit II-56
MAIN REASON MAY NOT STAY IN PRIMARY JOB**

	Count (N=20)	Percentage
Low pay	8	40.0%
No health insurance	1	5.0%
No opportunity to advance/earn more money	3	15.0%
Work hours not convenient	1	5.0%
Might be laid off	1	5.0%

Does not like the job	2	10.0%
Wants to own business	1	5.0%
Wants to work in field of study	2	10.0%
Other	1	5.0%

Exhibit II-57 presents data on the percentage of employed respondents who were working for an employer with a health care plan. The data show that 77.2 percent were working for an employer with a health plan. However, the percentage was very low in County A (45.5 percent) compared to the other counties.

For respondents who were working for an employer with a health plan, Exhibit II-58 shows the percentage of persons who were participating in the plan. The data show that only 43.2 percent were participating. This percentage was highest in County C and County D and lowest in County B and the three “other” counties combined.

Combining the data from the two exhibits, we find that *only one third (33.3 percent) of employed respondents were receiving health coverage through their employer* (43.2 percent of the 77.2 percent who were working for an employer with a health plan). The percentage was 41.7 percent in County C, 36.0 percent in County D, 29.4 percent in County B, and 18.2 percent in County A and the three “other” counties combined.

**Exhibit II-57
PERCENTAGE OF PERSONS WORKING FOR AN EMPLOYER WITH
HEALTH COVERAGE**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Has Health Plan	45.5%	82.4%	79.2%	79.0%	72.7%	77.2%
Does not have Health Plan	54.5%	17.6%	20.8%	21.0%	27.3%	22.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Exhibit II-58
PERCENTAGE OF PERSONS PARTICIPATING IN THEIR
EMPLOYER'S COVERAGE**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Participating	40.0%	35.7%	52.6%	45.6%	25.0%	43.2%
Not Participating	60.0%	64.3%	47.4%	54.4%	75.0%	56.8%

Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
-------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

For respondents who reported that they were not participating in their employer’s health plan (n = 79), Exhibit II-59 shows the reasons given for not participating. About 47 percent said that they had not worked for the employer long enough to qualify for health benefits. Almost 28 percent indicated that the costs of the premiums were too high. About 37 percent indicated that they were still on Medicaid. The relatively short time frame between the diversion event and the follow-up survey must be taken into account when considering the low percentage of employed respondents who were covered by an employer health plan.

**Exhibit II-59
REASONS FOR NOT PARTICIPATING IN EMPLOYER'S HEALTH PLAN**

	Count (N=79)	Percentage
I haven't worked there long enough	37	46.8%
I'm a part-time employee	4	5.1%
I'm a temporary employee	2	2.5%
The cost is too high	22	27.8%
I'm still on Medicaid	29	36.7%
Don't know	2	2.5%
Other	3	3.8%

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

The surveys show relatively encouraging results in terms of the large percentage of employed respondents who were working 30 hours or more per week and who had earnings of \$1,000 per month or more. The data also show relatively high rates of job satisfaction among employed respondents. On the other hand, about 22 percent of the sample were making less than \$1,000 per month and 21 percent did not have a very high level of job satisfaction. About one-half did not see any opportunities for advancement in their current positions but about three quarters thought they would probably stay in their jobs.

The data showing that only about one third of all employed respondents were participating in an employer health insurance plan also raises some concerns, although this percentage may increase over time as more respondents begin to qualify for benefits at their jobs. The fact that about 39 percent of the respondents usually work on weekends raises potential

issues about child care availability. The data on occupations confirm that wages vary considerably in terms of the type of occupations in which low-income persons may be placed or find jobs.

G. RECEIPT OF SERVICES, PUBLIC ASSISTANCE, AND OTHER BENEFITS SINCE DIVERTING

Exhibit II-60 shows the percentage of respondents who indicated that they had received different types of training or other services since they obtained diversion assistance. About 13.7 percent had received job training or education and 9.5 percent had received job placement assistance. Very few respondents had received transportation assistance, vocational rehabilitation, substance abuse treatment, domestic violence assistance, or mental health counseling.

For those who had received job training or education, Exhibit II-61 shows who provided the training or education. As indicated, about 27 percent received the training from their employer and 54.5 percent received training or education at a local college. Exhibit II-62 shows the types of education or training that were received. Most of the training involved occupational skills training and college courses.

**Exhibit II-60
PERCENTAGE OF PERSONS RECEIVING DIFFERENT TYPES OF ASSISTANCE SINCE DIVERTING**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Job Training or education	10.5%	18.6%	17.1%	10.8%	21.4%	13.7%
Job placement assistance	5.3%	11.6%	8.6%	8.5%	21.4%	9.5%
Transportation assistance	5.3%	7.0%	8.6%	3.8%	-	5.0%
Vocational Rehabilitation	-	2.3%	-	-	-	.4%
Substance abuse treatment	-	4.7%	-	.8%	-	1.2%
Domestic violence assistance	-	2.3%	-	-	-	.4%
Mental health counseling	5.3%	7.0%	5.7%	.8%	-	2.9%

**Exhibit II-61
ENTITY PROVIDING THE JOB TRAINING OR EDUCATION**

	Count	Percentage
--	-------	------------

	(N=33)	
County agency	1	3.0%
Employer	9	27.3%
Community/technical college or university	18	54.5%
Job training provider	2	6.1%
Other	3	9.1%

Exhibit II-62
TYPE OF JOB TRAINING OR EDUCATION RECEIVED

	Count (N=33)	Percentage
GED instruction or high school diploma	2	6.1%
English-as-a-Second Language (ESL)	1	3.0%
Occupational skills training	18	54.5%
Course(s) at a community/technical college or university	10	30.3%
Other	5	15.2%

Exhibit II-63 presents data on the receipt of various types of public assistance by respondents at the time of the surveys. The data show that 55.8 percent of the respondents were receiving Food Stamps at follow-up. The percentage was higher than average in County A (68.4 percent) and lowest in the three “other” counties combined (35.7 percent). As indicated previously in Exhibit II-26, County A had the lowest percentage of respondents who were employed at follow-up.

Exhibit II-63 also indicates that 80.6 percent of the respondents were receiving Medicaid for themselves or their children at the time of the surveys. The percentage was very high in all of the counties except for County B, where only 59.1 percent were receiving Medicaid. We do not have a clear explanation of why the rate of Medicaid participation in County B was so much lower than in the other counties. As noted previously in Exhibit II-44, monthly wages among employed respondents in County B were higher than in the other counties, but this factor does not seem sufficient to explain the very low rate of Medicaid participation.

Exhibit II-63 also indicates that 8.3 percent of respondents were receiving assistance under the Section 8 housing program and 7.4 percent were in public housing. In County A, the percentage of respondents who were receiving assistance with housing was much higher than in the other counties (47.4 percent).

About 36.8 percent of respondents were participating in the WIC program. The percentage was very high in County B (56.8 percent) and relatively low in County D (30.0 percent) and the three “other” counties combined (21.4 percent). The low rate of WIC participation in the three “other” counties may be due to the fact that, as noted previously in Exhibit II-18, none of the respondents in these counties was on maternity leave and very few were seeking assistance because of a new baby. In contrast, 40.9 percent of the respondents in County B were on maternity leave when they sought assistance.

Exhibit II-63
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS RECEIVING DIFFERENT TYPES OF
BENEFITS AT FOLLOW-UP

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Food Stamps	68.4%	50.0%	57.1%	57.7%	35.7%	55.8%
Medicaid (self or child)	89.5%	59.1%	85.7%	84.6%	85.7%	80.6%
Section 8 Certificate	21.1%	6.8%	8.6%	6.9%	7.1%	8.3%
Public housing	26.3%	11.4%	2.9%	4.6%	7.1%	7.4%
WIC Program	42.1%	56.8%	40.0%	30.0%	21.4%	36.8%
Transportation	5.3%	2.3%	2.9%	3.1%	-	2.9%
SSI/SSDI (self or children)	5.3%	4.5%	-	3.8%	-	3.3%
Fuel/utility Assistance	26.3%	4.5%	-	-	-	2.9%

As noted in Exhibit II-63, very few of the respondents had received help with transportation or fuel and utility assistance. Only 3.3 percent were receiving SSI/SSDI for themselves or their children. This low rate of participation in the SSI and SSDI programs reflects that fact that diversion assistance is targeted primarily at persons without major barriers to employment.

Exhibit II-64 shows the percentage of respondents who were receiving different types of benefits at follow-up, by education. The data indicate that persons without a high school diploma were more likely to be receiving Food Stamps than other respondents. Persons who had

attended college were less likely to be receiving Medicaid or Section 8 assistance than other respondents. Persons without a high school diploma were less likely to be participating in WIC than more educated respondents, but were somewhat more likely to be receiving assistance with transportation and fuel/utility assistance, and to be on SSI/SSDI.

**Exhibit II-64
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS RECEIVING DIFFERENT TYPES OF
BENEFITS AT FOLLOW-UP, BY EDUCATION**

	Did not complete HS/GED (N=47)	Completed HS/GED Only (N=78)	Attended college (N=115)	Total (N=240)
Food Stamps	74.5%	52.6%	51.3%	56.3%
Medicaid (self or child)	87.2%	87.2%	74.8%	81.3%
Section 8 Certificate	10.6%	11.5%	5.2%	8.3%
Public housing	6.4%	11.5%	5.2%	7.5%
WIC Program	27.7%	44.9%	35.7%	37.1%
Transportation	6.4%	3.8%	.9%	2.9%
SSI/SSDI (self or children)	6.4%	2.6%	2.6%	3.3%
Fuel/utility Assistance	4.3%	2.6%	2.6%	2.9%

Exhibit II-65 shows the percentage of respondents receiving different types of assistance, by ethnicity. As indicated, there were no major differences between whites and non-whites in the receipt of Food Stamps or Section 8 housing assistance. Whites were slightly more likely to be receiving Medicaid than non-whites. In turn, non-whites were somewhat more likely to be in public housing and receiving WIC benefits.

**Exhibit II-65
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS RECEIVING DIFFERENT TYPES OF
BENEFITS AT FOLLOW-UP, BY ETHNICITY**

	White (N=70)	Non-white (N=172)	Total (N=242)
Food Stamps	58.6%	54.7%	55.8%
Medicaid (self or child)	85.7%	78.5%	80.6%
Section 8 Certificate	7.1%	8.7%	8.3%
Public housing	4.3%	8.7%	7.4%
WIC Program	27.1%	40.7%	36.8%
Transportation	1.4%	3.5%	2.9%
SSI/SSDI (self or children)	-	4.7%	3.3%

Fuel/utility Assistance	4.3%	2.3%	2.9%
-------------------------	------	------	------

Exhibit II-66 presents data on the receipt of public assistance, by age of the respondents. The data indicate that Medicaid participation was highest among persons under age 22. The percentage of respondents living in public housing was higher among the younger age groups than among older respondents. As expected, participation in WIC was much higher among respondents aged under 26 than among older respondents. Receipt of SSI/SSDI was much higher among the oldest age groups than among younger respondents.

**Exhibit II-66
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS RECEIVING DIFFERENT TYPES OF
BENEFITS AT FOLLOW-UP, BY AGE**

	Less than 22 (N=20)	22 to 25 (N=40)	26 to 30 (N=49)	31 to 35 (N=57)	36 to 40 (N=56)	41 and over (N=35)	Total (N=242)
Food Stamps	55.0%	71.4%	49.1%	57.1%	48.6%	48.0%	55.8%
Medicaid (self or child)	95.0%	77.6%	80.7%	78.6%	82.9%	76.0%	80.6%
Section 8 Certificate	5.0%	10.2%	7.0%	10.7%	5.7%	8.0%	8.3%
Public housing	25.0%	8.2%	10.5%	1.8%	2.9%	4.0%	7.4%
WIC Program	60.0%	69.4%	36.8%	30.4%	11.4%	4.0%	36.8%
Transportation	-	2.0%	7.0%	1.8%	-	4.0%	2.9%
SSI/SSDI (self or children)	-	2.0%	5.3%	1.8%	-	12.0%	3.3%
Fuel/utility Assistance	5.0%	4.1%	1.8%	1.8%	2.9%	4.0%	2.9%

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

The data show relatively low rates of participation in services such as job placement and transportation assistance, but this might be expected in view of the fact that most of the respondents had recent work histories and had already returned to work. Although Food Stamps are part of the package of services designed to help recipients of Diversion Assistance, 44 percent of the overall sample were not receiving Food Stamps at the time of the survey. However, this may reflect the fact that three-quarters of all respondents were employed at follow-up and does not necessarily provide evidence of under-utilization of Food Stamps. Variations among counties in the rate of WIC participation may be related to differences in the

targeting of the Diversion Assistance program, but may also reflect differences in WIC outreach efforts.

H. USE OF CHILD CARE

Exhibit II-67 presents data on the use of child care (paid or unpaid) by respondents to the survey. The data show that 61 percent of the respondents were using child care. The percentage was higher in County C (74.3 percent) and County B (65.1 percent) than in the other counties.

**Exhibit II-67
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS USING
PAID OR UNPAID CHILD CARE**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Use Child Care	52.6%	65.1%	74.3%	58.5%	50.0%	61.0%
Do not use Child Care	47.4%	34.9%	25.7%	41.5%	50.0%	39.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

For respondents who were *not* using child care, Exhibit II-68 shows the reasons given for not using child care. Overall, 35.1 percent indicated that they were not working or in school and so did not need child care. About two-thirds of the respondents in County A cited this as a reason for not using child care. Another 34 percent of all respondents indicated that they did not need child care because their children were old enough to look after themselves. Another 18 percent indicated that their spouse looked after their children. Only 5.3 percent cited problems with being able to afford child care as the reason for not using child care. Only 3.2 percent mentioned problems finding a child care provider that met their needs.

Exhibit II-69 presents data on the types of child care used by respondents. Overall, about 47 percent of persons who were using child care were using a child care center. The percentage using a child care center was relatively high in County B, County D, and the three “other” counties combined, and relatively low in County A and County C. The next most common type of provider was “paid relative or friend – not living in the home,” accounting for about one-fifth of all providers. Another 10.2 percent were using a relative or friend who was not living in the home and who was not being paid. About 7.5 percent were using a day care home and 6.1 percent were using a school-based program.

**Exhibit II-68
REASONS FOR NOT USING CHILD CARE**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
I'm not working or attending school	66.7%	40.0%	44.4%	31.5%	-	35.1%
My children are old enough to look after themselves	22.2%	26.7%	-	38.9%	71.4%	34.0%
I can't afford to pay for child care	11.1%	6.7%	11.1%	3.7%	-	5.3%
I can't find a child care provider that meets my needs	11.1%	-	11.1%	1.9%	-	3.2%
Spouse cares for children	-	13.3%	33.3%	20.4%	14.3%	18.1%
Other	-	20.0%	11.1%	7.4%	14.3%	9.6%

**Exhibit II-69
TYPE OF CHILD CARE PROVIDER FOR PERSONS USING CHILD CARE**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Relative living in home – paid	-	7.1%	-	1.3%	-	2.0%
Relative living in home – unpaid	20.0%	3.6%	-	2.6%	-	3.4%
Relative or friend not living in home – paid	20.0%	25.0%	15.4%	19.7%	14.3%	19.7%
Relative or friend not living in home – unpaid	20.0%	-	19.2%	10.5%	-	10.2%
Day care Center	30.0%	50.0%	30.8%	52.6%	57.1%	46.9%
School program (before/after school care)	10.0%	-	15.4%	3.9%	14.3%	6.1%
Family child care home	-	14.3%	7.7%	6.6%	-	7.5%
Other	-	-	11.5%	2.6%	14.3%	4.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

For the 127 respondents who reported that they were paying for child care, Exhibit II-70 shows the percentage who were receiving help from the county. The data indicate that 59.1 percent were receiving assistance from the county. The percentage did not differ substantially by county, but more respondents were receiving help in County D than in the other counties. Among those who were not receiving help from the county (n=52), 30.8 percent said that they did not know they could get help paying for child care. Seven (13.5 percent) said that they had applied for assistance but been found ineligible, seven said that they did not want to deal with the county's requirements, and three said that the provider did not want to deal with the county's requirements. Seven were on a waiting list and four were in the process of applying. Three thought that they made too much money to get help.

Exhibit II-71 shows the amounts being paid per month for child care by persons using paid care. For persons receiving help with child care payments from the county, the amounts in the exhibit refer only to payments being made out-of-pocket by the respondents. The data indicate that 25.2 percent were paying more than \$300 per month, although the percentage was much higher in County B (52 percent) than in other counties.

Exhibit II-70
PERCENTAGE OF PERSONS RECEIVING HELP FROM THE COUNTY
IN PAYING FOR CHILD CARE

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Receive help from county	50.0%	55.6%	57.1%	62.1%	57.1%	59.1%
No help from county	50.0%	44.4%	42.9%	37.9%	42.9%	40.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Exhibit II-71
AMOUNT BEING PAID PER MONTH FOR CHILD CARE

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Less than \$100	50.0%	16.0%	25.0%	33.9%	60.1%	28.6%
\$101 to \$200	16.7%	32.0%	55.0%	43.5%	40.9%	38.9%
\$201 to \$300	16.7%	36.0%	10.0%	4.8%	-	11.9%
More than \$300	16.7%	16.0%	10.0%	17.7%	-	14.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

Access to subsidized child care is potentially an important component of diversion programs. “Diversionary” child care can help prevent persons from leaving jobs or turning down jobs because of lack of access to affordable or convenient child care. Child care subsidies can also be important for job retention after a diversion client finds a job. The surveys showed that, although 39 percent of the overall sample were not using child care, most of these respondents did not feel that they needed child care, either because they were not working or because of the ages of their children. Relatively few of the respondents indicated that they were not using child care because of problems with affordability or access. In addition, of those who were using child care, only about 35 percent were relying on “informal” child care arrangements through family members or friends.

The fact that about 41 percent of the families who were using paid child care were not receiving help from the county is a potential concern, especially since about 31 percent of these did not know that they could get help. Another 13.5 percent were on waiting lists.

I. RECEIPT OF CHILD SUPPORT

Exhibit II-72 presents data on the percentage of respondents who were receiving child support at the time of the surveys. As indicated, 17.9 percent were receiving child support and 82.1 percent were not. The percentage who were receiving child support did not vary substantially among the counties, except that a much higher percentage of respondents in the three “other” counties combined were receiving support. When interpreting the data, it must be kept in mind that 19.4 percent of the respondents were living with their spouses (see Exhibit II-7). Adjusting for this, about 22.3 percent of respondents who were not living with their spouses were receiving child support.

**Exhibit II-72
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS RECEIVING CHILD SUPPORT**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Receive child support	15.8%	18.6%	17.1%	17.1%	28.6%	17.9%
Do not receive child support	84.2%	81.4%	82.9%	82.9%	71.4%	82.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Exhibit II-73 shows the percentage of respondents who were receiving child support, by ethnicity. The data show that there was not a major difference between whites and non-whites in the percentage of respondents who were receiving child support. Exhibit II-74 shows the

percentage who were receiving child support, by education. *The data indicate that persons who had completed high school or attended college were more than twice as likely to be receiving child support as persons who had not completed high school.*

**Exhibit II-73
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS RECEIVING CHILD SUPPORT,
BY ETHNICITY**

	White	Non-White	Total
Receive child support	17.4%	18.1%	17.9%
Do not receive child support	82.6%	81.9%	82.1%
Total	100.0% (N = 69)	100.0% (N = 171)	100.0% (N = 240)

**Exhibit II-74
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS RECEIVING CHILD SUPPORT,
BY EDUCATION**

	Did not complete HS/GED	Completed HS/GED Only	Attended college	Total
Receive child Support	8.5%	21.8%	19.1%	17.9%
Do not receive child support	91.5%	78.2%	80.9%	82.1%
Total	100.0% (N = 47)	100.0% (N = 78)	100.0% (N = 115)	100.0% (N = 240)

Exhibit II-75 presents data on the percentage of respondents who were receiving child support, by age. The data indicate that persons aged 41 and over were less likely to be receiving child support than younger respondents. Persons aged under 22 were also somewhat less likely to be receiving child support than the average respondent.

Among persons who were receiving child support (n = 43), 25.6 percent said they were receiving \$100 per month or less. Another 25.6 percent were receiving \$101 to \$200; 18.6 percent were receiving \$201 to \$300; 20.9 percent were receiving \$301 to \$500; and 9.3 percent were receiving more than \$500 per month.

Exhibit II-75

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS RECEIVING CHILD SUPPORT,
BY AGE**

	Less than 22	22 to 25	26 to 30	31 to 35	36 to 40	41 and over	Total
Receive child support	15.0%	22.4%	14.3%	21.4%	20.0%	8.3%	17.9%
Do not receive child support	85.0%	77.6%	85.7%	78.6%	80.0%	91.7%	82.1%
Total	100.0% (N = 20)	100.0% (N = 49)	100.0% (N = 56)	100.0% (N = 56)	100.0% (N = 35)	100.0% (N = 24)	100.0% (N = 240)

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

Effective child support enforcement is a potentially important component of efforts to divert welfare applicants from cash assistance. Child support, if paid consistently, can help reduce the family’s reliance on welfare. Under welfare reform, efforts by states to divert applicants from welfare have usually been accompanied by greater emphasis on expediting and strengthening child support enforcement activities. The fact that only 22 percent of respondents who were not living with their spouses were receiving any child support suggests that enforcement may need to be strengthened to make diversion efforts more feasible for a greater percentage of welfare applicants.

J. HEALTH CARE AND HEALTH INSURANCE

Exhibit II-76 presents data on the percentage of respondents who reported that they had a regular place where they took their child(ren) for medical care and check-ups. As indicated, about 90.8 percent of the respondents reported that they *did* have a regular place to take their children. The percentage was somewhat lower in County D (85.3 percent) than in the other counties. This may have reflected the refugee population in the County D sample.

For those respondents who had a regular place to take their children, Exhibit II-77 shows the place where respondents usually took their children for medical care. Slightly more than half took their children to a clinic, but the percentage was lower in County A and higher in County D. About 35.8 percent took their children to a private physician, but the percentage was much higher in County A, County C, and the three “other” counties, and lower in County B and County D.

**Exhibit II-76
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS REPORTING THAT THEY HAD A
REGULAR PLACE TO TAKE CHILDREN FOR MEDICAL CARE**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Have a regular place	94.7%	100.0%	94.3%	85.3%	100.0%	90.8%
Do not have a	5.3%	-	5.7%	14.7%	-	9.2%

regular place						
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Exhibit II-77
PLACE WHERE RESPONDENTS USUALLY TOOK CHILDREN FOR
MEDICAL CARE**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Private physician	61.1%	30.2%	48.5%	27.3%	57.1%	35.8%
HMO	-	11.6%	6.1%	13.6%	-	10.1%
Clinic	33.3%	51.2%	45.5%	57.3%	42.9%	51.4%
Emergency room	5.6%	-	-	.9%	-	.9%
Other	-	7.0%	-	.9%	-	1.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Exhibit II-78 shows the percentage of respondents who reported that their children were covered by a medical plan. About 91.6 percent of all respondents reported that their children were covered by a medical plan. However, only 79.1 percent of respondents in County B reported that their children were covered.

For respondents whose children were covered by a medical plan, Exhibit II-79 shows the type of health plan involved. Respondents could indicate more than one option. About 91.8 percent of the children were covered by Medicaid or Health Choices. Combining this number with the 91.6 percent of respondents whose children were covered by a health plan, we find that children were covered by Medicaid or Health Choices in about 84.1 percent of all cases. In County B, only 65.2 percent of children were covered by Medicaid or Health Choices. However, children in County B were somewhat more likely to be covered by the parent’s employer health insurance than in the other counties.

**Exhibit II-78
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WHOSE CHILDREN ARE
COVERED UNDER A MEDICAL PLAN**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Covered under Medical Plan	100.0%	79.1%	94.3%	93.0%	100.0%	91.6%
Not Covered under Medical Plan	-	20.9%	5.7%	7.0%	-	8.4%

Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
-------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

**Exhibit II-79
TYPE OF HEALTH INSURANCE PLAN FOR COVERED CHILDREN**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Medicaid or Health Choices	89.5%	85.3%	93.9%	93.3%	92.9%	91.8%
Health insurance through employer	5.3%	11.8%	6.1%	9.2%	7.1%	8.7%
Health insurance from the children's other parent	5.3%	5.9%	6.1%	.8%	-	2.7%

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

The data do not show any major issues with health care access or coverage for the large majority of children in the different counties. However, the data for County B suggest that more of the respondents in the sample may encounter health coverage problems over time as they obtain jobs and potentially lose their coverage for their children under Medicaid or Health Choices. Many of these persons may not be able to find jobs that have employer health plans or may not be eligible immediately to participate in these plans.

K. DEPRIVATION, OVERALL FINANCIAL SITUATION, AND FUTURE NEEDS

Respondents were asked a series of questions designed to assess their material and financial well-being in the context of their decision to accept diversion assistance. The key findings are presented below.

Deprivation and Food Security

Respondents were asked whether they had experienced various types of deprivation (including problems buying food) either before or after they had received diversion assistance. Exhibit II-80 presents data on reported deprivation, by county. It should be noted that the time period before receiving diversion assistance is open-ended, while the time period since receiving diversion assistance is constrained by the timing of the surveys.

The data show that 34.7 percent reported getting behind in paying their rent or mortgage since diverting, and that 37.9 percent had experienced this problem before diverting. About 17.5 percent reported that, since diverting, they had on occasion needed medical care for a family

member but could not afford it. This was an increase from 12.5 percent in the period before diverting. About 14.6 percent reported that, since diverting, they had on occasion needed child care but could not pay for it. Relatively small percentages reported other types of deprivation, such as having to move in with a relative, take in a boarder, stay in a homeless shelter, or go without utilities.

About 21.7 percent reported that, since diverting, there were times when they had no way to buy food. About 26.3 percent reported that there were times *before* they diverted when they had no way to buy food.

**Exhibit II-80
RESPONDENTS REPORTING DIFFERENT EVENTS
BEFORE OR AFTER DIVERTING**

	Before Diverting	Since Diverting
Got behind in paying for rent or mortgage	37.9%	34.2%
Moved because could not pay for housing	10.0%	4.6%
Moved in with a friend or relative	17.5%	5.0%
Took in a boarder or relative	0.8%	3.3%
Went without heat, electricity, or water in home	5.4%	6.3%
Stayed in a homeless shelter	3.3%	0.4%
Placed children with someone else	4.2%	1.3%
Placed children in foster care	0.4%	-
Needed routine child care but could not pay for it	16.3%	14.6%
Needed medical care for a family member but could not pay	12.5%	17.5%
Had times when had no way to buy food	26.3%	21.7%

Exhibit II-81 presents data on the percentage of respondents who reported various types of deprivation since diverting from welfare, by county. The data show that no major differences existed among the counties for many of the deprivation indicators. However, persons in County A were more likely to report problems paying for child care than persons in other counties. No major differences existed among the counties in the percentage who reported being unable to pay for medical care at some time. *Respondents in County B and County D were much more likely to report problems paying for food than persons in other counties.*

**Exhibit II-81
RESPONDENTS REPORTING DIFFERENT EVENTS SINCE DIVERTING**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Got behind in paying for rent or mortgage	36.8%	41.9%	20.0%	34.9%	35.7%	34.2%
Moved because could not pay for housing	-	4.7%	2.9%	6.2%	-	4.6%
Moved in with a friend or relative	5.3%	4.7%		7.0%	-	5.0%
Took in a boarder or relative	5.3%	7.0%	5.7%	1.6%	-	3.3%
Went without heat, electricity, or water in home	5.3%	4.7%	8.6%	7.0%	-	6.3%
Stayed in a homeless shelter	-			0.8%	-	0.4%
Placed children with someone else	-	4.7%	2.9%		-	1.3%
Placed children in foster care	-			0.8%	-	0.4%
Needed routine child care but could not pay for it	26.3%	14.0%	11.4%	15.5%	-	14.6%
Needed medical care for a family member but could not pay	15.8%	18.6%	17.1%	17.8%	14.3%	17.5%
Had times when had no way to buy food	10.5%	30.2%	11.4%	24.0%	14.3%	21.7%

Exhibit II-82 presents data on reported deprivation since diverting, by ethnicity. The data show that non-whites were about twice as likely as whites to report having needed medical care for a family member but not having been able to pay. As noted previously in Exhibit II-65, non-whites were slightly less likely to be covered by Medicaid (78.5 percent) than whites (85.7 percent). However, as noted in Exhibit II-27, non-whites were also more likely to be employed at follow-up than whites. It is possible that a number of non-whites may have lost Medicaid coverage for themselves due to employment, but may not have been covered by an employer health plan.

The exhibit also shows that non-whites were much more likely than whites to report having had times when they had no way to buy food. Almost one-quarter of non-whites reported food insecurity, compared to 14.5 percent of whites. On most of the other deprivation measures, non-whites were slightly more likely than whites to report deprivation.

Exhibit II-82
RESPONDENTS REPORTING DIFFERENT EVENTS
SINCE DIVERTING, BY ETHNICITY

	White	Non-White	Total
Got behind in paying for rent or mortgage	31.9%	35.1%	34.2%
Moved because could not pay for housing	2.9%	5.3%	4.6%
Moved in with a friend or relative	4.3%	5.3%	5.0%
Took in a boarder or relative	2.9%	3.5%	3.3%
Went without heat, electricity, or water in home	2.9%	7.6%	6.3%
Stayed in a homeless shelter	-	0.6%	0.4%
Placed children with someone else	-	1.8%	1.3%
Placed children in foster care	-	0.6%	0.4%
Needed routine child care but could not pay for it	15.9%	14.0%	14.6%
Needed medical care for a family member but could not pay	10.0%	20.5%	17.5%
Had times when had no way to buy food	14.5%	24.6%	21.7%

For those respondents who reported that there had been times when they had no way to buy food, Exhibit II-83 shows the actions taken to address the situation. The data show that the most common action taken both before and after diversion was to ask friends or relatives for food or money. This action was taken by about 69 percent of respondents who had problems buying food. Since diverting, only one of the respondents said that they went hungry. About 9.6 percent (n = 5) had obtained food from a shelter or food pantry.

Exhibit II-83
ACTIONS TAKEN BY RESPONDENTS WHEN THEY DID NOT HAVE
MONEY FOR FOOD, BEFORE AND AFTER DIVERTING

Actions Taken	Before Diverting (N=63)	Since Diverting (N=52)
Went hungry	6.3%	1.9%
Got meals or food at shelter/food kitchen/food pantry	15.9%	9.6%
Got meals/food/money for food from church	28.6%	17.3%
Were given food or money for food by friends/relatives	69.8%	69.2%
Other	6.3%	7.7%

Housing Adequacy

Exhibit II-84 presents data relevant to possible housing overcrowding among the respondents. The exhibit shows the number of rooms in the respondent’s home, excluding bathrooms. Only 6.3 percent indicated that they had three rooms or less. The data, therefore, do not provide any significant evidence of housing overcrowding among the sample.

Exhibit II-85 presents data on problems reported by respondents with housing conditions. Overall, 13.6 percent reported problems with water leakage, with the percentage being highest among County C respondents. About 14.9 percent reported problems with open cracks or holes in the walls or ceilings, including more than one-third of persons in the three “other” counties combined. Residents in the “other” counties were also more likely to report broken or missing windows. Relatively few respondents reported security problems with their homes.

**Exhibit II-84
NUMBER OF ROOMS IN RESPONDENT'S HOUSE**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
1 - 3 rooms	5.3%	4.7%	2.9%	8.5%	-	6.3%
4 rooms	47.4%	44.2%	51.4%	41.1%	35.7%	43.3%
5 rooms	31.6%	34.9%	31.4%	32.6%	42.9%	33.3%
6 or more	15.8%	16.3%	14.3%	17.8%	21.4%	17.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Exhibit II-85
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS REPORTING
HOUSING DEFECTS**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Portable room heater	5.3%	6.8%	8.6%	7.7%	7.1%	7.4%
Water leakage	-	13.6%	20.0%	13.8%	14.3%	13.6%
Open cracks or holes	-	15.9%	14.3%	14.6%	35.7%	14.9%
Broken plaster	5.3%	2.3%	8.6%	13.1%	-	9.1%
Broken/ missing windows	5.3%	6.8%	5.7%	7.7%	14.3%	7.4%
Heating or AC problems	15.8%	6.8%	5.7%	12.3%	7.1%	10.3%
Electrical problems	5.3%	4.5%	-	10.8%	-	7.0%
Security problems for self/family	-	4.5%	-	8.5%	7.1%	5.8%

Overall Financial Situation

Respondents were asked how well their family’s current income and benefits met their family’s needs. Exhibit II-86 presents the findings by county. As indicated, 19.2 percent felt that their income and benefits met their family’s needs with some left over, and another 34.2 percent felt that their needs were being met with nothing left over. About 27.1 percent believed that their income and benefits nearly met their needs, and 19.6 percent felt that their needs were definitely not being met.

The percentage who felt that their needs were being met, with or without some left over, was about the same in County B, C, and D (50-52 percent), but higher in County A (57.9 percent) and the three “other” counties (71.4 percent). The percentage who felt that their needs were clearly not being met was much higher in County C (37.1 percent) than in the other counties. Overall, the percentage who believed that their needs were not being met (last two categories combined) was about the same in County B, C, and D (48-49 percent) and lower in the other counties.

**Exhibit II-86
HOW WELL FAMILY'S INCOME AND BENEFITS
MEET THE FAMILY'S NEEDS**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Meet Needs with Some Left Over	26.3%	20.9%	17.1%	17.8%	21.4%	19.2%
Meet Needs with Nothing Left Over	31.6%	30.2%	34.3%	34.1%	50.0%	34.2%
Nearly Meet Needs	21.1%	30.2%	11.4%	31.0%	28.6%	27.1%
Does Not Meet Needs	21.1%	18.6%	37.1%	17.1%	-	19.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Other Household Income

Respondents were asked about other family income besides their own earnings and benefits. Only five percent of the respondents reported that they personally had income besides their earnings and the public assistance benefits described earlier in Exhibit II-63. This additional income included gifts of money from family and friends, as well as more formal types of income.

However, many of the respondents reported that there were other adults in the household who had income. Exhibit II-87 shows that slightly more than one third of the households included another adult who was working for pay. In total, 111 respondents reported that they had other adults living with them (first two rows in the exhibit). In these 111 families combined, there were 145 other adults besides the respondent. Of these 145 other adults, 93 were reported to be working for pay.

Exhibit II-87
PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS IN WHICH THERE WAS
ANOTHER ADULT WORKING FOR PAY

	Count (N=240)	Percentage
Other adult in home, and working	77	32.1%
Other adult in home, not working	34	14.2%
No other adult in home	129	53.8%

Future Needs

Respondents were asked to identify anticipated needs for specific services in the near future. Exhibit II-88 shows that about 40 percent of the respondents were anticipating a need for emergency food or clothing, including 53.5 percent of respondents in County B but relatively few in County A and the smaller counties. About 36.7 percent anticipated a need for housing assistance, including almost 42 percent in County D and about 35 percent in County B. Slightly more than one quarter felt that they would need job counseling or job search assistance, with the highest percentages being in County C and County A. (As noted previously in Exhibit II-26, County A had the lowest percentage of respondents who were employed at the time of the survey).

Exactly 50 percent thought they would need help with child care, including 60.5 percent in County B and 57.9 percent in County A. About 27.5 percent anticipated a need for transportation assistance, including one third of all County D respondents. Relatively few respondents anticipated a need for substance abuse treatment, domestic violence counseling, or mental health counseling.

Almost 30 percent of the respondents thought that they would need help with household budgeting, including 36.4 percent of persons in County D. Slightly more than 40 percent felt that they would have a need for job training or education, including relatively high percentages in County A, County C, and County D. Finally, 50 percent of all respondents said that they would need help with child support enforcement. The percentage was fairly standard across the counties.

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

Overall, the findings indicate that there is some evidence of deprivation and lack of food security among the respondents, but there is no evidence of major problems in such areas as families going hungry, becoming homeless, living in substandard or overcrowded housing, or having to place children elsewhere. Persons who reported problems obtaining enough food to eat were generally able to find food from family members, friends, or food pantries. However, the fact that a significant percentage of persons reported problems buying food (30 percent in County B and 24 percent in County D) may be cause for concern, especially since diverters are supposed to be persons who need minimal income support or other services. The data also raise some concerns about medical coverage for certain segments of the population.

Part of the reason why there is little evidence of deprivation is that most respondents were employed and about 39 percent had other adults in the household who were working. In terms of future needs, the data confirm that many respondents see a need for improved child support enforcement.

**Exhibit II-88
ANTICIPATED NEEDS OF RESPONDENTS IN THE FUTURE**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Emergency food or clothing	26.3%	53.5%	37.1%	40.3%	21.4%	40.0%
Housing assistance	31.6%	34.9%	31.4%	41.9%	14.3%	36.7%
Job counseling or job search assistance	31.6%	25.6%	34.3%	26.4%	7.1%	26.7%
Child care assistance	57.9%	60.5%	51.4%	48.1%	21.4%	50.0%
Transportation assistance	26.3%	25.6%	17.1%	33.3%	7.1%	27.5%
Substance abuse treatment	-	2.3%	-	-	-	.4%
Domestic violence assistance	-	-	-	.8%	-	.4%
Mental health counseling	5.3%	2.3%	5.7%	8.5%	-	6.3%
Household budgeting assistance	15.8%	25.6%	22.9%	36.4%	7.1%	29.2%
Job training or education	42.1%	32.6%	42.9%	43.4%	35.7%	40.8%
Child support	47.4%	55.8%	51.4%	47.3%	57.1%	50.0%

assistance						
------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

L. LIKELIHOOD OF REAPPLYING FOR WELFARE

Exhibit II-89 presents data on what respondents thought about their likelihood of reapplying for welfare in the next six months. About 40.8 percent thought it very unlikely that they would reapply. This percentage did not vary much by county. Another 12.9 percent thought it somewhat unlikely that they would reapply. A total of 17.1 percent said that it was very likely or somewhat likely that they would reapply for welfare. The percentage who thought it “very likely” that they would reapply was highest in County C, County B and County D.

**Exhibit II-89
LIKELIHOOD OF REAPPLYING FOR WELFARE**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Very likely	5.3%	14.0%	17.1%	11.6%	-	11.7%
Somewhat likely	10.5%	7.0%		4.7%	14.3%	5.4%
Not sure	21.1%	30.2%	25.7%	27.9%	35.7%	27.9%
Somewhat unlikely	15.8%	9.3%	11.4%	14.0%	14.3%	12.9%
Very unlikely	42.1%	39.5%	45.7%	40.3%	35.7%	40.8%
Already applied	5.3%	-	-	1.6%	-	1.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Exhibit II-90 presents data on the likelihood of reapplying for welfare, by education. The data indicate that 19.1 percent of persons who had *not* completed high school and 21.7 percent of those who had *only* completed high school thought it very likely or somewhat likely that they would reapply for welfare in the future. This compares to only 13.0 percent of persons who had attended college.

**Exhibit II-90
LIKELIHOOD OF REAPPLYING FOR WELFARE, BY EDUCATION**

	Did not complete HS/GED	Completed HS/GED Only	Attended college	Total
Very likely	8.5%	17.9%	8.7%	11.7%
Somewhat likely	10.6%	3.8%	4.3%	5.4%

Not sure	38.3%	21.8%	27.8%	27.9%
Somewhat unlikely	2.1%	16.7%	14.8%	12.9%
Very unlikely	38.3%	38.5%	43.5%	40.8%
Already applied	2.1%	1.3%	.9%	1.3%
Total	100.0% (N = 47)	100.0% (N = 78)	100.0% (N = 115)	100.0% (N = 240)

Exhibit II-91 shows the likelihood of reapplying for welfare, by ethnicity. About 14 percent of non-whites thought that they were very likely to reapply, compared to only 5.8 percent of whites. However, the percentage who were *not* likely to reapply or who were not sure was not very different between the two groups.

Exhibit II-92 shows the likelihood of reapplying for welfare, by age. The data do not show any clear pattern of age differences, except that persons in the 36 to 40 age group were less likely to reapply than the other age groups.

**Exhibit II-91
LIKELIHOOD OF REAPPLYING FOR WELFARE, BY ETHNICITY**

	White	Non-White	Total
Very likely	5.8%	14.0%	11.7%
Somewhat likely	8.7%	4.1%	5.4%
Not sure	27.5%	28.1%	27.9%
Somewhat unlikely	14.5%	12.3%	12.9%
Very unlikely	42.0%	40.4%	40.8%
Already applied	1.4%	1.2%	1.3%
Total	100.0% (N = 69)	100.0% (N = 171)	100.0% (N = 240)

**Exhibit II-92
LIKELIHOOD OF REAPPLYING FOR WELFARE, BY AGE**

	Less than 22	22 to 25	26 to 30	31 to 35	36 to 40	41 and over	Total
Very likely	10.0%	12.2%	12.5%	14.3%	5.7%	12.5%	11.7%
Somewhat likely	10.0%	8.2%	3.6%		8.6%	8.3%	5.4%
Not sure	40.0%	32.7%	21.4%	25.0%	22.9%	37.5%	27.9%
Somewhat unlikely		10.2%	17.9%	19.6%	5.7%	12.5%	12.9%
Very unlikely	40.0%	34.7%	44.6%	37.5%	57.1%	29.2%	40.8%
Already applied	-	2.0%	-	3.6%	-	-	1.3%
Total	100.0% (N = 20)	100.0% (N = 49)	100.0% (N = 56)	100.0% (N = 56)	100.0% (N = 35)	100.0% (N = 24)	100.0% (N = 240)

Exhibit II-93 presents data on the likelihood of reapplying for welfare, by the age of the youngest child. Welfare researchers have often found that persons with young children are more likely to go back on welfare than other former recipients. The data in the exhibit do not show any clear relationship between age of the youngest child and the perceived likelihood of reapplying for welfare. Persons whose youngest child was 3 to 5 were the least likely to think that they would reapply.

Finally, Exhibit II-94 presents data on the likelihood of reapplying for welfare, by whether the respondent had been on welfare before. As indicated, 14.0 percent of persons who had been on welfare before thought it very likely that they would be reapplying, compared to only 9.8 percent of persons who had not been on welfare before. Of those who had been on welfare, 48.6 percent thought that it was somewhat unlikely or very unlikely that they would reapply, compared to 57.9 percent of persons who had not been on welfare.

**Exhibit II-93
LIKELIHOOD OF REAPPLYING FOR WELFARE,
BY AGE OF THE YOUNGEST CHILD**

	Less than one year	1 to 2 years	3 to 5 years	6 to 8 years	Over 9 years	Total
Very likely	10.4%	13.5%	6.5%	18.9%	11.9%	11.7%
Somewhat likely	6.5%	2.7%	4.3%	5.4%	7.1%	5.4%
Not sure	31.2%	27.0%	19.6%	32.4%	28.6%	28.0%
Somewhat unlikely	14.3%	16.2%	17.4%	5.4%	9.5%	13.0%
Very unlikely	36.4%	40.5%	50.0%	35.1%	42.9%	40.6%
Already applied	1.3%	-	2.2%	2.7%	-	1.3%
Total	100.0% (N = 77)	100.0% (N = 37)	100.0% (N = 46)	100.0% (N = 37)	100.0% (N = 42)	100.0% (N = 239)

**Exhibit II-94
LIKELIHOOD OF REAPPLYING FOR WELFARE,
BY WHETHER ON WELFARE BEFORE**

	On Welfare Before	Not on Welfare Before	Total
Very likely	14.0%	9.8%	11.7%
Somewhat likely	4.7%	6.0%	5.4%
Not sure	30.8%	25.6%	27.9%
Somewhat unlikely	9.3%	15.8%	12.9%
Very unlikely	39.3%	42.1%	40.8%
Already applied	1.9%	.8%	1.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	(N = 107)	(N = 133)	(N = 240)
--	-----------	-----------	-----------

Reasons for Reapplying

Among respondents who thought that they were very likely or somewhat likely to reapply for welfare, 43.9 percent cited “loss of job or lack of a job” as the most probable reason. Another 7.3 percent mentioned a decrease in work hours or wages. About 14.6 percent cited housing problems. Only 7.3 percent mentioned child support problems and only 4.9 percent cited transportation problems.

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

Overall, the data are relatively encouraging in terms of the low percentage of respondents who feel that they are unlikely to reapply for welfare. However, in County B, County C, and County D, between 11 percent and 17 percent of respondents thought it very likely that they would reapply. The data suggest that there may be a segment of the diverter population that needs to be screened more effectively before being referred to the Diversion Assistance program. This population may include persons who have been on welfare before for extensive periods of time, especially if they do not have high school diplomas.

M. SATISFACTION WITH THE DIVERSION DECISION

Respondents were asked how satisfied they were with the decision to accept diversion assistance, including the amount of the diversion payment. Exhibit II-95 shows that two-thirds of all respondents were “very satisfied” with the diversion decision and that another 20 percent were somewhat satisfied. Only 6.3 percent were either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. The percentage who were dissatisfied was highest in County A and County B. However, County A also had the highest percentage of respondents who were very satisfied with the decision.

Exhibit II-96 presents data on the level of satisfaction with the amount of the diversion payment. Overall, 51.7 percent were very satisfied and 37.1 percent were somewhat satisfied. No major differences existed among the counties, except that County B respondents were somewhat less satisfied than respondents in other counties.

Exhibit II-97 presents data on levels of satisfaction with the amount of the diversion payment, by ethnicity. The data indicate that whites were slightly more likely than non-whites to be very satisfied with the amount of the diversion payment, but there was not a major difference between the two groups.

**Exhibit II-95
SATISFACTION WITH THE DIVERSION DECISION**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Very satisfied	84.2%	53.5%	74.3%	67.4%	57.1%	66.7%
Somewhat satisfied	5.3%	30.2%	11.4%	20.2%	28.6%	20.0%
Neutral/no opinion		7.0%	11.4%	6.2%	14.3%	7.1%
Somewhat dissatisfied	10.5%	7.0%	-	3.1%	-	3.8%
Very dissatisfied		2.3%	2.9%	3.1%	-	2.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Exhibit II-96
SATISFACTION WITH THE AMOUNT OF THE DIVERSION PAYMENT**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Very satisfied	57.9%	41.9%	54.3%	53.5%	50.0%	51.7%
Somewhat satisfied	36.8%	44.2%	45.7%	32.6%	35.7%	37.1%
Neutral/no opinion	-	7.0%	-	4.7%	14.3%	4.6%
Somewhat dissatisfied	5.3%	4.7%	-	6.2%	-	4.6%
Very dissatisfied	-	2.3%	-	3.1%	-	2.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Exhibit II-97
SATISFACTION WITH THE AMOUNT OF THE DIVERSION PAYMENT,
BY ETHNICITY**

	White	Non-white	Total
Very satisfied	56.5%	49.7%	51.7%
Somewhat satisfied	36.2%	37.4%	37.1%
Neutral/no opinion	4.3%	4.7%	4.6%
Somewhat dissatisfied	2.9%	5.3%	4.6%
Very dissatisfied	-	2.9%	2.1%
Total	100.0% (N = 69)	100.0% (N = 171)	100.0% (N = 240)

Exhibit II-98 shows the percentage of respondents who believed that they were better off at the time of the survey than before they received diversion assistance. The data show that about one quarter considered themselves much better off than before and another 37.1 percent thought they were a little better off. Only 6.2 percent thought that they were worse off, including 10.1 percent of persons in County D. The percentage who thought that they were much better

off or a little better off did not vary by county except that the percentages were higher in the three “other” counties combined.

Exhibit II-99 presents data on whether respondents thought that they were better off, by ethnicity. The data show that non-whites were less likely than whites to think that they were much better off. However, not much difference exists between the two groups in the percentage who thought that they were either much better off or a little better off (68.1 percent for whites and 60.2 percent for non-whites). There was not a major difference between the two groups in the percentage of persons who thought that they were worse off.

**Exhibit II-98
RESPONDENTS’ VIEWS OF THEIR OVERALL SITUATION
SINCE DIVERTING**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	Other	Total
Much better off	26.3%	23.3%	28.6%	23.3%	42.9%	25.4%
A little better off	31.6%	34.9%	31.4%	39.5%	42.9%	37.1%
About the same	36.8%	39.5%	40.0%	27.1%	14.3%	31.3%
A little worse off	5.3%	2.3%	-	8.5%	-	5.4%
Much worse off	-	-	-	1.6%	-	.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Exhibit II-99
RESPONDENTS’ VIEWS OF THEIR OVERALL SITUATION
SINCE DIVERTING, BY ETHNICITY**

	White	Non-White	Total
Much better off	33.3%	22.2%	25.4%
A little better off	34.8%	38.0%	37.1%
About the same	24.6%	33.9%	31.3%
A little worse off	7.2%	4.7%	5.4%
Much worse off	-	1.2%	.8%
Total	100.0% (N = 69)	100.0% (N = 171)	100.0% (N = 240)

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

The data show that, despite evidence of deprivation among some segments of the population, the large majority of participants were satisfied with their decision to divert from

welfare. The majority were also satisfied with the amount of the diversion payment. The fact that 13 percent were not satisfied with the diversion decision may indicate a need for more careful screening by counties in referring certain applicants to the program.