

This report was prepared for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, under Contract No. DU100C000005865. The contents reflect the findings of Abt Associates, Inc., and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development or the U.S. Government.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report is one of three component pieces that together comprise Abt's study of the Operation Bootstrap Program. The research was conducted through the collaborative efforts of many individuals, from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and from Abt Associates.

First and foremost, the data collection necessary for this portion of the study depended on the cooperation, assistance, and goodwill of administrators and staff from the participating Public Housing Agencies, Operation Bootstrap participants, and representatives of a wide variety of other agencies and organizations affiliated with the program in the 26 communities included in our study sample. We particularly appreciate the support of Garland Allen, our Government Technical Reviewer at HUD, who provided guidance and valuable input throughout all stages of the analysis. Ron Sepanik also shared his knowledge of the American Housing Survey, which was useful in comparing our findings to national characteristics. We also benefitted from the review and comments of other HUD staff on an earlier draft of this report.

Within Abt Associates, we benefitted from the direction and careful review of Joe Frees, the Project Director, and from review comments by Chris Hamilton. Joe Frees and Gretchen Locke provided the context and background information on which much of Chapter One and Chapter Two were based. Kathy Cole directed the survey data collection, and Lois Levin conducted the survey data file processing. Analytic support was provided by Ted Shen. We also thank Susan Veirs, Wendy Davis, and Heather Hulse, who contributed to the typing and editing of the manuscript.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	viii
Program Design	viii
Policy Background and Context	ix
Objectives and Approach of the Participant Outcomes Analysis	ix
Progress toward Self-Sufficiency	x
Prerequisites to Self-Sufficiency	xii
Background and Environmental Conditions	xiii
Variations across Models	xiv
Implications for Family Self-Sufficiency	xvi
CHAPTER ONE Introduction	1
1.1 Program Design	1
1.2 Policy Background and Context	2
1.3 Objectives of the Participant Outcomes Analysis	4
1.4 Overview of Approach and Data	7
1.5 Overview of the Report	8
CHAPTER TWO Site Selection, Data, and Methodology	9
2.1 Selection of Study Sites and Participants	9
2.2 Participant Outcome Survey	14
2.3 Methodology	16
CHAPTER THREE Baseline Characteristics of Operation Bootstrap	
Program Participants	21
3.1 Selected Demographic Characteristics	21
3.2 Selected Household Characteristics	24
3.3 Housing Characteristics	26
3.4 Education and Training at Baseline	28
3.5 Work Histories	31
3.6 Sources of Income Support	33
CHAPTER FOUR Receipt of Self-Sufficiency Services	36
4.1 Education and Training	36
4.1.1 Receipt of Education and Training During the Program	37
4.1.2 Comparison of Pre- and Post-Program Participation Rates	37
4.1.3 Characteristics of the Education and Training Received	42
4.1.4 Educational Credentials Earned Following Program Entry	44

4.2	Job Search Assistance	46	
4.3	Housing and Neighborhood Conditions	50	
4.3.1	Housing Status	50	
4.3.2	Characteristics of Residence and Neighborhood		52
4.3.3	Reasons for Moving	54	
4.4	Child Care and Transportation Assistance	56	

CHAPTER FIVE Progress Toward Self-Sufficiency During the Operation
Bootstrap Program 62

5.1	Educational Attainment	63
5.2	Self-Esteem	65
5.3	Employment Activities	66
5.4	Sources of Income Support	75

CHAPTER SIX Summary and Lessons for the Transition to the Family
Self-Sufficiency Program 81

6.1	Summary of Main Findings	81
6.1.1	Progress toward Self-Sufficiency	81
6.1.2	Prerequisites to Self-Sufficiency	83
6.1.3	Background and Environmental Conditions	84
6.1.4	Variations across Models	85
6.2	Implications for Family Self-Sufficiency	87

Appendix A Key Differences Among HUD Self-Sufficiency Programs:
Project Self-Sufficiency, Operation Bootstrap
Demonstration, and Family Self-Sufficiency A-1

Appendix B Selected Characteristics of Intensive-Study Sample of
Operation Bootstrap Demonstration Sites B-1

Appendix C Operation Bootstrap Demonstration Questionnaire C-1

Appendix D Employment Activities of Operation Bootstrap Program
Participants by Six-Month Time Intervals
Following Program Entry, by Program Model D-1

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit 2.1	Operation Bootstrap Participant Outcomes Survey Response Rate by Site and Program Model	15
Exhibit 2.2	Percent of Interview Respondents with Data, by Length of Follow-Up	17
Exhibit 3.1	Selected Demographic Characteristics of Operation Bootstrap Program Participants at Program Entry	22
Exhibit 3.2	Selected Household Characteristics of Operation Bootstrap Program Entry	25
Exhibit 3.3	Housing Characteristics of Operation Bootstrap Program Households at Program Entry	27
Exhibit 3.4	Education and Training Background and Activities of Operation Bootstrap Program Participants Prior to Program Entry	29
Exhibit 3.5	Employment Activities of Operation Bootstrap Program Participants in 6 Months Prior to Program Entry	31
Exhibit 3.6	Public Sources of Income for Operation Bootstrap Households in 6 Months Prior to Program Entry	33
Exhibit 4.1	Education and Training Activities of Operation Bootstrap Program Participants Prior to and Following Program Entry	37
Exhibit 4.2	Education and Training Activities of Operation Bootstrap Program Participants by Six-Month Time Intervals Prior to and Following Program Entry	38
Exhibit 4.3	Characteristics of Educational and Training Activities of Operation Bootstrap Program Participants Following Program Entry	42
Exhibit 4.4	Educational Credentials Earned by Operation Bootstrap Participants Following Program Entry	44
Exhibit 4.5	Employment Preparation and Search	46
Exhibit 4.6	Characteristics of Spells of Employment Assistance Received During the Operation Bootstrap Program, by Source	47
Exhibit 4.7	Housing Status Before and After Operation Bootstrap	

	Program Entry	50
Exhibit 4.8	Self-Rated Housing and Neighborhood Characteristics Before and After Operation Bootstrap Program Entry	52
Exhibit 4.9	Reasons for Housing Change Among the 42 Percent of the Families Which Moved at Least Once Since Receipt of Certificate	54
Exhibit 4.10	Child Care Arrangements of Operation Bootstrap Program Participants While Working or in School	56
Exhibit 4.11	Child Care and Transportation Assistance Received by Operation Bootstrap Program Participants While Working or in School	58
Exhibit 4.12	Child Care and Transportation Assistance Received by Operation Bootstrap Program Participants While Working or in School, by Program Model	59
Exhibit 5.1	Percent of Operation Bootstrap Program Participants with High School Diploma or GED	63
Exhibit 5.2	Self-Esteem Before and After Operation Bootstrap Program Entry	66
Exhibit 5.3	Employment Activities of Operation Bootstrap Program Participants by Six-Month Time Intervals Prior to and Following Program Entry, All Sites	67
Exhibit 5.4	Employment Activities of Operation Bootstrap Program Participants by Six-Month Time Intervals Following Program Entry by Program Model	72
Exhibit 5.5	Sources of Public Income Received by Operation Bootstrap Program Participants by Six-Month Time Intervals Following Program Entry	75

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

DOCUMENTATION OF OPERATION BOOTSTRAP: REPORT ON THE OUTCOMES OF PARTICIPATION

In October 1989, the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) selected 61 public housing agencies (PHAs) around the country to participate in Operation Bootstrap, a community-based initiative designed to coordinate housing assistance with employment and training services in order to help low-income families develop careers and skills, secure jobs, and ultimately achieve economic independence. HUD contributed two special allocations of federal rental subsidies known as Section 8 certificates in Fiscal Year 1989 and Fiscal Year 1990, but local housing agencies were responsible for providing the education and job training services, as well as all other support services. Because the Operation Bootstrap Program offered no funding for these services, each housing agency had to reach out to neighboring organizations in its local community to provide all the services needed to help clients develop their skills and secure stable employment.

Program Design

HUD gave local agencies considerable flexibility to design individual programs that would meet their communities' particular needs and match their available resources. Grantees responded with a wide variety of program designs which may be grouped into three basic models:

- ***PHA-Centered Model:*** The PHA either hires new staff or assigns existing staff to be responsible for selection of participants, referral to services, and case management. Participants are generally drawn from Section 8 waiting lists; however, current Section 8 recipients are also eligible.
- ***Contract Model:*** Similar to the first approach, but rather than using its own staff, the PHA contracts with an outside agency to provide referral and case management.
- ***Pass-Through Model:*** The PHA makes an agreement to provide Section 8 assistance to eligible participants in an existing self-sufficiency program. The organization operating the self-sufficiency program typically selects participants from among its active pool of clients, and these families apply for Section 8 assistance if they are not already on the

waiting list.

Agreement to attempt self-sufficiency was required for admission to the program in all sites. However, participants could not be penalized or have their Section 8 certificates rescinded for failure to comply with this objective after entering the program.

Policy Background and Context

The Operation Bootstrap Program was the second in a series of three self-sufficiency initiatives undertaken by HUD over the last decade. The first, a mid-1980s demonstration program called Project Self-Sufficiency (PSS), was targeted specifically to low-income single parents and thought to be fairly successful in helping participants achieve economic self-sufficiency. Established five years later, the Operation Bootstrap Program borrowed the structure of its predecessor but aimed to provide opportunities to all low-income families, not just single-parent families.

HUD awarded just two rounds of funding through the Operation Bootstrap Program before the program was replaced by a third self-sufficiency initiative: the Family Self-Sufficiency Program. Authorized by the 1990 National Affordable Housing Act, the Family Self-Sufficiency Program (FSS) broadened its target client population to include public housing residents as well as Section 8 recipients. Beginning in FY 1993, participation in FSS became mandatory for all PHAs receiving either additional Section 8 assistance or new public housing units. Unlike the Operation Bootstrap Program, the FSS program is limited to individuals already receiving housing assistance, but does not require them to participate.

Objectives and Approach of the Participant Outcomes Analysis

In order to assess the results of the Operation Bootstrap Program and to share that information with other communities, HUD contracted with Abt Associates Inc. to document the results of the program. This second in a series of Abt reports describes the movement of Operation Bootstrap Program participants toward self-sufficiency following program entry. It also describes who participated in the program and what education and employment-related activities they engaged in during the course of their participation. The analysis is not intended to measure the **impacts** of the program on participant outcomes, however, only the overall progress of those outcomes toward economic self-sufficiency.

In order to collect the information needed for the analysis, Abt designed and administered a telephone survey of Operation Bootstrap Program participants in 24 sites. The interviews covered a period beginning six months prior to program entry and

continuing up to the date of interview. For the 723 individuals interviewed, the follow-up period ranged from 2 to 42 months and averaged 23 months. The data are analyzed in six-month intervals beginning with the semester prior to program entry and continuing for five semesters (30 months) thereafter. Sample sizes for Months 31 through 42 were too small to include.

Progress toward Self-Sufficiency

Operation Bootstrap Program participants in the 24 study sites were found to have made mixed progress toward self-sufficiency during the 30 months following enrollment in the program:

- Within six months after entry and for the remaining two years of the follow-up period, the percentage of participants **looking for work** in any 6-month interval was 6 to 10 percentage points higher than during the six months prior to program entry.
- The percentage actually **employed** during that same time span initially declined from its pre-program level of 40 percent (as education and training program participation rose; see below) but then climbed above its original level by 6 to 11 percentage points in the final year of follow-up.
- **Full-time employment** (35 hours per week for at least one month) also rose following an initial decline, exceeding its pre-program level (15 percent) by 4 to 9 percentage points beginning a year after program entry.
- Compared to the pre-program period, when 31 percent of program participants held **a job paying more than the minimum wage** (\$4.25 an hour), an additional 12 percent of participants held such a job during the final six months of follow-up.
- **Long-term employment** (employment in the same job for six months or more) and **"quality" jobs** (jobs with paid vacation and health insurance, weekly hours above 30, or positive job satisfaction) also followed a similar pattern over time, with the percentage of participants holding jobs with each of these characteristics rising 5 to 15 percentage points over baseline during the last year of the follow-up period.
- **Receipt of food stamp benefits** increased by about 10 percentage points following program entry, compared with 51 percent dependence at baseline. **AFDC receipt** rose less (from a pre-program level of 47 percent) and possibly not at all after the first six months of the program. These unexpected increases in welfare dependence may reflect unmeasured reductions in household earnings (despite increases in employment among

program participants) or unmeasured increases in awareness of public assistance programs generally.

- Reported **self-esteem** rose markedly from baseline to follow-up, as measured by positive responses to any of three questions on self-image. Depending on the question, 15 to 20 percent of the sample swung from a negative response to a positive response over the two-year average follow-up period.

This modest and mixed movement toward self-sufficiency **following** program entry does not necessarily imply beneficial or detrimental effects **from** the program, since we do not know how the same individuals would have fared absent the intervention. Lacking such a benchmark, the only thing we can say with certainty is that the Operation Bootstrap Program was one among possibly many factors that led participants toward greater employment but not greater economic independence in the two-and-one-half years following program entry. Other factors that may have played a role include participants' background characteristics and motivation and the availability of jobs and other employment and training services in their communities.

Prerequisites to Self-Sufficiency

We were also able to identify increases in some of the potential prerequisites to future self-sufficiency:

- Steady increases in **educational and training activities** over the baseline period, with an additional 7 to 14 percent of participants active each semester of the follow-up period beyond the 49 percent active in the six months before program entry.
- Of those reporting any education and training activities, 60 percent were very **satisfied with their courses** and--of those who later looked for work--46 percent found the training very helpful in finding a job.
- Forty-one percent of education/training participants completed their **courses of study**, which concentrated on vocational programs and two-year college programs. As a result, 21 percent of all program participants **received a degree or training certificate** at some point during the 23-month average follow-up period.
- As a result of these activities, the share of Operation Bootstrap Program participants with a **high school diploma or GED certificate** rose from 84 percent at baseline to 92 percent at follow-up.
- Of several **job search techniques** examined, each of three self-initiated approaches (direct employer contacts, talks with friends and relatives, responses to advertisements) were used by about a third of all participants during the follow-up period, while strategies involving outside assistance (job referrals, job counseling, job search assistance) were used by about a quarter of the sample.
- Slightly more program households **lived in a private apartment** at follow-up than at baseline (88 percent as opposed to 84 percent), with those living in public housing units and in shared living quarters declining 2 percentage points each.
- **Self-rated housing and neighborhood conditions** increased slightly, with 5 to 15 percent of participants shifting from a neutral or negative baseline rating to a positive follow-up rating, depending on the factor evaluated (e.g., housing condition, neighborhood safety, school quality).
- Fifty-seven percent of those with child care responsibilities received **child care assistance** at some point during the follow-up period, compared to only 36 percent during the (substantially shorter) baseline period. Corresponding percentages receiving **transportation assistance** (among all Operation Bootstrap

Program participants) were 36 percent at follow-up and 24 percent at baseline.

Here again, we cannot be sure which of these changes were induced by the Operation Bootstrap Program and which would have occurred without it. Still, regardless of their origins, each of these factors may have played a role in moving participants toward employment during--and possibly after--the analysis period.

Background and Environmental Conditions

We also reviewed the background and environmental factors that defined the program participants under study. In particular, the 723 individuals studied lived in 24 PHA jurisdictions representing:

- All 10 HUD administrative regions, providing considerable **geographic diversity** in the sample;
- Both **urban and rural sites**;
- **Large, medium, and small PHAs**, as well as large, medium, and small Operation Bootstrap units;
- A range of **local unemployment rates** and **employment and training program service capacities**.

The 24 study sites match up well with the full set of 59 first-year Operation Bootstrap sites on virtually all of these factors.

In terms of personal and family characteristics, participants had the following profile at baseline:

- The majority were **female** (91 percent), between the **ages** of 26 and 35 (53 percent), **white** non-Hispanic (54 percent), and **U.S. born** (94 percent).
- Most were **unmarried** (41 percent never married, 39 percent divorced or separated) and living in **households** of 2 to 4 people that included one or more **children** and, quite often, a child under the age of six.
- Almost all lived in single-household **housing units** with at most two persons per bedroom, and 60 to 70 percent rated their housing units and neighborhoods "excellent" or "good."
- Most (84 percent) had **high school diplomas or GEDs** at baseline and half had recently (within the last six months) participated in some form of **training or education**, primarily

vocational training and two-year college programs.

- Few had been **employed** full time in the six months prior to program entry (19 percent) and only 41 percent had held any job over that period. **Wages** on the most recent job met or exceeded the minimum wage (\$4.25 per hour) in most instances and averaged \$5.56 per hour.
- In addition to earnings, **major sources of income** in participant households in the six months prior to entering the Operation Bootstrap Program were food stamp benefits (55 percent), and AFDC grants (49 percent).

These and other unmeasured baseline characteristics such as motivation, family background, and health status may have substantially affected participants' responses to the Operation Bootstrap Program and their overall progress toward self-sufficiency.

Variations across Models

Some but not all of these findings differed in important ways among the three program models. Of the outcomes considered separately by model of coordination:

- **Job search** activities increased most strikingly in the PHA-Centered programs, although no statistically significant differences between models were observed.
- **School and training** activities increased most in the Contract Model programs, and declined relative to baseline in the Pass-Through Model programs.
- **Employment rates** rose most quickly in the Pass-Through Model programs. There was no evidence of statistically significant differences across program models, however.
- **Welfare dependence** increased most in the Contract Model sites and fell in the Pass-Through Model sites.
- **High school diploma and GED attainment** increased most in the Contract Model sites, but all sites showed significant gains.
- **Receipt of child care assistance** increased most in the Contract Model sites.
- Use of **transportation assistance** rose most significantly among Pass-Through Model sites.

Thus, it appears that the PHA-Centered Model programs focused more on job

search, Contract Model programs more on education and training (at least in the short run), and Pass-Through Model programs more on employment. This last result is not surprising given that the Pass-Through Model programs served individuals already participating in employment and training programs. It stands to reason that these clients were already positioned to increase their employment rates--and decrease their schooling activities--near the point of program entry, whereas participants in the other two models needed longer to reach that point. Similarly, it is not surprising to see welfare reductions in the Pass-Through Model programs only--and the largest **increase** in welfare dependence among the programs with the greatest emphasis on education and training activities (the Contract Model programs).

Slight differences in **background characteristics** may also have played a role in the patterns of outcomes observed across models. In particular:

- Participants in the **PHA-Centered Model** programs were slightly older with less recent education and training experience;
- Participants in the **Contract Model** programs were younger and more likely to have a high school education; and
- Participants in the **Pass-Through Model** programs were less satisfied with the quality of their neighborhoods and more likely to receive AFDC benefits.

The distinctive profiles of the PHA-Centered Model and the Contract Model clients generally accord with the greater focus on more job search strategies for the older, less-recently educated participants in the former sites and the emphasis on (generally post-secondary) education and training for the younger, more educated participants in the latter sites. Similarly, in comparison to the other models, we would expect participants in the Pass-Through Model programs to be more dependent on welfare at baseline, since three of those sites drew their participants directly from the roles of the AFDC JOBS program. That they were also less satisfied with their neighborhoods is somewhat surprising, however; the reverse might have been expected, given that those participants were the only ones not already on a Section 8 waiting list.

Implications for Family Self-Sufficiency

The Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Program, as defined by HUD in regulations issued on May 27, 1993, differs from the Operation Bootstrap Program in several respects. Most fundamentally, FSS cannot use the desire for housing assistance to motivate entry into training and employment efforts on the part of its clients, as did the PHAs in the PHA-Centered and Contract Model programs, since FSS participants will

be members of current Section 8 families. Nor can FSS build linkages with other social service agencies in the same way that the Pass-Through Model programs did. In particular, FSS cannot contribute housing assistance to other self-sufficiency programs, since PHAs will not necessarily receive additional Section 8 certificates through FSS. However, families participating or seeking to participate in other self-sufficiency programs may receive a selection preference for up to 50 percent of FSS Section 8 certificates.

As a result of these factors, both the pool of participants and the types of services provided under FSS could differ substantially from the Operation Bootstrap Program. So, too, could participants' incentives to sustain their self-sufficiency efforts once the program begins. Few if any sanctions were available to program administrators to assure continued compliance with employment plans once participants entered the program, whereas retraction of Section 8 assistance may be considered when FSS participants fail to uphold their self-sufficiency "contracts" with PHAs. FSS rules provide a further inducement to continue pursuing employment through the use of escrow accounts whose proceeds generally cannot be accessed until public assistance program dependence ends.

In light of these differences, the Operation Bootstrap Program may be most useful to policy makers in relation to FSS by illustrating what progress toward self-sufficiency is possible among "self-starting" Section 8 recipients. By focusing on these "self-starting" individuals, the program findings can:

1. Determine the availability and likely utilization of the self-sufficiency services on which FSS will depend.
2. Illustrate what the most motivated FSS participants are capable of doing in the self-help realm once housing, referral, and support services are made available;
3. Depending on whether those self-help efforts were sustained or short-lived, anticipate the effort required in enforcing the terms of FSS "contracts"; and
4. Establish realistic expectations as to what is attainable from the FSS program, in terms of increased employment and lessened welfare dependence.

On the first three of these counts, the findings provide the basis for cautious optimism. They show that the majority of Operation Bootstrap participants participated in educational and training activities and (if they had child care responsibilities) received child care assistance following program entry. The ability of these

participants to "stay the course" in a self-sufficiency program was also evident over the two-and-one-half year follow-up period. An immediate corollary to these patterns is that volunteers for FSS, if similar to Operation Bootstrap Program participants, are likely to take their commitments to the program seriously and uphold them with little enforcement effort. If anything, FSS participants may be even more committed to long-term betterment than were Operation Bootstrap Program participants, given the possibility of sanctions and the requirement of some measure of success before receiving escrow funds.

Despite their commitment, only about half of Operation Bootstrap Program participants worked at all in the final six months of the follow-up period, a rate only 11 percentage points above the equivalent measure for the six months leading into the program. Gains in full-time employment and employment in jobs with fringe benefits and earnings above minimum wage were equally modest. Over the same interval, welfare dependence increased rather than declined in most sites, and educational attainment rose only slightly. However, it is possible that over a longer follow-up period than that available for this study, welfare dependence might decline and educational attainment rise substantially in response to the relatively long-term educational and training activities undertaken by participants.

It appears, then, that the Operation Bootstrap Program--and possibly the Family Self-Sufficiency Program that will replace it--achieved a result quite often seen among employment and training programs for low-income households: modest but noticeable progress toward employment--but not greater self-sufficiency--over a medium-length follow-up period. It is unclear what contribution the program itself made to this result, as opposed to what would have taken place absent the intervention. Ultimately, it is the size of this **contribution**--measurable only in an impact analysis--that determines the true worth of a program in relation to its cost. For the Operation Bootstrap Program, we should not assume a favorable balance based on these results, nor should we assume the reverse.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

In October 1989, the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) selected 61 public housing agencies (PHAs) around the country to participate in Operation Bootstrap, a community-based initiative designed to coordinate housing assistance with employment and training services in order to help low-income families develop careers and skills, secure jobs, and ultimately achieve economic independence. HUD contributed two special allocations of federal rental subsidies known as Section 8 certificates (in Fiscal Year 1989 and Fiscal Year 1990), but local housing agencies were responsible for providing the education and job training services, as well as all other support services. Because the Operation Bootstrap Program offered no funding for these services, each housing agency had to reach out to neighboring organizations in its local community to provide the education and training services, the case management, the child care and transportation assistance, and all the other services needed to help clients develop their skills and secure stable employment. Program participation was completely voluntary for the participants. Once admitted to the Operation Bootstrap Program, participants could not be dismissed for failing to meet any program objectives.

1.1 Program Design

HUD gave local agencies considerable flexibility to design individual programs that would meet their communities' particular needs and match their available resources. Grantees responded with an impressive variety of program designs -- designs which may be grouped into three basic models:

- ***PHA-Centered Model:*** The PHA either hires new staff or assigns existing staff to be responsible for selection of participants, referral to services, and case management. Participants are drawn from typically lengthy Section 8 waiting lists. They must agree to take certain steps toward self-sufficiency and in return may receive certificates far in advance of the time they would have received them through the regular Section 8 program.
- ***Contract Model:*** Similar to the first approach, but rather than using its own staff, the PHA contracts with an outside agency to provide referral and case management.
- ***Pass-Through Model:*** The PHA makes an agreement to provide

Section 8 assistance to eligible participants in an existing self-sufficiency program. The organization operating the self-sufficiency program typically selects participants from among its active pool of clients, and these families apply for Section 8 assistance if they are not already on the waiting list.

The three models are distinguished by their approach to a pair of basic program design questions. First, should Operation Bootstrap be a distinct, free-standing, self-sufficiency program or should it be built into an existing effort? Second, should the program be centered in the PHA? Operation Bootstrap Program programs are considered to adhere to the PHA-Centered Model when they are both free-standing and operated by the PHA. Contract Model programs were free-standing, but centered in an outside service agency, typically a Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) program, a local non-profit, or a Community Action Program (CAP) initiative run by a public agency. Finally, unlike the other two approaches, Pass-Through Model programs were attached to an existing self-sufficiency program. The only additional service provided to participants was housing.

The decision of whether or not to develop a freestanding program radically changed the incentives provided by the program for individual participants. By providing certificates to those already in employment or training programs, Pass-Through Model sites lost their potential to use the prospect of housing assistance to persuade individuals to move toward self-sufficiency. (In the long-run, of course, assuming perfect information, Section 8 applicants would find out that participating in certain training and education programs increases one's chances of getting housing aid and the "incentive-value" of the program would thus be restored.) Still, while housing assistance did not serve as a "carrot" in these sites, it may have played an important role as a facilitator, providing additional security and stability at home while working toward economic independence in existing employment or education programs.

1.2 Policy Background and Context

The Operation Bootstrap Program was the second in a series of three self-sufficiency initiatives undertaken by HUD over the last decade. The first, Project Self-Sufficiency (PSS), was implemented in 1984 and 1985 in 155 local communities, and was targeted specifically to low-income single parents. Follow-up efforts indicate that PSS was fairly successful in helping participants move toward self-sufficiency. In August 1988, HUD reported that 42 percent of the nearly 10,000 participants had "significantly improved their situations," either through full-time employment, enrollment in college degree programs, or other important steps toward self-sufficiency.¹

¹ Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and

Established five years later, the Operation Bootstrap Program essentially borrowed the structure of its predecessor; a key difference was that it aimed to provide opportunities to all low-income families, not just single-parent families. HUD awarded just two rounds of funding through Operation Bootstrap (FY 1989 and FY 1990) before the program was replaced by a third self-sufficiency initiative: the Family Self-Sufficiency Program. Authorized by the 1990 National Affordable Housing Act, the Family Self-Sufficiency Program (FSS) broadened its target client population to include public housing residents as well as Section 8 recipients. HUD published its first Notice of Funding Availability for Family Self-Sufficiency in the fall of 1991 and, beginning in FY 1993, participation in the program became mandatory for all PHAs receiving either additional Section 8 assistance or new public housing units.²

Appendix A presents the main differences among the three initiatives and shows that there are many more important differences between FSS and the Operation Bootstrap Program than existed between the program and its predecessor, Project Self-Sufficiency. Perhaps most importantly, the FSS program is limited to individuals already receiving housing assistance. Thus, whereas in PSS and the Operation Bootstrap Program, individuals had an incentive to participate because it would allow them to receive a Section 8 certificate much sooner than they would through the regular Section 8 program (sometimes amounting to a five- to ten-year wait), they have no such incentive under Family Self-Sufficiency. The primary incentive to participate is the increased access to self-help services made possible by FSS. A further incentive for some may be the FSS escrow account, which gives all participants the chance to recoup any Section 8 rent increases they must pay due to augmented earnings.³ FSS, however, also requires that participants take on greater risk than those in PSS or the Operation Bootstrap Program. In particular, the FSS guidelines permit housing

Research, Project Self-Sufficiency: An Interim Report on Progress and Performance: December 1987.

² PHAs may receive an FSS exception from HUD if they can demonstrate that there are inadequate support services available in the local community, lack of administrative money, lack of support from local government, or if eligible families demonstrate no interest in the program.

³According to recent regulations, there are two scenarios under which a family may receive the proceeds from the escrow account. First, the balance of the account will be transferred to the head of the family upon successful completion of the contract of participation and when no family members receive Federal or state welfare assistance. Alternatively, at the discretion of the particular PHA, a portion of the escrow account may be advanced to the family prior to the completion of the contract of participation if certain interim self-sufficiency goals have been reached and it is determined that the funds are needed to fulfill the contract (eg. school tuition or other school costs, small business start-up expenses, a car when public transportation is unavailable, or job training costs).

agencies to revoke certificates if individuals fail to comply with program requirements. By contrast, once candidates were selected for the Operation Bootstrap Program, housing agencies were given no power to force them to participate in education or job search: participants could not be penalized or have their certificates or vouchers terminated for a failure to actively pursue training, education, or employment.

1.3 Objectives of the Participant Outcomes Analysis

In order to assess the results of the Operation Bootstrap Program and to share that information with other communities, HUD issued a request for proposals to document the results of the program and awarded a research contract to Abt Associates Inc. The study is not intended to evaluate the impact of the Operation Bootstrap Program on participating families, but (1) to document its implementation in local communities, (2) to measure the progress of participants in moving toward economic independence, and (3) to identify the elements of successful programs that might serve as models for other communities. The overall plan for the research consists of three interconnected studies: a study of program administration; a study of participant outcomes; and a series of case studies of exemplary programs.

This report presents the results of the study of participant outcomes. Its chief goal is to report on the movement toward self-sufficiency achieved by participating families. In addition, it describes who participated in the program and what education and employment-related activities they engaged in during the course of their participation.

The study focuses on four broad measures of self-sufficiency inputs and outcomes:

- Receipt of job training and education, job search assistance, and support services such as child care and transportation assistance;
- Changes in employment status and job satisfaction;
- Changes in other measures of self-sufficiency, such as welfare dependence and self-esteem; and
- Changes in housing and neighborhood conditions.

The paragraphs below discuss the key hypotheses tested related to these measures.

Receipt of Services

Did Operation Bootstrap Program programs achieve their goals of making

education and training available to participants and of inducing and/or enabling them to enroll? Although we can not assess what participants would have done in the absence of the Operation Bootstrap Program, we can at least compare the share of participants attending classes or training programs after they enrolled in the program with the share enrolled prior to the program and test for a significant increase.⁴

Given the formidable barriers often posed by child care needs and transportation requirements (especially in rural areas), we tested whether a greater share of participants received help with meeting these needs after enrolling in the Operation Bootstrap Program. It is possible, of course, that the share of participants employed or enrolled in school could rise without a corresponding increase in the share receiving child care or transportation assistance. But this would suggest that neither child care nor transportation constituted a significant barrier prior to the Operation Bootstrap Program.

Changes in Employment Status and Job Satisfaction

The ultimate goal of the Operation Bootstrap Program was to provide people with the skills and resources they needed to support themselves through employment. Yet it was unclear how much of an increase in employment we should have expected to see over the course of the one- to three-year follow-up period provided by our survey. A number of participants had substantial deficiencies in education and skills which they were attempting to address before looking for work. Indeed, time spent in education or training programs could actually reduce time at work in the short-term, even if such training improves employment prospects in the long term. Moreover, even those participants who completed their education and secured jobs might not immediately see the full, long-range results of their education. Thus, the education and training provided through the Operation Bootstrap Program might not dramatically change the prospects for starting jobs, but they might radically improve advancement possibilities and job stability. Still, even in the relatively short time period covered by this survey, we expected to see some progress in employment outcomes.

Changes in Welfare Dependence and Self-Esteem

Another long-term goal of the Operation Bootstrap Program was to reduce

⁴ This approach was less appropriate for Pass-Through programs, where participants were already enrolled in a self-sufficiency program, and often in education or training, prior to being selected for the Operation Bootstrap Demonstration. The objective of Pass-Through programs is not necessarily to induce additional enrollments but rather to stabilize participants' living situations and enable them to complete their education or training. Thus, one would not expect to see an increase in participation after the Operation Bootstrap Demonstration.

dependency on government assistance. Once again, it might well be the case that the follow-up period examined for this study was not long enough to reveal the true benefits of the Operation Bootstrap Program in reducing dependence on welfare and other government programs. Indeed, it seems plausible that a program like the Operation Bootstrap Program would actually lead to an increase in the proportion of participants receiving some types of assistance over the short-run. Participants might find they need additional help from public programs in order to attend school or look for more promising and stable employment. It seems possible, for instance, that participants would be more likely to receive unemployment insurance after they had enrolled in the Operation Bootstrap Program than before, since program staff might encourage their clients to collect unemployment insurance and look thoroughly for a stable, well-paying, full-time job rather than taking a low-paying job with no opportunities for advancement. Once again, however, despite these caveats, we expected to see some reduction in dependency in the short-run. Similarly, we expected to see an improvement in participants' self-esteem.

Changes in Housing and Neighborhood Conditions

While not a direct goal of the Operation Bootstrap Program, improving the housing conditions (or reducing the housing costs) of participants clearly helps allow family providers to concentrate on acquiring skills and training and improving employment prospects in the move toward self-sufficiency. To investigate how the housing conditions of families changed, we compared participants' housing situations immediately before the program and at the time of the follow-up survey (typically two years after). In particular, we searched for differences in housing size, housing quality, and neighborhood conditions. We also explored the reasons behind the decision of certain participants to move. Were they looking for a safer neighborhood for their children, or proximity to job opportunities? Such an exploration may help to shed light on the nature of the barriers to education and employment posed by poor housing conditions.

1.4 Overview of Approach and Data

Given the broad diversity of program designs adopted and given the dissimilarity of local conditions (such as labor market conditions and transportation requirements), it seems unlikely that outcomes will be constant across different sites. As a result, the study presents outcomes for individual sites as well as for the population as a whole. Outcomes are also compared across the three program models. One might expect these different strategies of coordination (especially the Pass-through Model) to lead to different kinds of results. And similarly, the interpretation of the outcomes, and the

corresponding policy implications, differ sharply. In the case of the PHA-Centered Model and the Contract Model, the outcomes shed light on the effect of providing housing subsidies and access to employment and training resources to low-income households. For the Pass-Through Model, the outcomes instead indicate whether offering housing assistance to participants in self-sufficiency programs improves their performance, their chances of completion, and their long-term success.

In order to conduct a reliable analysis of the program's outcomes, it is critical to have accurate data collected consistently across sites. Unfortunately, local Operation Bootstrap Program programs maintained no uniform records on participation in education and training programs, employment, or welfare dependence. In order to collect such information, Abt designed and administered a telephone survey of participants. The survey was used to provide information on services received while in the Operation Bootstrap Program as well as a comparison of a variety of self-sufficiency measures just before entry and one to three years after. Ideally, a study would have surveyed participants at the time when they entered the Operation Bootstrap Program and then again at a later date. But neither project resources nor timing permitted this approach. As a result, we surveyed participants at a single date and asked them to recall certain facts about their life (such as schooling, housing, and employment) which were evident up to four years prior to their interview. Our experience in a variety of other similar studies suggests that we can rely on participant recollection for this information.

1.5 Overview of the Report

The next chapter of this report describes our approach to examining participant outcomes. It discusses the selection of the Operation Bootstrap Program sites included in the study, data collection, and the methodology employed for analysis. The third chapter describes key characteristics of the participants responding to the survey. It summarizes their demographic make-up, their housing situation, their education, their employment status, and their dependence on government support just before enrolling in the program.

Chapter Four examines the nature of the self-sufficiency services received by Operation Bootstrap Program participants: education and training; job search assistance; and child care and transportation assistance. The fifth chapter presents pre/post comparisons of the central self-sufficiency measures and compares these measures among the three models of coordination. The sixth and final chapter offers conclusions and policy implications of the participant outcome findings. While we can not interpret these results as direct evidence of Operation Bootstrap Program effects, we can use them to point to some possible implications for the Family Self-Sufficiency

Program, and more generally, for any initiatives attempting to combine housing with other support services in order to help motivate and facilitate low-income families to become self-sufficient.

CHAPTER TWO

SITE SELECTION, DATA, AND METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, we discuss the selection of the Operation Bootstrap Program sites and participants in the study. The key features and characteristics of the 26 selected sites are presented as well as a description of the data collected and methodology employed for analysis.

2.1 Selection of Study Sites and Participants

In Fiscal Year 1989, HUD awarded 2,842 Section 8 certificates⁵ to 61 of the approximately 3,000 local housing agencies in the country with Section 8 programs, to support Operation Bootstrap programs. In Fiscal Year 1990, HUD awarded another 1,053 certificates and vouchers to 39 of these original grantees.⁶ In two cases, separate city and county housing agencies pooled their certificates to operate a single joint program: the Sacramento City and County Housing Authorities, and the Seattle Housing Authority and the Housing Authority of King County. In addition, two other sites failed to implement programs as a result of administrative problems. Thus, 59 programs were funded and 57 were actually implemented. The study is based on data collected from a purposive sample of 26 local programs selected by Abt staff in consultation with HUD officials. The characteristics of these programs and the details of our site selection procedures have been discussed in our program administration report. Here we summarize that information.⁷

Given the diversity of strategies adopted by local programs, intimate knowledge about the design of individual programs was necessary in order to arrive at any meaningful interpretation of participant outcomes. Were participants selected from existing self-sufficiency programs? Were they required to enroll in and attend school before being offered a certificate? Without answers to these and other critical questions, the policy implications of our findings would be uncertain. Thus, we confined attention to those programs included in our study of program administration.

Due to limited resources, project staff assigned to the program administration

⁵ In total, approximately 1.275 million certificates and vouchers have been funded under the Section 8 program as of March 1992.

⁶ 8,033 certificates and vouchers were also provided to an additional 253 communities. These Operation Bootstrap Demonstration projects are **not** included in this evaluation.

⁷ See Frees, J.W., Ingrid Ellen, and Gretchen Locke, Documentation of the Results of Operation Bootstrap: Program Administration Report, Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates Inc., October 1993.

study did not visit the entire universe of 57 Round One programs, but instead traveled to a sample of 26. To choose the 26, we relied largely on data collected through a review of program applications and follow-up telephone discussions with key representatives of each program. Significantly, the objective of the selection process was **not** to identify a statistically representative sample of sites. We aimed instead to choose sites that were implementing interesting programs and that had representatives who voiced an interest in cooperating with our efforts.

Once an initial set of sites was identified on this basis, we used a database of program features and characteristics (developed from applications and telephone discussions with staff) to compare the characteristics of potential sites with those of the full universe to ensure that the sample represented the full range and diversity of Operation Bootstrap programs. This comparison resulted in some replacement of sites to achieve a more balanced sample and ensured that there were sound and carefully considered reasons supporting all site selection decisions. We developed and applied a set of seven characteristics for this purpose:

- Lead agency
- Participant selection requirements
- Previous self-sufficiency experience
- Geographic region
- Urban/rural location
- Size
- Local labor market conditions

Brief discussions and justifications of these criteria are provided below. Appendix B displays all 26 sites according to these seven criteria.

Lead Agency

The lead agency was the agency responsible for providing referral and case management services (and in most cases, selecting participants as well). In the PHA-Centered programs, the lead agency was always the PHA. In the Contract and Pass-Through Models, the lead agency was an organization that typically had more experience with employment and training services, such as a JOBS agency, a JTPA provider, a non-profit, or a community college. Of the 26 sites selected, eight were run by PHAs, seven by private non-profits, five by JTPA programs, four by JOBS programs, and two by publicly run CAP programs. These numbers represent between a third and a half of all the Operation Bootstrap projects in the nation run by each particular type of agency, providing a fairly representative mix of agency types.

Participant Selection Requirements

Most Bootstrap sites required candidates to demonstrate their commitment to the self-sufficiency effort prior to receiving their Section 8 certificate through a series of steps. The simplest selection requirement was also the most common: assessment and completion of an individual employability plan. Six sample sites fall into this group. The remaining sample sites split among those requiring -- in addition to assessment and planning -- multi-week workshops (five sample sites), enrollment in an education or training program (four sites), attendance in an education or training program for a specified period of time (six sites), and previous enrollment in such a program and/or full-time employment (five sites). Compared to the universe of 61 Operation Bootstrap sites, this sample noticeably over-represents local programs that selected participants on length of attendance and under-represents those that selected on previous enrollment or employment.

Previous Self-Sufficiency Experience

Just over half of the sample of Operation Bootstrap Program sites had prior experience with a self-sufficiency program. Thirteen had participated in HUD's previous Project Self-Sufficiency demonstration program, while another four had used regular Section 8 certificates and vouchers to support other local self-sufficiency endeavors. In designing their Operation Bootstrap programs, these sites had an established system of coordination with other agencies on which to build, and most modeled their programs closely after their earlier self-sufficiency initiatives. A final category of previous self-sufficiency experience -- none -- was the one group under-represented in the research sample compared to the Operation Bootstrap Program as a whole, and included nine sites.

Geographic Region

The fourth criterion used was location or region. The quality, availability, and price of housing vary greatly from one area of the country to another, as do the local job market and the nature and availability of social services. Consequently, we made sure that we selected sites from each of the ten HUD regions roughly in proportion to the distribution of all 61 Bootstrap sites across the country. While generally quite balanced in this regard, the West is slightly over-represented in the sample, and the South slightly under-represented.

Urban/Rural

Low income families living in rural areas face very different problems and opportunities than those in more urban sites. With dispersed employment, social

services, and housing, participants in rural sites are likely to face greater difficulties getting to jobs, classes, and/or counselling. Agencies themselves also tend to be dispersed in rural sites which makes communication among them more difficult. Very few rural sites were selected by HUD to participate in the Operation Bootstrap Program -- roughly one out of every five or six sites. We made sure to include approximately the same proportion -- four -- in our research sample of 26 because of the distinct challenges that they face.

Size

The sixth selection criteria used was size -- both PHA size (measured by the total Section 8 allocation) and Operation Bootstrap program size (measured by the total program allocation). Larger programs, for instance, are likely to have a greater variety of internal resources available for program operations, more negotiating leverage with other service providers, and more experience in running special programs. On the other hand, smaller programs may be less constrained by bureaucracy and more open to innovation. We tended to favor sites with larger Operation Bootstrap programs to ensure a sufficient number of participants for the outcomes study, but we also made sure to include some smaller programs. Of the 26, six received 50 or fewer Operation Bootstrap Program certificates or vouchers, 13 were allotted between 50 and 100, and seven received over 100. Apart from small sites, this mix closely reflects that of the program as a whole.

Local Labor Market Conditions

The seventh selection criteria was local labor market conditions. A low income individual trying to achieve economic self-sufficiency in a city or county with a stagnant economy clearly faces greater challenges than a similar individual in an area with a thriving local economy and growing job opportunities. A study looking only at programs in areas with thriving economies would tend to overstate the efficacy of the services and assistance provided, while a study considering only sites with depressed economies would be likely to understate it. It is therefore important to include a mix of sites which represent a diversity of local economic situations. We used 1990 local unemployment rates (most sites began operations in 1990) to serve as a measure of the health of the local economy. Of the 26 sites, ten had an unemployment rate of more than six percent, nine had a rate between four and six percent, and seven had a rate of less than four percent -- numbers right in line with the mix of conditions found among Operation Bootstrap sites as a whole.

Similarly, the capacity of the Operation Bootstrap programs to help participants achieve positive, short-term labor market outcomes also depends on the capacity of

the local employment and training system to provide training and job development services to program participants. The two most widely available sources of employment and training services are JTPA and JOBS. No national data are available for JOBS, but the JTPA Annual Status Report provides a variety of performance statistics for each Service Delivery Area in the country, including the number of JTPA participants placed in jobs. We constructed a capacity index for each site which is the ratio of the total number of Operation Bootstrap Program certificates issued in the first year of the program to the number of local JTPA participants placed in jobs between July 1989 and June 1990.

While this capacity index has limitations, it provides a rough measure of the ability of the local employment and training system and the local labor market to successfully absorb and secure jobs in relation to the number of Operation Bootstrap Program participants. Communities that had low ratios of program enrollments to JTPA job placements should have been better able to absorb and serve those individuals, and hence more likely to produce positive employment outcomes than those with higher ratios. For the sample of 26, capacity ratios ranged from a low of 0.05 in Huntington, West Virginia, to a high of 1.01 for Lincoln, Nebraska. Ten sites had a capacity ratio of less than 0.15; eight had a ratio between 0.15 and 0.25; and eight had a ratio of at least 0.25. Sites with unusually high capacity ratios are under-represented in this mix, a deficit offset by an over-representation of those only somewhat above average.

2.2 Participant Outcome Survey

A follow-up telephone survey of participants was the primary source of data for this analysis. The survey was conducted in early 1993, approximately two years after the typical survey respondent had been admitted to the Operation Bootstrap Program. It involved a 45-minute interview that asked sample members about their spells of education, employment, job search, and receipt of government assistance, from six months prior to their initial enrollments in the program up through the time of their interviews. Selected characteristics of jobs held -- including the number of hours worked, wage rate, benefits, and satisfaction -- were collected for each job as were the timing, type, and usefulness of each experience in school, training, and/or job search. Questions about demographics, family composition, and housing status were also asked. A copy of the survey instrument appears in Appendix C.

Computer-assisted telephone interviewing, or CATI, was used for all telephone interviews. In this system, a computer program displays each question on a computer screen for the interviewer to read, and then records each answer as it is given and entered by the interviewer. CATI provides tight control over skip patterns and prompts

the interviewer for corrections when out-of-range responses are entered.

Within our sample of 26 programs, we attempted to interview all 2,109 participants.⁸ Unfortunately, we were unable to obtain telephone numbers or addresses from the PHAs for 581 participants.⁹ Our effective pool of participants therefore consisted of 1,528 participants. We were able to reach 798 of these participants (52 percent), and interviews were successfully completed with all of them. As shown in Exhibit 2.1, survey response rates varied considerably

across sites, from a low of 23 percent¹⁰ to a high of 82 percent. Response rates for the PHA-Centered, Contract, and Pass-Through Model sites averaged 64, 52, and 52 percent, respectively.

2.3 Methodology

This section outlines the methodology used to analyze the data collected in the participant survey. It summarizes our approach to describing who participated in the program, to identifying what activities they engaged in during the course of the program, and to measuring movement towards self-sufficiency among participating families.

The findings presented in this report are divided into three categories: baseline characteristics; services received; and pre/post measures of self-sufficiency. The baseline characteristics include demographic features, household characteristics, housing conditions, education and training background, employment history, and public sources of income. The services received include education and training, job search assistance, and child care and transportation assistance. The analysis focuses on participation levels, types, and the level of satisfaction associated with each self-sufficiency service. Finally, the pre/post analysis of progress made toward self-sufficiency highlights the following measures:

⁸ HUD records suggest that 2,118 certificates and vouchers were given to these 26 sites. The total number of participants on record at the local housing agencies differs slightly, partly due to discrepancies between HUD and local PHA records regarding total Operation Bootstrap Demonstration allocations and partly due to turnover of demonstration certificates.

⁹ Two sites -- Baltimore, MD, and Huntington, WV -- failed to provide contact information for the survey for any of their participants, so this study in fact relies on participant data from only 24 of the 26 sites.

¹⁰ Contact information from this site was not provided until the end of April 1993, less than two weeks before the close of the survey, which explains the relatively low response rate.

- Share of high school graduates before and after the program;
- Jobs held, earnings, and job satisfaction;
- Receipt of AFDC, Food Stamps, and Unemployment Insurance before and after program entry;
- Self-esteem before and after program participation;
- Type, size, and quality of residence, and safety/quality of neighborhood before and after entry into the program; and
- Reasons for moving for those respondents who moved.

Time Span Covered by Data

The survey was administered between January and April of 1993 and asked participants to provide information dating back to six months prior to their initial enrollment in the Operation Bootstrap Program. The earliest enrollment date was November 1989, so for some participants, the survey furnished information dating back to May 1989.¹¹ The typical participant, however, was interviewed two years after entry into the program. Exhibit 2.2 provides a summary of the percentage of respondents for whom we have followup data, by length of time since Operation Bootstrap Program enrollment. As shown, there was considerable variation. For the first six months of follow-up, we have complete data for 98 percent of the respondents, a percentage that declines substantially as we increase the followup period. By 36 months after program entry, we have data for only 6 percent of respondents.

Exhibit 2.2

Percent of Interview Respondents with Data, by Length of Follow-Up

6 months	12 months	18 months	24 months	30 months	36 months
98	89	68	47	22	6

¹¹ While this asks a few participants to provide data about their self-sufficiency activities four years after the fact, our experience in other studies suggests such a recall period is reasonable.

As noted earlier, the survey was anchored around the date when participants reported receiving Operation Bootstrap Program certificates, a date provided initially by the local PHA and then confirmed by the respondent. This date was used to define the pre- and post-program periods for data collection purposes and, in most cases, for the analysis. However, in six of the sites included in the survey participants received substantial services prior to the receipt of the certificate. Effective start dates of the Operation Bootstrap Program in these sites were thus two or three months prior to the date of certificate receipt. We adjusted recorded program start dates in the analysis accordingly.

However, because the survey asked participants to provide information dating back to six months prior to **certificate receipt**, we have only three or four months of pre-program data for participants in those sites. To include them in our pre/post analysis, we assume that any such participants who had not enrolled in education or training (or worked, or looked for work) during the four months immediately prior to the Operation Bootstrap Program enrollment had not participated in those activities during the two preceding months either.

To test whether this was a reasonable assumption, we examined the pool of participants in the remaining 18 sites who reported no service activity in the four months prior to enrollment and calculated the share who did in fact participate during the two preceding months. The percentages were on the order of one to eight percent. We then multiplied this percentage by the number of participants from the six sites that provided services prior to certificate issuance who had no activity reported during the pre-program period to confirm that our totals for pre-program participation in those sites were off by no more than a single percentage point. Because one would expect the degree of progress made toward self-sufficiency to be quite different for someone who had been enrolled in the program for only six months, as compared with three years, straight pre/post comparisons are difficult to interpret and might conceal significant differences across individuals at different stages of the program. As a result, a series of sub-samples were created for the pre/post comparisons: those with follow-up data for at least 6 months following program entry; those with at least 12 months of data; those with at least 18 months; those with at least 24 months; and those with at least 30 months.¹² For the pre/post comparisons, we looked at each cohort separately and compared outcomes during the six months immediately preceding program entry with the final six-month period covered by the survey for all participants within the cohort.¹³

¹²We exclude the sub-sample composed of participants with at least 36 months of follow-up data because of the insufficient sample sizes from which to draw valid inferences.

¹³Note that the sub-samples are not true cohorts, since they are not composed of

For instance, for those with at least 18 months of data, we compared their experience during the pre-program six months with that during months 13 through 18.

Exclusions from the Analysis Sample

Not all of the 798 Operation Bootstrap Program participants interviewed can be included in the analysis. Twenty-five said they received their certificates prior to November 1989, the start of the program. Clearly, either these participants were not Operation Bootstrap Program participants (i.e., they received a regular Section 8 certificate), or their interviews are anchored around an incorrect certificate issuance date. We exclude all such cases from the analysis.

We also exclude another 50 participants from Schenectady whose certificate issuance dates are invalid. Schenectady was the single Operation Bootstrap program which opted to select many of its program participants from among current Section 8 recipients. As a result, in some cases, the survey interviews are anchored to an inappropriate date -- the date of certificate issuance, rather than the date of entry into the Operation Bootstrap Program. In these and other instances with invalid certificate issuance dates, we omit respondents whose dates of issuance -- and, hence, reference dates in the interviews -- are more than three months before or after the date of official program entry.

For the most part, we are able to include the remaining 723 survey respondents in the analysis. We do, however, restrict the sample to the 645 respondents who had entered the Operation Bootstrap Program at least one full year prior to follow-up for certain analyses. In particular, we judged that at least a year of follow-up was essential to obtain meaningful pre/post comparisons of self-esteem and the receipt of child care and transportation assistance. All other pre/post analyses, plus our examination of baseline characteristics and the receipt of employment and training services, rely on the full sample of 723 respondents.

Statistical Tests

As stated in Chapter 1, the intent of this study is not to evaluate the impact of the Operation Bootstrap Program on participating families, but to gauge the progress of those families toward economic independence following entry into the program. Thus, we would like to know whether the outcomes that occur following program entry differ participants who entered the demonstration at discrete times. Rather, the sub-samples are composed of progressively smaller groups of participants that are defined by the availability of follow-up data. Participants can belong to more than one "cohort." Thus, a participant with 24 months of follow-up data would be included in the 24-month "cohort" as well as the 18, 12, and 6 month cohorts, but would be excluded from the 30 and 36 month cohorts.

from those observed just prior to entry. In addition, we would like to know whether either set of outcomes--or their movement between periods--differs across the three basic program models discussed earlier. To determine whether apparent differences in these factors reflect real differences in the population or just chance variations in our data, we employ tests of statistical significance based on the chi-square statistic.

The chi-square statistic provides a test for true differences in underlying outcomes between two or more data samples. In all analyses comparing pre- and post-Operation Bootstrap Program outcomes or the distribution of outcomes across models, we conduct chi-square tests for true differences. Differences that are statistically significant at the 90-percent confidence level (the .10 significance level) are indicated in the exhibits and discussed in the text. When three-way comparisons of the program models reveal significant variations, we attempt to "zero in" on the one or two unusual models through pairwise tests of one model against the other two (e.g., the PHA-Centered Model versus the combined Contract and Pass-Through Models).

CHAPTER THREE

BASELINE CHARACTERISTICS OF OPERATION BOOTSTRAP Program PARTICIPANTS

This chapter presents a description of the baseline characteristics of the Operation Bootstrap Program participants in 24 sites. The baseline period covers the six months prior to program enrollment, generally between the fall of 1990 and the spring of 1991. The characteristics fall into six categories:

- selected demographic characteristics;
- selected household characteristics;
- housing situation;
- education and training;
- employment histories; and,
- alternative income sources.

Each category is treated in a separate section and exhibit in the chapter. The exhibits present these characteristics for the individual models of coordination as well as for the Operation Bootstrap Program population as a whole. Variation across individual sites is discussed in the text.

3.1 Selected Demographic Characteristics

Exhibit 3.1 presents selected demographic characteristics for the Operation Bootstrap Program participants as a whole and for the three different program models. As shown, the survey respondents are fairly diverse with respect to ethnicity and marital status. They are somewhat less diverse in terms of age and less still in terms of gender and nationality:

- **91 percent of the sample were women.** As for individual sites, the share of women ranged from 64 percent in Redding, California, to 100 percent in six other sites. The sample has a higher concentration of women household heads than is true nationally, where about 74 percent of all Section 8 certificate or voucher households are headed by a female.¹⁴

¹⁴See Casey, Connie H., Characteristics of HUD-Assisted Renters and Their Units in 1989, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy

- **The majority of the respondents (53 percent) were between the ages of 26 and 35.** A third were older, mostly between the ages of 36 and 45, and one-fifth were younger--a substantially younger group than the non-elderly Section 8 recipients in general, roughly 45 percent of whom are age 35 or older.¹⁵ There are no dramatic differences across the models of coordination, though the PHA-Centered Model participants were somewhat older and the Contract Model participants somewhat younger.¹⁶ Ages at individual sites vary considerably, however. In Lincoln, Nebraska, a majority of respondents were 25 or younger, while at several sites, none of the survey respondents was this young.
- **Just over half of the sample were white, a third were non-Hispanic black, and roughly 12 percent were other minority**--figures that somewhat under-represent minorities in relation to the non-elderly Section 8 program overall.¹⁷ These percentages varied considerably and significantly across program models, although no one model stood out from the other two based on tests of statistical significance. Most striking in the numbers themselves is the contrast in the percentage of minority participants between the PHA-Centered Model (58 percent non-white minorities) and the Contract Model (30 percent). At individual sites, the share of minority respondents ranged from 0 to 100 percent. This level of variation appears to be the rule among Section 8 programs generally, where the racial composition of recipients reflects the characteristics of particular communities.¹⁸ Among models, however, those most heavily concentrated in urban areas do not show greater minority representation, as might have been expected. (See Appendix B.)
- **Ninety-four percent of the survey respondents were born in the United States,** while 95 percent identified English as their native

Development and Research, March 1992. The data consist of a nationally representative sample of some 17,000 HUD-assisted rental units matched to the 1989 American Housing Survey. The number of female householders increases to only 75 percent when examining the non-elderly population, the group most similar to Operation Bootstrap program participants.

¹⁵Casey, 1992. Also see Leger, Mireille L., and Stephen D. Kennedy, Final Comprehensive Report of the Freestanding Housing Voucher Demonstration, Volume 1, Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates Inc., May 1990 (Table 9.1), who present data on a stratified probability sample of all larger, urban PHAs in the nation (plus two statewide PHAs) for the period 1986-1988. There, nearly half of the respondents are 35 or older. Leger and Kennedy do not report a breakdown of their sample by gender, although ancillary figures imply that it is predominantly female.

¹⁶As shown in the exhibit, the age distribution differs significantly among models.

¹⁷Casey, 1992, indicates that about 60 percent of non-elderly Section 8 units have a minority householder.

¹⁸See Meryl Finkel and Stephen D. Kennedy, "Racial/Ethnic Differences in Utilization of Section 8 Existing Rental Vouchers and Certificates." Housing Policy Debate, Volume 3, Issue 2, 1992. This paper uses the same probability sample of PHAs as Leger and Kennedy (see above).

language. The share of respondents born outside of the United States was less than 12 percent in all sites but two -- San Diego, California and Fairfax County, Virginia, where the proportions were 21 and 29 percent respectively.

- As of six months prior to the receipt of an Operation Bootstrap Program certificate, **41 percent of the sample had never been married, 39 percent were separated or divorced, 18 percent were married, and 2 percent were widowed.** There was only slight (but statistically significant) variation in marital status across the models of coordination. The site with the highest share of married participants was Redding, California, the same site that had the largest share of men. The overall Operation Bootstrap figures comport well with national estimates, which show that 16 percent of the non-elderly Section 8 population is married.

3.2 Selected Household Characteristics

Exhibit 3.2 shows the distribution of household size, number of children, and number of children younger than six for the sample as a whole and for the three program models.

- **Most of the participants (82 percent) lived in households of between two and four people.** The mean household size was 3.3 people (most typically a single mother and two children), considerably larger than for the Section 8 program in general.¹⁹ Differences were not notable across the models of coordination. For individual sites, the means ranged from 2.6 to 3.8 people per household.
- **94 percent of the respondents had at least one child in their household under the age of 18,** well above the share (77 percent) reported on a representative sample of non-elderly Section 8 households.²⁰ Just over one-third of the respondent sample had exactly one child, just over one-third had two, while 22 percent had more than two. On average, the participants had 1.8 minor children. There was little variation evident across different program models. As for individual sites, the mean ranged from a low of 1.4 in Clearwater, Florida to a high of 2.3 in San Diego, California.
- **38 percent of the survey respondents had no children in their household under age six,** 40 percent had one, and 23 percent had two or more. The mean for all respondents was 0.9, while the means ranged from 0.4 to 1.1 for individual sites. Little variation was evident across the different models.

¹⁹Casey, 1992, reports an average household size of 2.3, while Leger and Kennedy, 1990 (Table 9.1) find an average household size of 2.5. Data restricted to non-elderly Section 8 households are not available.

²⁰Casey, 1992. Casey also reports that 61 percent of all Section 8 households have at least one child under 18.

3.3 Housing Characteristics

Exhibit 3.3 presents data on the characteristics of the housing of survey respondents at the time they received their Section 8 certificates and vouchers. It shows the housing arrangements of respondents, the size and quality of their housing, and their perception of the condition of their neighborhood.

- **The overwhelming majority of Operation Bootstrap Program households (84 percent) were sole tenants in private housing at the time of certificate receipt.** Nine percent were renting public housing as sole tenants, 4 percent were sharing an apartment/house, and the remaining 3 percent were living in other situations. These figures differ strikingly from national projections, which show 37 percent of all Section 8 recipients in shared units prior to receipt of a certificate.²¹ There are no significant differences in baseline housing status among the three program models.
- **Forty-four percent of the Operation Bootstrap Program households reported living in units with fewer than one person per bedroom at the time of certificate receipt, and another 50 percent reported between 1 and 2 persons per bedrooms.** Hence, only 6 percent of the respondents lived in housing with more than 2 persons per bedroom on average. No differences between models emerge as significant.
- **26 percent of respondents rated the physical condition of their baseline housing as excellent, 44 percent as good, 20 percent as fair and 10 percent as poor.** There are no significant differences between models. Participants rated their baseline housing higher than Section 8 recipients generally, only 54 percent of whom rate their unit as excellent or good.²²
- **18 percent rated their baseline neighborhood as excellent, 45 percent as good, 25 percent as fair, and 11 percent as poor.** A sample of the national Section 8 population shows that 52 percent rate their neighborhood as fair or poor, indicating that recipients hold a lower opinion of their neighborhoods than did Operation Bootstrap Program participants.²³ Interestingly, Pass-Through Model participants -- who came to the Operation Bootstrap Program not as Section 8 applicants per se but as participants in other employment and training programs -- rated their original neighborhoods significantly lower than did participants in the other two models.

3.4 Education and Training at Baseline

²¹Leger and Kennedy, 1990 (Table 3.2).

²²Finkel and Kennedy, 1992 (Table 5). The respondents were asked to rate their housing units on the same four-point scale as that used in this report.

²³Finkel and Kennedy, 1992 (Table 5).

Exhibit 3.4 shows the share of respondents with high school diplomas or GEDs at the time of entry into the Operation Bootstrap Program, and the share enrolled in various kinds of training/education programs over the prior six months. (Again, percentages are displayed for individual models of coordination as well as for the program as a whole.)

- **At the time of entry into the Operation Bootstrap Program, 84 percent of respondents had high school diplomas or GEDs.** The educational attainment of program participants exceeds that of Section 8 recipients nationally: at the time of entry, 78 percent of Operation Bootstrap Program participants versus only 63 percent of non-elderly Section 8 recipients had completed 12 or more grades of schooling.²⁴ For reasons discussed below, the three models differed significantly on the percentage of participants possessing high school diplomas or GEDs, though no one stood out from the other two. It is worth noting, however, that 91 percent of the Contract Model participants had high school diplomas or GEDs largely as a result of a pair of sites which virtually required them.
- **At the time of entry into the program, 48 percent of all respondents were enrolled in some form of education or job training.** The percentage again varied significantly across the program models. For respondents in the PHA-Centered programs, the share in education or training was only 40 percent, in contrast to higher percentages (51 and 58, respectively) for the other two models.
- **19 percent of all respondents were enrolled in two-year college programs during the six months prior to the Operation Bootstrap Program.** Another 15 percent were in vocational training, 6 percent in four-year college or graduate programs, 4 percent in basic education, and 3 percent in high school or GED programs. We did not look for variations across models at this level of detail.

To some extent, these disparities in education among models may be explained by the differing selection procedures adopted by sites. Certainly, one would expect a higher share of participants in Pass-Through Model programs to be enrolled in education and training at entry, since participants in these programs are enrolled in some type of self-sufficiency program at baseline.²⁵ The significant difference between

²⁴Casey, 1992. The respondents actually indicated the number of years of schooling completed, which may differ slightly from the highest grade completed, depending on how the questions are interpreted. Highest grade completed is not shown separately from possession of a GED the exhibits in this report.

²⁵The share of Pass-Through participants enrolled in education or training at baseline was only 58 percent, because participants in self-sufficiency programs may be looking

the shares enrolled in the PHA-Centered Model and the Contract Model is somewhat more puzzling. But a closer examination of the individual sites reveals that the difference is fully explained by the presence of a pair of Contract Model programs which only select participants who are already enrolled in education and training. After subtracting these two sites (Clearwater, Florida, and Panhandle, Texas), the share enrolled in education or training at baseline in the remaining Contract Model programs falls to 40 percent.

A similar explanation may be given for at least some of the disparity in high school diplomas among models. While Clearwater and Panhandle did not require high school diplomas, they tended to select participants from vocational schools and community colleges whose students had virtually all either completed high school or attained a GED. The share of participants with diplomas in the balance of the Contract Model sites was a more modest 88 percent. Still, this proportion remains significantly higher than the 79 percent calculated for the PHA-Centered Model. The difference might be that a greater share of the Contract Model programs adopted more complex selection procedures than did the PHA-Centered programs. The outside contractors, for instance, more frequently demanded that participants complete multi-week personal development workshops. It seems plausible that high school graduates, more experienced with school, more commonly completed these workshops successfully. One-third of the Round Two sites sponsored these sorts of selection workshops, as compared with only 14 percent of Round One sites.

3.5 Work Histories

Exhibit 3.5 summarizes the employment status of Operation Bootstrap Program participants during the six months prior to entering the program, along with the ranges of hourly wages earned in the last job held during that period. Key findings include:

- **The majority of respondents (59 percent) were not employed at any time during the six months preceding entry into the Operation Bootstrap Program.** Twenty-two percent held one or more part-time jobs (but no full-time job) during that period, while 19 percent held at least one full-time job. There are no significant differences in these patterns among models.
- **Seventy-four percent of the respondents who worked for pay during the six months prior to entering the program earned above the minimum wage of \$4.25 on their most recent job.** The majority of these earned between \$4.26 and \$8.00 per hour. However, nearly a fifth of those who worked during this period were paid at rates below minimum wage, presumably those with part-time or casual employment not covered by minimum wage legislation (e.g., baby sitting). No major

for work or otherwise occupied rather than enrolled in training or education.

differences in wage rates exist between the three models of coordination.

- **The mean wage for respondents who worked during the pre-program period was \$5.56.** Again, there are no significant differences across the program models in this regard.

3.6 Sources of Income Support

Exhibit 3.6 presents the share of respondents receiving selected forms of income support at the time of entry into the Operation Bootstrap Program. Specifically, the exhibit shows the share who received Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), food stamps, unemployment insurance, and/or child support payments during the six month period immediately preceding their entry into the program.

- **Forty-nine percent of all households received AFDC at some point during the six months prior to enrolling in the Operation Bootstrap Program.** The share varied significantly across the models of coordination. Sixty-three percent of those in the Pass-Through Model programs received AFDC in contrast to only 43 and 47 percent for the PHA-Centered and Contract Models respectively. Much of the discrepancy is explained by the fact that three of the eight Pass-Through Model programs were operated through local JOBS programs, where all participants were receiving AFDC. The share receiving AFDC was close to 100 percent in these sites. In contrast, the proportion was less than 25 percent at four sites and as low as 6 percent at one site (Fairfax County, Virginia). Without these three JOBS sites, the share of Pass-Through Model respondents receiving AFDC during the pre-program interval falls to only 53 percent.
- **55 percent of all respondents received food stamps during the six months prior to participating in the Operation Bootstrap Program.** The variation across the program models was not statistically significant in this case. Nationally, 62 percent of non-elderly Section 8 households receive food stamps.²⁶

²⁶Casey, 1992.

- **Only 3 percent of all respondents received unemployment insurance during the pre-program period.** Receipt rates did not vary significantly by model.
- **19 percent of all respondents received child support payments during the pre-program period.** This figure corresponds roughly to national projections of non-elderly Section 8 recipients, of whom 16 percent receive alimony or child support payments.²⁷ **The share differed significantly among models and was highest for those in the Contract Model sites (25 percent).**

This chapter has described the characteristics of the Operation Bootstrap Program participants during the six months preceding enrollment. The participants in each of the three models of coordination were homogeneous in several categories, including gender, age, and employment histories, but were diverse in a number of others. Differences across program models emerge with regard to ethnicity, housing self-rating, education and training background, and sources of income support. The majority of these differences can be attributed to differences in participant selection procedures among sites.

In several respects, Operation Bootstrap Program participants differed from non-elderly Section 8 recipients nationally. Program participants were more often female, were younger, possessed more education, had larger households, and were more likely to live as sole tenants in private housing than the average non-elderly Section 8 household.

The next chapter examines the nature of the services utilized by program participants in their movements toward economic self-sufficiency.

²⁷Casey, 1992.

CHAPTER FOUR

RECEIPT OF SELF-SUFFICIENCY SERVICES

This chapter discusses the services received by Operation Bootstrap Program participants while they were enrolled in the program. The key services include:

- education and training;
- job search assistance;
- Section 8 housing certificates;
- child care assistance; and,
- transportation assistance.

Since we rely on self-reported survey information, we could not determine whether these services (other than the Section 8 certificates) were provided through the Operation Bootstrap Program or whether they were offered through another source.²⁸ Nor can we tell whether participants would have received them in the absence of the program. The survey did ask participants, however, to describe the services they received during the six months prior to the start of the program. By comparing these services to those following entry into the Operation Bootstrap Program, we obtain some indication of the extent to which the program increased overall service receipt.

4.1 Education and Training

One of the central goals of the Operation Bootstrap Program is to enhance the skills of participants in order to enable them to perform more successfully in the job market. This section describes the nature of participants' education and training activities during the program.

4.1.1 Receipt of Education and Training During the Program

Exhibit 4.1 displays the share of participants who enrolled in different kinds of education and training classes during the six months prior to, and in the time since

²⁸ Survey respondents typically do not know or can not recall which programs provided which services. This is especially problematic when the program of interest, here the Operation Bootstrap Demonstration, arranged the services, but did not typically provide them.

enrolling in the Operation Bootstrap Program. It also shows the share of respondents who reported completing each of these different kinds of training.

As shown, over three-quarters of all survey respondents participated in some type of education or training program after enrolling in the Operation Bootstrap Program, and just over one-third reported completing one or more programs. As for the kinds of training, two-year college programs were the most popular; 37 percent of all respondents attended such programs. The next two most common were vocational schools and four-year colleges/advanced programs, with 23 and 11 percent of respondents attending respectively. The increase in enrollment over the pre-program period is statistically significant for all education and training programs except for high school and advanced program enrollment. The pattern was somewhat different for completions. Sixteen percent of all respondents **completed** vocational schools or training programs since enrolling in the Operation Bootstrap Program; in contrast, only 10 percent **completed** two-year college programs, despite the fact that many more participants enrolled in them. This discrepancy may be explained by the typically shorter duration of vocational programs and/or the limited time span of our follow-up data.

Perhaps not surprisingly, participants who were enrolled in education or training at some point during the pre-program period (not shown separately in the exhibit) were more likely to participate in such programs once the program began. Of those enrolled in education or training during the six months prior to the Operation Bootstrap Program, 90 percent attended classes at some point after. The post-program participation rate for those who did not attend school or training during the pre-program period was only 63 percent.

4.1.2 Comparison of Pre- and Post-Program Participation Rates

Although pre- and post-program participation rates are presented in Exhibit 4.1, given the different duration of the time periods (six months and an average of two years), these proportions should not be directly compared. Exhibit 4.2 offers a more meaningful comparison: participation rates for the six months immediately prior to the Operation Bootstrap Program and equivalent six-month periods thereafter. Separate participation rates are displayed for five sub-samples: those with at least 6 months of follow-up data; those with at least 12 months; those with at least 18 months; those with at least 24 months; and those with at least 30 months. Sample sizes for each group, shown in the first row for the exhibit, grow smaller as the analysis extends to longer follow-up periods. Separate panels provide the same information broken down by model of coordination.

The education and training participation rates shown in the second row of the

exhibit fall over time following an increase in the first six months after program enrollment. However, much of this decline is explained by lower *pre*-program enrollment rates for each successive cohort analyzed. A smaller share of those who could be followed two or more years after program entry were enrolled in education or training in the pre-program interval than those who could only be followed for a year or so.²⁹ The third row of the exhibit adjusts for this shift in sample composition by showing the **change** in enrollment rates from baseline for each cohort, using that cohort's own baseline rate as a benchmark. Specifically, we obtained these measures by subtracting from the share of participants enrolled in education or training during a particular post-program period the pre-program participation rate of that very same set of individuals. In this way, measures of change from baseline are made comparable across all post-program periods, regardless of the particular samples involved.

As can be seen from the adjusted measures, post-program participation rates are higher than pre-program rates in all periods, by a fairly steady 7 to 14 percentage points. These post-demonstration figures represent statistically significant increases over the pre-program rate for each six-month follow-up period. Thus, starting from baseline enrollment rates of approximately 50 percent, enrollment rose to approximately 60 percent per semester over the five semesters (30 months) covered by the follow-up data.

The rest of Exhibit 4.2 shows that this pattern varied considerably across program models. In fact, the change in enrollment from the baseline is statistically different among the three models for all follow-up periods except for the longest (25-30 months). The general increase in participation following entry into the Operation Bootstrap Program occurred only for PHA-Centered Model and Contract Model participants. Education and training enrollment rates actually declined following program entry in the Pass-Through Model sites, although these changes were largely

²⁹ The reason for this is largely that the Pass-Through Model programs and the pair of Contract Model programs which selected only participants already enrolled in education and training started later than other sites. As a result, we do not have data for many of the participants from these programs in the intervals further from demonstration entry, such as Months 13-18, 19-24, and 25-30. More than half of the respondents from the PHA-Centered Model and the Contract Model programs enrolled in the Operation Bootstrap Demonstration years prior to their interview; in contrast, only one-third of those in the Pass Through Model programs had started by this point. The pair of Contract Model programs that selected only candidates already enrolled in school (Clearwater and Panhandle) also started significantly later than their Contract Model counterparts. (The majority of respondents from Clearwater and Panhandle enrolled in the Operation Bootstrap Demonstration within 18 months of their interview; only 13 percent of the remaining Contract Model respondents enrolled during this time period.)

insignificant. Given the design of the Pass-Through Model programs, this lack of increase is expected. Recall that the objective of the Pass-Through Model programs was not to induce additional enrollments in education or training, since many Pass-Through Model participants -- drawn from the roles of existing self-sufficiency programs -- already were enrolled in or had completed training courses. Instead, the objective was to make the path toward self-sufficiency easier for those who had already begun it. Thus, while they did not increase enrollment rates over time, it is possible that certain Pass-Through Model programs were successful at enabling some participants to remain in school who would have otherwise dropped out. We have no way of testing this hypothesis with available data, however, since we lack knowledge of what participants would have done in the absence of the program.

The difference between the PHA-Centered Model and the Contract Model is more unexpected. In four of five follow-up periods, enrollment levels in Contract Model sites are statistically different from the rest of the sites; in two of five periods enrollment levels in the PHA-Centered Model sites are statistically different from the other sites. As suggested in Chapter Three, the difference between pre-program enrollment rates in these two models is explained by the pair of Contract Model programs (Clearwater and Panhandle) which required applicants to be enrolled in educational programs at entry.³⁰ But this does not explain the greater **increase** in participation following the Operation Bootstrap Program entry seen in the Contract Model sites. Indeed, after removing these two sites from the analysis (not shown), post-program participation gains for the Contract Model grow even larger, averaging 19 percentage points over the five follow-up semesters. Hence, it appears that the contracting organizations in the Contract Model programs were able to achieve a greater increase in school/training participation than their PHA counterparts in the PHA-Centered sites. The reasons for this success may concern differences in service delivery approach, client characteristics, and/or education and training environments across the two sets of sites.

4.1.3 Characteristics of the Education and Training Received

Exhibit 4.3 offers additional information about the education and training spells which occurred following entry into the Operation Bootstrap Program. The first few columns display the methods by which respondents were referred to education or training. Surprisingly, the majority of enrollees (59 percent) said that they came to the

³⁰ After subtracting respondents from Clearwater and Panhandle (some two-fifths of the entire Contract Model sample), the share of remaining Contract Model respondents who were enrolled in education or training during the pre-demonstration six months falls to just 40 percent.

training or education on their own, not through a referral from an agency. They said that welfare departments, JTPA contractors, and other agencies referred them 21 percent of the time, while their Operation Bootstrap Program programs referred them only 20 percent of the time. This does not, of course, mean that 80 percent of enrollees would have attended classes even without the aid of the program. First, it is difficult to assign ultimate credit for referral. In some cases, an Operation Bootstrap Program coordinator at the housing agency might have referred a given participant to a local JTPA program which then referred her to training. Moreover, even if going to a certain training program was a participant's own idea, he or she might not have been able to do so successfully without the housing, support, and other resources provided by the program.

The exhibit also shows that 41 percent of the education and training spells started during the Operation Bootstrap Program were completed by the end of the follow-up period. Completion rates varied considerably by type of training. For instance, 87 percent of all job-related training spells were completed as compared to just 14 percent of four-year college programs -- not surprising given the significant difference in duration, and, in some cases, intensity between these types of programs and the limited duration of follow-up available.

As an attempt to estimate the enrollment in education and/or training induced by the Operation Bootstrap Program, the survey asked participants whether the given training was required in order to receive a program certificate, and of those who felt it was required, how many enrolled solely because of the requirement. As shown, fewer than one-fourth of all spells were perceived by respondents as mandatory for the Operation Bootstrap Program, and only 3 percent of all spells were reported as undertaken solely as a result of a Section 8 requirement. Once again, this does not mean that 97 percent of these spells would have been started in the absence of the program. It does suggest, however, that the program's mandatory training/education requirements did not produce much additional education, at least in the ex-post view of the participants.

Finally, the exhibit also shows that 60 percent of enrollees were **very** satisfied with their education or training. Respondents were most satisfied with advanced degree programs and job-related training (80 and 73 percent respectively said they were very satisfied) and least satisfied with ESL and high school (only 48 percent of enrollees in ESL/adult education and 33 percent of high school enrollees described themselves as very satisfied). Of those who later looked for work, 46 percent found their education or training very helpful in their job search. Participants again found job-related training and advanced degree programs most helpful according to this measure. GED programs were viewed as the least helpful in finding jobs.

4.1.4 Educational Credentials Earned Following Program Entry

The final exhibit related to education and training (Exhibit 4.4) shows the number and percentage of respondents who received degrees or educational credentials since entering the Operation Bootstrap Program. As shown, 151 participants (21 percent) reported receiving degrees following program entry.³¹ More than half of these participants -- and 11 percent of all participants -- received degrees or certificates from vocational schools. Five percent of all participants received high school diplomas or GEDs, 4 percent received two-year college degrees, and 1 percent obtained four-year college degrees. The first of these figures represents about a third of the individuals who lacked a high school diploma or equivalent at baseline (16 percent of all participants).

All of these percentages are somewhat lower than those in Exhibit 4.1 which shows education or training program completions. The discrepancy is probably explained by the fact that many of the programs attended did not offer official certificates or degrees. Thus, many participants may have completed education or training programs without receiving certificates or degrees. In the case of high school diplomas or GEDs, the share receiving degrees was actually higher than the share completing high school or a GED program. This may be the result of some respondents studying for and passing GED exams during the follow-up period without attending any formal programs.

4.2 Job Search Assistance

Exhibit 4.5 provides information about the uses of various forms of job search assistance by Operation Bootstrap Program participants in the six months prior to program entry and over the subsequent 6 to 42 months (depending on the length of follow-up).

Pre-Program Activities. No more than 15 percent of the respondents used any single resource during the six-month period prior to the Operation Bootstrap Program. Several types of job search resources were used by at least 1 in 10 participants, however: answering TV and radio advertisements, directly contacting employers, talking with relatives and friends, checking job listings or referrals, and more formalized job search assistance. It should also be noted that many participants made use of

³¹ In fact, 193 participants reported receiving degrees since enrolling in the Operation Bootstrap Demonstration, but 24 of them failed to report that they attended the relevant program type over that period, and another 18 reported that they were still attending the relevant program at the time of their interview. As a result of these apparent contradictions, we decided to subtract these 42 individuals from the count of participants receiving degrees, which lowered the total to 151 participants.

more than one of these resources (not shown). Thus, a fair amount of employment-seeking behavior was already apparent among Operation Bootstrap Program participants prior to program entry.

Post-Program Activities. That activity may or may not have increased substantially following program entry.³² In the much longer period examined after entry into the Operation Bootstrap Program, roughly twice as many participants used each of the job search resources as in the prior six months. The most prevalent method of job search during this interval was direct employer contact, with 34 percent using this method at some point during the follow-up period. Talking with friends and relatives and answering TV or radio advertisements were also frequently employed methods, used by 32 and 31 percent of participants, respectively. Talking with unions and taking a civil service test or filling out a federal job application were the least frequently used resources, both in the six months before entry into the Operation Bootstrap Program and following entry. However, the share of participants using each resource since entry into the program represents a statistically significant increase over the pre-program period.

Additional information regarding employment assistance received by participants during the Operation Bootstrap Program is presented in Exhibit 4.6. Here we see not only the sources of several of the more structured job search resources discussed earlier (job counseling, job search assistance, and job referrals/listing), but also the recipients' sense of their relationship to Section 8 housing and their value.

Sources of Assistance. As can be seen from the first column of the exhibit, the most common source of structured employment assistance was an unemployment office or service, used by 21 percent of respondents. Private employment agencies, school placement offices, and JTPA/JOBS/welfare agencies were also important sources of employment assistance in the post-program period, each accessed by 12 to 15 percent of all Operation Bootstrap Program participants.

Types of Assistance. The majority of participants received several forms of assistance from each of these sources. (See the second, third and fourth columns.) Of those participants who used the most common source of assistance -- an unemployment office or service -- 66 percent obtained job referrals or job listings, 48 percent received some form of job counseling, and 38 percent received job search assistance. For most sources of help, the three types of assistance ranked in this order of frequency. And regardless of source, receipt of two or more of these types of assistance from a single source was fairly common.

³²Overall job search activity is examined by time period in Chapter 5. The analysis indicates that job search did increase substantially in the later months following demonstration entry.

Perceived Role of the Operation Bootstrap Program in Seeking Services.

As shown in columns 5 and 6, very few of the participants who used these employment resources perceived them as requirements for receiving Section 8 assistance, and even fewer said they used the service solely because it was a requirement. For example, only 9 percent of those who obtained assistance from an unemployment office or service thought that they were required to do so, and only 1 percent went to the unemployment office or service solely because of a perceived program requirement. Similarly low rates apply to the other sources in the exhibit with the exception of JTPA, JOBS, and other types of training programs, where 14 to 22 percent of those who utilized these services said they were required by the Operation Bootstrap Program. Even so, only 1 to 3 percent of that group used the services **solely** because of the program.

These figures do not necessarily imply that the Operation Bootstrap Program had little influence on the receipt of employment assistance in the post-program period. For example, the program may have induced higher levels of **voluntary** participation in these types of activities or encouraged more serious employment efforts even among those who believed they would have utilized some level of services in any case. Without information on what the Operation Bootstrap Program participants would have done absent the program (such as would be provided by a randomly assigned control group), we cannot say how much of the employment-seeking activity described here occurred as a direct result of the program.

Satisfaction with Services. Satisfaction rates with these various types of assistance vary, as shown in the final column of the exhibit. While the unemployment office or service was the single most commonly used source, it had the lowest incidence of very satisfied users (10 percent). Of the commonly used assistance sources, JTPA/JOBS/welfare agencies and school placement offices received the highest overall ratings, with 28 percent of those who used each source reporting that they were very satisfied with the service. These self-reported measures should be interpreted with caution, however, since there is no single criteria or set of criteria on which satisfaction is likely to be based. For example, satisfaction may be a function of eventual labor market success, which will be influenced to a large degree by factors beyond the control of service providers (e.g., local labor market conditions). Thus, the measures in Exhibit 4.6 should not necessarily be interpreted as evidence that some employment assistance sources were considered superior to others on the basis of service ratings alone.

4.3 Housing and Neighborhood Conditions

Adequate housing may facilitate achieving self-sufficiency through steady

employment. In this section, we describe the housing conditions of the Operation Bootstrap Program participants and how they changed following enrollment into the program. We also consider living arrangements, housing and neighborhood characteristics, and reasons for moving.

4.3.1 Housing Status

Exhibit 4.7 displays the distribution of Operation Bootstrap Program participants by type of housing, both at the start of the program (the date the Section 8 certificate was issued) and at the interview date (6 to 36 months later). At the point of issuance, the vast majority of participants (84 percent) occupied private apartments as sole tenants. The next most common housing arrangement was sole tenancy of a public housing unit (9 percent).³³ Very few Operation Bootstrap Program households lived in shared units (4 percent), and fewer still were homeless (1 percent).

These characteristics changed little between the pre- and post-program periods. As shown in the second and third columns of the exhibit, sole tenancy of private apartments rose 4 percentage points by the date of interview, to 88 percent, while residence in public housing units and shared living arrangements fell 2 percentage points each.³⁴ These modest changes mask larger movements among the 42 percent of respondents who moved following receipt of their Section 8 certificates. Among participants who moved (see the final column of the exhibit), the share occupying private apartments by the time of interview had risen by 10 percentage points from pre-program levels. Most came from public housing units, where tenancy dropped by 6 percentage points, though an important number had previously shared living quarters with other households (3 percentage points). These changes in housing mix are both substantively and statistically significant. Presumably, provision of Section 8 rental assistance contributed to this shift from other forms of housing toward sole tenancy of private apartments.

³³While residence in public housing disqualifies a family from using a Section 8 certificate for rent support, it does not preclude **receiving** a certificate to be used later if the family moves to a qualifying private unit.

³⁴As noted earlier, families are not allowed to use Section 8 assistance while living in public housing. One possible explanation for the finding that 7 percent of Operation Bootstrap families lived in public housing at follow-up is that those families had surrendered their Section 8 certificates. Approximately 10 percent of survey respondents reported surrender of certificates by the time of the interview. However, this 10 percent does not overlap the 7 percent who reported living in public housing at follow-up. Thus, it is possible that the latter group was utilizing both types of housing assistance at once, in violation of program rules. Alternatively, there may be errors in the housing status measure used here, as have been the case in other self-reported measures of this sort (e.g., in the American Housing Survey).

4.3.2 Characteristics of Residence and Neighborhood

Exhibit 4.8 presents a pre/post comparison of housing and neighborhood quality as self-reported by participants on the follow-up survey. Because they reflect participant perceptions rather than independent, objective measures of housing and neighborhood quality, the numbers in this table must be interpreted with caution. Subjective measures of perceived quality at baseline may be especially subject to recall error or skewing as respondents attempt to reconstruct how they **felt** (rather than simply what they **did**) one to three years previously. There may be a tendency for some respondents to view the past more favorably than they did at the time, while others may portray it less favorably due to an inclination to see things as improving more than they truly have. The net result of these factors cannot be gauged with any certainty, implying that, while useful, pre/post comparisons of attitudes and perceptions should be viewed as only suggestive of true changes in circumstances.

The first column of Exhibit 4.8 shows that at the date of certificate receipt, 26 percent of all participants rated the physical condition of their housing units "excellent," and another 44 percent "good." These percentages climbed to 35 and 47 percent by the date of interview, a 12 percentage point increase in ratings of "good" or better compared to baseline. Over the same interval, those reporting "poor" housing conditions dropped 9 percentage points. Those who moved experienced similar and more extensive upward shifts, adding 19 percentage points to the "excellent" category since baseline and reducing "poor" ratings by 19 percentage points. Both sets of changes are statistically significant.

The same patterns are evident for all of the ratings in Exhibit 4.8. There are statistically significant increases in "excellent" and "good" ratings between certificate receipt and follow-up for all participants, and these increases are greater among those participants who moved. Particularly striking are the increases in the frequency of "excellent" and "good" ratings for neighborhood safety and the overall neighborhood quality. Overall, then, the generally favorable-to-neutral perceived living situations at baseline reported in Chapter 3 improved significantly, though not tremendously, following entry into the Operation Bootstrap Program.

4.3.3 Reasons for Moving

Forty-two percent of the participant families moved at least once between the receipt of a housing certificate and our follow-up interviews. The main and contributing reasons for moving are presented in Exhibit 4.9. The single most common reason given for moving was concern over neighborhood safety. Twenty-six percent of those who moved indicated that their primary reason for moving was to live in a safer

neighborhood, while 30 percent listed this as a secondary factor. The next most common reasons for moving were the need for larger living quarters (listed as primary or secondary by 28 percent of movers) and the desire for better quality housing (22 percent of movers). Together, the desire for safety, larger living quarters, and better quality housing accounted for 67 percent of the main reasons participants gave for moving. No other single factor provided the primary motivation for moving for more than 7 percent of the sample.

The exhibit illustrates that it was the simple desire for a higher quality living environment that motivated most participants to move, rather than changes in family composition or the search for greater employment opportunities. This last finding is not surprising given the relatively stronger emphasis the program placed on longer-term training and education over job search and placement. Further, training and job placement was undertaken locally in most instances, and did not require or encourage moving to satisfy individual service plans.

4.4 Child Care and Transportation Assistance

Exhibit 4.10 presents information about the **child care** needs of the Operation Bootstrap Program participants and the arrangements they made both during the six months prior to receiving a program certificate and during the year or more since.³⁵ As shown, 39 percent of all respondents needed to make arrangements for child care for pre-school age children as a result of working or going to school during the six months prior to the Operation Bootstrap Program. During the time after enrollment, that share rose to 50 percent. The change over the pre-program period is statistically significant, but given the difference in the length of the two time periods, it is difficult to know if this represents an important increase in the need for pre-school child care.

As for type of provider used, respondents in need of help most commonly relied on non-relatives for care, and secondly on relatives. Eighty-three percent of participants needing pre-school care received it from nonrelatives after receiving the Section 8 certificate, a statistically significant increase of 6 percentage points above the share of participants using such care six months prior to the program. As for location, the most popular choices were someone else's home and a day care center or nursery school, followed by a participant's own home. Differences in the locations of care between the pre- and post-program periods were generally positive and significant.

As for school-age children, the exhibit shows that 27 percent of respondents needed to make arrangements for care for school-age children due to work or school obligations during the six months prior to the Operation Bootstrap Program. The share

³⁵ The table is based on the experience of only those participants with at least one year of follow-up data.

rose to a statistically significant 41 percent in the twelve months or more since. Eighty-five percent of those in need of care relied on someone else besides themselves for that purpose in the pre-program period, while 91 percent did so during the post-program period. This 6 percentage point positive change is statistically significant and may reflect a greater availability of child care assistance in the latter period.

Average monthly out-of-pocket costs for child care remained fairly steady before and after the Operation Bootstrap Program. Average costs for pre-school children rose slightly from \$112 to \$122 per month, while the average for school-age children rose from \$68 to \$79. The lack of reduction does not, however, suggest that the program failed to ease child care cost burdens for participants. It is possible that respondents actually received more hours of care after the Operation Bootstrap Program, hours that enabled them to either work longer hours or spend more time in school.

The figures in Exhibit 4.11 suggest that respondents did indeed receive additional child care help after enrolling in the program. Of those that needed child care, 57 percent received assistance with child care (including financial help in virtually all cases) since enrolling in the Operation Bootstrap Program, as compared to 36 percent during the six months immediately before. The difference is substantively and statistically significant. Most participants were quite happy with the assistance -- 87 percent described it as **very** helpful.

Assistance with **transportation** was elevated somewhat less than help with child care, although the change is statistically significant. During the six months prior to the program, 24 percent of all participants said they received some help with transportation; during the time since, 36 percent received it. Eighty-two percent reported that the assistance they received following program entry was **very** helpful.

Exhibit 4.12 shows that the share of respondents receiving support services varied significantly across the models of coordination. As was the case in education and training, a significantly larger share of respondents from Pass-Through Model programs received both child care and transportation assistance during the six months prior to receiving an Operation Bootstrap Program certificate. And again mirroring the case of education and training, the share of Pass-Through Model respondents receiving these services after receiving a certificate did not increase as much as it did for respondents from the PHA-Centered Model and the Contract Model programs. (The post-program period was shorter on average for respondents from the Pass-Through Model programs, which might account for at least part of the discrepancy.) Respondents from the Contract Model programs experienced the largest increase in the share of households receiving child care assistance, while respondents from the PHA-Centered Model programs enjoyed the largest boost in transportation assistance.

This chapter has examined the self-sufficiency services used, and activities

engaged in, by program participants during enrollment. We find steady increases in educational and training activities over the baseline period, particularly two-year college attendance and vocational training. A larger share of Operation Bootstrap program participants reported living in a private apartment at the time of the follow-up interview, and more participants gave favorable self-assessments of housing quality at follow-up. There were also significant increases in the use of all job search techniques as well as increases in child care and transportation assistance. The increases observed in these activities can be viewed as important first steps on the path to future independence.

Chapter Five presents pre/post comparisons of central measures of self-sufficiency and compares these measures among the three models of coordination. It serves to record the progress of participants in achieving the goals of the program.

CHAPTER FIVE PROGRESS TOWARD SELF-SUFFICIENCY DURING THE OPERATION BOOTSTRAP PROGRAM

This chapter documents changes in self-sufficiency that occurred once Operation Bootstrap participants enrolled in the program. We focus on how much the experience of participants changed following program entry as compared with the six months prior to entry. Several central measures of self-sufficiency are considered, along with some of the determinants of self-sufficiency and overall quality of life:

- Educational attainment (share of participants with a high school diploma or GED);
- Self-esteem;
- Jobs held, earnings, employment benefits, and job satisfaction; and
- Dependence on public income sources, including AFDC and food stamps.

By measuring the changes in the above measures, we can gauge the progress that participants made toward economic independence in the one to three years following enrollment in the Operation Bootstrap Program. We cannot, however, evaluate the **impact** of the program on participating families. The research design does not allow us to determine the extent to which participants would have achieved self-sufficiency absent the program. Thus, we cannot know how much of the measured progress was due to the program itself and how much to other factors. Even so, documenting participant progress will provide evidence on how well the program, in conjunction with other factors, accomplished its stated objectives.

Direct pre/post comparisons of self-sufficiency measures will show the extent of improvement in participants' education, employment, and self-esteem. If these characteristics change following program entry, we would expect them to increase. Conversely, we would expect (non-housing) public assistance payments to fall.

The time table for these changes is less clear. Added educational attainment may take a long period to become manifest, and increased employment and reduced dependence on public benefits may take longer still, depending on the sequence of events in the movement toward self-sufficiency. It is unclear exactly where in this process self-esteem might also move upward, though, in general, changes in all of these factors--if they occurred at all--should be evident within the available follow-up

period of our data.

However, for most of these measures of self-sufficiency, the extent of improvement may be quite sensitive to the duration of program enrollment. The degree of progress experienced by someone who has been an Operation Bootstrap Program participant for only six months could be vastly different than that experienced by an individual who has been a participant for several years. This sensitivity may apply especially to employment outcomes and receipt of public benefits.

To take account of time variations of this sort, we break down the follow-up period into six month intervals when examining pre/post differences in employment characteristics and public income receipt. To use all of the available data--which cover different lengths of follow-up for different participants--we create five separate sub-samples for analysis: participants with follow-up data of at least 6 months duration; those with at least 12 months of data; those with at least 18 months; those with at least 24 months; and those with at least 30 months. In forming pre/post comparisons, we examine each cohort separately, comparing its characteristics during the six months immediately preceding program entry with the final six-month period covered by the data for those individuals. For those followed at least 12 months, for example, we compare employment characteristics and public assistance during the pre-program period with characteristics during Months 7 through 12 month following program entry. Earlier and later time periods are examined using somewhat larger or smaller collections of participants.

5.1 Educational Attainment

Exhibit 5.1 shows changes in schooling status, as measured by possession of a high school diploma or GED, from the date of receipt of an Operation Bootstrap Program certificate to the date of follow-up, by model and for the entire sample.³⁶ As seen in the final column of the exhibit, attainment for the sample as a whole went up a statistically significant 8 percentage points by the time of our follow-up interviews (23 months following certificate receipt, on average), from 84 to 92 percent. The extent of this gain varies significantly across the three models of coordination. In fact, there is a statistically significant difference in the share of participants with a diploma or GED at

³⁶Due to data limitations, years of schooling at baseline had to be used as a proxy for possession of a high school diploma or GED (12+ years = have the degree at baseline) for the 27 percent of participants who received additional degrees or certifications following demonstration entry. For similar reasons, participants whose highest degree at follow-up exceeded a high school diploma/GED are assumed to have also possessed that more basic credential. 22 percent of the sample falls into this group, 14 percent whose highest degree is a vocational/technical degree/certificate and 8 percent whose highest degree is an associate's, bachelor's, or advanced degree.

follow-up between the PHA-Centered Model sites and the other sites and between the Contract Model sites and the rest of the sites. The differences between program models point to the fact that the Pass-Through Model did not stress long-term, degree-granting education, instead focusing on relatively short-term job training and placement. Yet despite the different emphases placed on education, all models showed a significant improvement in high school degree attainment.

Viewing high school completion or the equivalent as one of the key "building blocks" for later labor market success, the potential for increases in self-sufficiency existed in the program participant population for all models. We look next at whether any improvements in measures of self-esteem are evident.

5.2 Self-Esteem

A positive outlook and sense of self-worth are among the determinants and/or by-products of a successful transition to self-sufficiency and economic independence. Individuals who feel good about themselves will be more likely to think they can change their current circumstances and consequently are more inclined to take steps toward a goal than those who are demoralized. The success of the Operation Bootstrap Program, therefore, will depend in part on how much the program can change the way participants feel about themselves. And tangible improvements in self-sufficiency outcomes such as employment and lessened dependence on welfare benefits should induce further improvements in self-image.

To measure the net result of these processes on participant self-esteem, we asked participants a series of three questions designed to address the general domain of self-esteem at the time of the interview. The same questions were then asked retrospectively regarding the time at which an Operation Bootstrap Program housing certificate was received. The questions were drawn from the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, originally designed to measure global feelings of self-worth or self-acceptance.³⁷ As with the ratings of housing and neighborhood quality discussed in Chapter Four, pre/post comparisons of attitudinal factors--in the one instance recorded substantially after the fact--carry an increased risk of recall error or respondent bias and must be interpreted with care. Subject to this limitation, Exhibit 5.2 displays results from the pre/post comparison of responses to the self-esteem questions. In general, participants indicated that they held fairly positive personal outlooks at baseline. Seventy-nine percent of respondents either agreed strongly or agreed with the

³⁷See Robinson, John P., Phillip R. Shaver, and Lawrence S. Wrightsman, Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Attitudes. New York: Academic Press, Inc., 1991. A copy of the Operation Bootstrap Demonstration questionnaire appears in Appendix C.

statement that they took a positive attitude toward themselves at the time. Sixty-eight percent disagreed or disagreed strongly with the sentiment that at times they thought they were "no good at all," while 73 percent responded negatively to the statement that they did not "have much to be proud of." These rather strong feelings of self-esteem at baseline are not unexpected, given that the individuals surveyed had already demonstrated a hopeful attitude toward life at that time by volunteering for a self-improvement program.

Exhibit 5.2 also shows that the follow-up measures of self-esteem increased significantly over these baseline levels. The number of respondents who indicated that they took a positive attitude toward themselves increased 18 percentage points over the baseline, to 97 percent. Similarly, the number of participants who disagreed or disagreed strongly with the statements that "At times I feel no good at all" and "I do not have much to be proud of" increased by 13 and 19 percentage points, respectively, compared with the baseline figures. Thus, the period of time following entry into the Operation Bootstrap Program appears to have been one of substantial improvement in self-esteem for those who volunteer for self-help programs. How much of this improvement would have occurred absent Operation Bootstrap Program and how much is due to its effects cannot be determined with the available data.

5.3 Employment Activities

Exhibit 5.3 presents a summary of patterns and changes in employment activities since Operation Bootstrap Program entry for various cohorts of program participants. The columns of the exhibit represent successive six-month intervals beginning with the six months prior to program entry and continuing two-and-one-half years past that point. The top row of the exhibit shows the number of respondents who reached each of these points of follow-up, who are then analyzed in that column. As with a similarly structured table in Chapter 4 (Exhibit 4.2 on education and training activities by semester), these sample sizes decline over time as we look to durations of follow-up covered by fewer and fewer of our follow-up interviews. Thus, while we begin with 707 participants with at least six months of follow-up data, there are only 158 participants left when we reach Months 25-30 of the follow-up period.

The rows of the exhibit indicate a range of measures related to employment that we would like to track over time:

- Percent looking for work, in school or training (repeated from Exhibit 4.2), and employed;
- Percent who held long-term and/or full-time jobs; and
- Percent who held jobs with certain types of fringe benefits,

pay scales, and satisfaction levels.

Overall Employment Patterns. At a glance, the percentage of participants working or looking for work appears to increase steadily over time following program entry. For example, of the participants with at least six months of follow-up data, only 9 percent were employed in a full-time job at some point during the first six months following Operation Bootstrap Program entry,³⁸ while of those with at least 30 months of follow-up data, 26 percent held a full-time job sometime between Months 25 through 30. Similarly, only 14 percent of the participants with at least six months of follow-up data earned a wage exceeding \$4.25 an hour over that interval, while three times as many of those with at least 30 months of follow-up earned such a wage in Months 25 through 30 (42 percent).

These raw percentage figures can be misleading, however, since each six-month interval in the table pertains to a different group of participants. Hence, changes in the composition of the analysis sample may be mistaken for--or may mask--true trends in activity levels. To eliminate this potential "cohort bias," we also present measures of **change** in employment conditions which compare each follow-up cohort with its own baseline situation. These estimates represent our best guess at how much Operation Bootstrap Program participants as a whole improved their situations in each semester, based on the data available for only a limited sub-sample.³⁹

As can be seen, the change measures indicate a similar pattern of movements as that suggested by the original "raw" percentages. Many of the pre/post changes in the exhibit are statistically significant, with notable changes occurring in the percent of respondents who looked for work and the percent in school or training. In all cases, there is a distinct decline in the percentage of participants working or looking for work immediately following entry into the Operation Bootstrap Program. This change from the pre-entry period gradually becomes positive over time, however, with the maximum improvement occurring at the end of the follow-up period 25 to 30 months after program entry. Interestingly, all three types of activities listed at the head of the table--job search, school/training, and employment--follow an upward trend throughout the follow-up period (except for the brief decline in school/training enrollment between Months 1-6 and Months 7-12). Apparently, Operation Bootstrap Program participants

³⁸A full-time job is defined as a job in which the participant worked 35 hours per week or more for at least one month.

³⁹Note that, except in Months 1-6, the change measures do not equal the difference between the percentage for that semester and the percentage shown in the left-hand column for the pre-entry semester. This is because a different pre-entry benchmark is used for each follow-up interval, as explained in the text, with only the benchmark for the broadest cohort (Months 1-6) shown in the exhibit.

were either ready to become gradually more active in all three areas of self-improvement when they volunteered for the program or the program itself induced this result over time.

A particularly important example of this trend, which drives many of the other numbers later in the exhibit, is the steady improvement in employment rates over time. As can be seen, participants with six months or more of follow-up data experienced a statistically significant 21 percentage-point **decline** in the number of individuals employed in the first six months of Operation Bootstrap Program participation compared with a 40-percent employment rate in the six months prior to enrollment. This declining pattern of employment in the first few months of follow-up is consistent with the relatively long-term training and job search activities that the Operation Bootstrap Program emphasized. Households may have left work to pursue the training activities made possible through program participation. This behavior would lead to a drop in the rate of employment in the first months of the program, along with a commensurate increase in education and training participation. In fact, one of the largest increases in education and training over baseline levels occurs in the first six months after enrollment.

Over time, participation in the Operation Bootstrap Program corresponds with increases in labor force attachment, education and training, and--with an 18-month lag--employment. On the employment side, particularly noticeable improvements are evident in the percent of participants employed in the same job for six months or longer, the percent of participants earning above minimum wage (\$4.25 per hour), and the percent of participants reporting that they were either "very satisfied" or "satisfied" with their job. For the most part, however, positive changes are not statistically significant until at least 25 months following program enrollment.

Employment Outcomes by Model. Within this overall pattern, there are intriguing differences in the pattern of employment across the different program models, although none are statistically significant. Exhibit 5.4 presents the similar pre/post comparisons for each of the three models of coordination. Appendix D presents additional details of these comparisons.

As can be seen from Exhibit 5.4, PHA-Centered Model participants who worked directly with PHA staff look the most like the overall population. In contrast, the Contract Model participants who were served by outside organizations following enrollment through the PHA, took longer than usual to rebound from their initial decline in employment following program entry. This contrast emerges most clearly with regard to the percent employed in full-time jobs and the percent with jobs that provide fringe benefits such as health insurance and paid vacation, where the PHA-Centered Model first shows improvement over baseline in Months 7-12 while the Contract Model

does not begin to improve until Months 19-24. Thus, it appears that PHA-Centered Model programs achieved more immediate employment results than the less-centralized Contract Model programs, although any number of non-program-related factors could also account for these observed differences (e.g., variations in the types of families served or in local labor market conditions).

As might be expected, the reverse is true for education and training involvement, where the Contract Model sites saw the greatest short-run gains. This supports the fact that the less PHA-Centered programs concentrated more on long-term employment strategies and less on immediate job placement than the typical PHA-Centered program.

The Pass-Through Model programs differed radically from both of these patterns. Pass-Through Model participants show increases in the broadest measure of employment--percent employed in any job--beginning in Months 7-12, much earlier than either the PHA-Centered Model or the Contract Model. The same is true of other employment outcomes: percent employed full-time, percent employed six months or longer, and percent earning above the minimum wage, as shown in Appendix D. Also, as first noted in Chapter Four, the percent in school and training actually **declines** relative to baseline in the Pass-Through Model sites beginning in Months 7-12, while the reverse holds for the PHA-Centered Model and the Contract Model. This may reflect the fact that the Pass-Through Model participants enrolled in the Operation Bootstrap Program while already participating in a training and employment program and, therefore, were closer to fulfilling their training needs.

Overall, then, the findings in Exhibits 5.3, 5.4, and Appendix D suggest that the participants in the Pass-Through Model sites were the quickest to move toward the program's employment goal following receipt of a certificate, and those in the community-based programs the slowest. As with education and training activities, the differences in employment patterns between the Pass-Through Model and the other two models can be attributed in part to the circumstances of their participants. It should be stressed again, however, that differences in employment patterns across program models is merely suggestive of more fundamental differences in the program structures and focus, since the employment differences were not of a statistically significant magnitude. The PHA-Centered Model and the Contract Model served individuals who had little prior involvement with employment and training programs, using the guarantee of a Section 8 housing certificate to encourage participation in self-sufficiency programs. Pass-Through Model sites, by contrast, recruited participants from existing self-sufficiency programs. Thus, Pass-Through Model participants had demonstrated motivation to engage in employment and training activities and may have been further along the road to economic independence prior to Operation Bootstrap

Program enrollment than other participants.

5.4 Sources of Income Support

Several sources of income support among program participants are summarized in Exhibit 5.5. As with the discussion of employment activities, we examine pre/post differences in income sources by focusing on successive six-month intervals of follow-up data. The exhibit shows the percentage of each follow-up cohort that experienced a spell of income support in the six-month follow-up period for two sources of income: AFDC and food stamps.

General Pattern of Support. The first panel of Exhibit 5.5 shows the pattern of changes in receipt of support payments for all program participants. Overall, the incidence of income assistance remains relatively constant over time. For example, the proportion of participants receiving AFDC benefits was around 50 percent for all cohorts. Receipt of food stamps among participants was uniformly higher than receipt of AFDC benefits and exhibits more variability throughout the follow-up period.

In order to clarify changes in the pattern of spells of income support over time, below each income source we present a row showing percentage changes from the pre-entry period for each follow-up cohort. The changes compare the share of participants in a follow-up cohort receiving each source of income with the same figure in the pre-enrollment period, for that cohort.

The percentage change measures illustrate a universal **increase** in the receipt of income support for all follow-up cohorts. This increase is far more pronounced for receipt of food stamps than for AFDC. The incidence of food stamp receipt shows statistically significant positive changes between the pre and post periods, fluctuating between 8 and 12 percentage point gains; while changes in AFDC receipt are generally insignificant, holding constant at 3 percentage points for nearly all cohorts. The pattern of pre/post changes does not vary systematically with months since program enrollment.

The finding that program participants increased their dependence on outside income sources following program enrollment should not necessarily be viewed as an undesirable outcome. Participants were encouraged to undertake training activities and to pursue employment opportunities that might well have induced temporary fluctuations in economic circumstances that affected the need for outside income support. For example, a participant may have left a low-paying full-time job (but one which exempted the participant's family from public assistance) to engage in education or training before taking a higher-paying job in the future. During the period of training, the participant might have become eligible for income assistance, thus showing an increase in the incidence of outside support over the pre-program period. Or a

participant may have gone through a series of economic ups and downs on the road to self-sufficiency, accumulating a number of on-again-off-again spells of assistance, a phenomenon that would be exacerbated by the recession that began in 1990. The increased incidence of such spells following program entry may also reflect greater awareness of public benefit programs as a result of program participation.

Public Assistance Spells by Model. The general pattern illustrated by the top panel of Exhibit 5.5 obscures striking differences in the pattern of income sources across the program models. Particularly evident are statistically significant program differences in the receipt of food stamps. The bottom three panels of the exhibit display pre/post comparisons for each program model.

Participants in sites that were PHA-Centered follow the pattern of the overall average in the top panel. This is not surprising given the relatively large sample sizes for those sites. The Contract Model participants show more consistent statistically significant pre/post changes in food stamp receipt for each cohort. Further, receipt of food stamps in the Contract Model sites is statistically different from the other sites in four of five follow-up cohorts. The difference between the PHA-Centered Model participants and Contract Model participants is in keeping with the employment outcomes discussed in the previous section. There, Contract Model participants were found to take longer to secure employment following program enrollment. We would therefore expect a larger increase in public assistance during this longer recovery period, as evidenced by panels two and three in Exhibit 5.5.

Changes in income sources after program enrollment also differ noticeably between Pass-Through Model participants and participants in the other models of coordination. The incidence of food stamp receipt shows a statistically significant difference between the Pass-Through Model and the other models for four of five follow-up periods. After several months of follow-up, the incidence of income support is seen to **decrease** compared with the six months preceding program enrollment (although the change is not statistically significant). For Pass-Through Model participants with at least 12 months of follow-up data, there was a 2 percentage point drop in the share of participants who received AFDC compared with the share of participants from the same cohort receiving AFDC in the baseline period. This decline increases for later cohorts. Thus, the share of Pass-Through Model participants who received AFDC sometime during Months 19-24 following program enrollment was 14 percent smaller than the share receiving AFDC during the six months prior to program enrollment for those with 24 or more months of follow-up data.

The same decline over time occurs for the Pass-Through Model participants in the incidence of other income sources. Pre/post changes in the share of participants with a spell of food stamp receipt become negative in Months 19-24 of follow-up. This

overall decline in alternative income sources may reflect the accelerated education and training activities of the Pass-Through Model participants. Recall from the previous section that the Pass-Through Model participants achieved labor market goals more quickly than did the PHA-Centered Model or the Contract Model participants. Given this success, we would expect similar speed in showing a decline in public assistance receipt.

In this chapter we discussed the pre/post changes in measures of self-sufficiency experienced by program participants following enrollment. A number of encouraging results were observed, including increases in the share of participants who looked for work, and who secured full-time employment. Dampening the positive findings, however, was an increase in the share of participants who received income support since program enrollment. Thus, we observe a movement towards greater employment among participants, but not toward overall self-sufficiency.

The following concluding chapter summarizes the findings of this report and suggests policy implications for the Family Self-Sufficiency Program.

CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY AND LESSONS FOR THE TRANSITION TO THE FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY PROGRAM

This report provides evidence on the progress of Section 8 housing recipients toward self-sufficiency following enrollment in the Operation Bootstrap Program. In this concluding chapter, we summarize that evidence and consider its relevance to the nation's newest self-sufficiency program for assisted housing families, the Family Self-Sufficiency Program. As noted in Chapter 1, Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) was authorized by the 1990 National Affordable Housing Act to make employment and training services available to Section 8 certificate and voucher holders, as well as public and Indian housing residents. To the extent that it represents the successor to the Operation Bootstrap Program strategy and will likely involve many more families than that program, it is important that any lessons learned from the current study be transferred to the planning and implementation of FSS.

6.1 Summary of Main Findings

Overall, the findings of this study can be grouped into four main areas: progress toward self-sufficiency, prerequisites to self-sufficiency, participant background and environment, and variations in all three sets of factors among the three Operation Bootstrap Program models of coordination. We review our results in that order.

6.1.1 Progress toward Self-Sufficiency

Operation Bootstrap Program participants in the 24 study sites were found to have made mixed progress toward self-sufficiency following enrollment in the program. For the 723 individuals interviewed as part of Abt's participant follow-up survey, progress was evident on several--but not all--fronts:

- Within six months after program entry and for the remaining two years of the follow-up period, the percentage of participants **looking for work** in any 6-month interval was 6 to 10 percentage points higher than during the six months prior to program entry.
- The percentage actually **employed** in the initial six months after program entry declined sharply from its pre-program level of 40 percent (as education and training program participation rose; see below) but then climbed above its original level by 11 percentage points by months 25 to 30 of the follow-up period.

- **Full-time employment** (35 hours per week for at least one month) also rose following an initial decline, exceeding its pre-program level (15 percent) by 4 to 9 percentage points beginning a year after program entry.
- Compared to the pre-program period, when 31 percent of program participants held a **job paying more than the minimum wage** (\$4.25 an hour), an additional 12 percent of participants held such a job during the final six months of follow-up (25 to 30 months after program enrollment).
- **Long-term employment** (employment in the same job for six months or more) and **"quality" jobs** (jobs with paid vacation and health insurance, weekly hours above 30, or positive job satisfaction) also followed a similar pattern over time, with the percentage of participants holding jobs with each of these characteristics rising 5 to 15 percentage points over baseline during the last year of the follow-up period (19 to 30 months after enrollment).
- **Receipt of food stamp benefits** increased by about 10 percentage points following program entry, compared with 51 percent dependence at baseline. **AFDC receipt** rose less (from a pre-program level of 47 percent) and possibly not at all after the first six months of the program. These unexpected increases in welfare dependence may reflect unmeasured reductions in household earnings (despite increases in employment among program participants) or unmeasured increases in awareness of public assistance programs generally.
- Reported **self-esteem** rose markedly from baseline to follow-up, as measured by positive responses to any of three questions on self-image. Depending on the question, 15 to 20 percent of the sample swung from a negative response to a positive response over the two-year average follow-up period.

In general, then, the Operation Bootstrap Program participants interviewed by Abt showed modest but important long-run movement into the labor force following an initial decline. The composition of the jobs held also improved slightly as indicated by the fact that percentage-point gains in full-time, "quality" employment equaled gains in overall employment, implying that additional employment came almost entirely within the "quality" job category. There is no evidence, however, that self-sufficiency increased as a result of these changes. In fact, receipt of welfare benefits, particularly food stamps, **increased** following program entry.

This modest and mixed movement toward self-sufficiency **following** program entry does not necessarily imply beneficial or detrimental effects **from** the program,

since we do not know how the same individuals would have fared absent the intervention. Lacking such a benchmark, the only thing we can say with certainty is that the Operation Bootstrap Program was one among possibly many factors that led participants both toward greater employment and increased welfare dependence over the two-and-one-half years following program entry. Other factors that may have played a role include participants' background characteristics and motivation and the availability of jobs and other employment and training services in their communities.

6.1.2 Prerequisites to Self-Sufficiency

We were also able to identify increases in some of the potential prerequisites to future self-sufficiency:

- Steady increases in **educational and training activities** over the baseline period, with an additional 7 to 14 percent of participants active each semester of the follow-up period beyond the 49 percent active in the six months before program entry.
- Of those reporting any education and training activities, 60 percent were very **satisfied with their courses** and--of those who later looked for work--46 percent found the training very helpful in finding a job.
- Forty-one percent of education/training participants completed their **courses of study**, which concentrated on vocational programs and two-year college programs. As a result, 21 percent of all program participants **received a degree or training certificate** at some point during the 23-month average follow-up period.
- As a result of these activities, the share of Operation Bootstrap Program participants with a **high school diploma or GED certificate** rose from 84 percent at baseline to 92 percent at follow-up.
- Of several **job search techniques** examined, each of three self-initiated approaches (direct employer contacts, talks with friends and relatives, responses to advertisements) were used by about a third of all participants during the follow-up period, while strategies involving outside assistance (job referrals, job counseling, job search assistance) were used by about a quarter of the sample.
- Fifty-seven percent of those with child care responsibilities received **child care assistance** at some point during the follow-up period, compared to only 36 percent during the (substantially shorter) baseline period. Corresponding percentages receiving **transportation assistance** (among all Operation Bootstrap Program participants) were 36 percent at follow-up and 24 percent at baseline.

- Slightly more program households **lived in a private apartment** at follow-up than at baseline (88 percent as opposed to 84 percent), with those living in public housing units and in shared living quarters declining 2 percentage points each.
- **Self-rated housing and neighborhood conditions** also increased slightly, with 5 to 15 percent of participants shifting from a neutral or negative baseline rating to a positive follow-up rating, depending on the factor evaluated (e.g., housing condition, neighborhood safety, school quality).

Here again, we cannot be sure which of these changes were induced by the Operation Bootstrap Program and which would have occurred without it. Still, regardless of their origins, each of these factors may have played a role in moving participants toward self-sufficiency during--and possibly after--the analysis period.

6.1.3 Background and Environmental Conditions

Finally, in thinking about the relevance of the Operation Bootstrap Program results for the nation as a whole, we need to review the background and environmental factors that defined the participants under study. In particular, our 723 sample members lived in 24 PHAs representing:

- All 10 HUD administrative regions, providing considerable **geographic diversity** in the sample;
- Both **urban and rural sites**;
- **Large, medium, and small PHAs**, as well as large, medium, and small Operation Bootstrap Program units;
- A range of **local unemployment rates** and **employment and training program service capacities**.

The 24 study sites match up well to the full set of 59 first-year Operation Bootstrap Program sites on virtually all of these factors.

In terms of personal and family characteristics, the participants we studied had the following profile at baseline:

- The majority were **female** (91 percent), between the **ages** of 26 and 35 (53 percent), **white** non-Hispanic (54 percent), and **U.S. born** (94 percent).
- Most were **unmarried** (41 percent never married, 39 percent divorced or

separated) and living in **households** of 2 to 4 people that included one or more **children** and, quite often, a child under the age of six.

- Almost all lived in single-household **housing units** with at most two persons per bedroom, and 60 to 70 percent rated their housing units and neighborhoods "excellent" or "good."
- Most (84 percent) had **high school diplomas or GEDs** at baseline and half had recently (within the last six months) participated in some form of **training or education**, primarily vocational training and two-year college programs.
- Few had been **employed** full time in the six months prior to program entry (19 percent) and only 41 percent had held any job over that period. **Wages** on the most recent job met or exceeded the minimum wage (\$4.25 per hour) in most instances and averaged \$5.56 per hour.
- In addition to earnings, **major sources of income** in participant households in the six months prior to entering the Operation Bootstrap Program were food stamp benefits (55 percent), and AFDC grants (49 percent).

These and other unmeasured baseline characteristics such as motivation, family background, and health status may have substantially affected participants' responses to the Operation Bootstrap Program and their overall progress toward self-sufficiency.

6.1.4 Variations across Models

The 24 sites we studied were almost evenly divided between three models of coordination:

- **PHA-Centered Model** programs where PHA staff selected participants from among the regular Section 8 waiting list and current recipients, and arranged self-sufficiency services;
- **Contract Model** programs where PHA staff selected participants from among the Section 8 waiting list and current recipients and then assigned them to an outside agency under contract to the PHA for self-sufficiency services; and
- **Pass-Through Model** programs where the PHA provided Operation Bootstrap Program certificates to participants in existing self-sufficiency programs (e.g., JTPA, JOBS).

Some but not all of the findings noted above differ in important ways among the three program models. Of the outcomes considered separately by model:

- **Job search** activities increased most strikingly in the PHA-Centered Model programs, although no statistically significant differences between models were observed.
- **School and training** activities increased most in the Contract Model programs, and declined relative to baseline in the Pass-Through Model programs.
- **Employment rates** rose most quickly in the Pass-Through Model programs. There was no evidence of statistically significant differences between models, however.
- **Welfare dependence** increased most in the Contract Model programs and fell in the Pass-Through Model sites.
- **High school diploma and GED attainment** increased most in the Contract Model sites, but all sites showed significant gains.
- **Receipt of child care assistance** increased most in the Contract Model sites.
- Use of **transportation assistance** rose most significantly among Pass-Through Model sites.

Thus, it appears that PHA-Centered programs focused more on job search, Contract Model programs more on education and training (at least in the short run), and Pass-Through Model programs more on employment. This last result is not surprising given that the Pass-Through Model programs served individuals already participating in employment and training programs. It stands to reason that these clients were already positioned to increase their employment rates--and decrease their schooling activities--near the point of program entry, whereas participants in the other two models needed longer to reach that point. Similarly, it is not surprising to see welfare reductions in the Pass-Through Model programs only--and the largest increase in welfare dependence among the sites with the greatest emphasis on education and training activities (the Contract Model programs).

Slight differences in **background characteristics** may also have played a role in the patterns of outcomes observed across program models. In particular:

- Participants in the **PHA-Centered Model** programs were slightly older with less recent education and training experience;
- Participants in the **Contract Model** programs were younger and more likely to have a high school education; and
- Participants in the **Pass-Through Model** sites were less satisfied with the

quality of their neighborhoods and more likely to receive AFDC benefits.

The distinctive profiles of the PHA-Centered and Contract Model clients generally accord with the greater focus on more job search strategies for the older, less-recently educated participants in the former programs and the emphasis on (generally post-secondary) education and training for the younger, more educated participants in the latter programs. Similarly, in comparison to the other models, we would expect participants in the Pass-Through Model programs to be more dependent on welfare at baseline, since three of those programs drew their participants directly from the roles of the AFDC JOBS program.

6.2 Implications for Family Self-Sufficiency

Like the Operation Bootstrap Program, the purpose of the Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Program is to promote local strategies coordinating the use of federal housing assistance with other public and private resources to enable low-income families to move toward economic self-sufficiency. The FSS program, as defined by HUD in regulations issued on May 27, 1993, differs from the Operation Bootstrap Program in several respects. Most fundamentally, FSS cannot use the desire for housing assistance to motivate training and employment efforts on the part of its clients, as did the PHAs in the PHA-Centered and Contract Model programs, since FSS participants will be members of existing Section 8 families. Nor can FSS build linkages with other social service agencies in the same way that the Pass-Through Model programs did. In particular, FSS cannot contribute housing assistance to other self-sufficiency programs, since PHAs will not necessarily receive additional Section 8 certificates through FSS. However, families participating or seeking to participate in other self-sufficiency programs may receive a selection preference for up to 50 percent of FSS Section 8 certificates.

As a result of these factors, both the pool of participants and the types of services provided under FSS could differ substantially from the Operation Bootstrap Program. So, too, could participants' incentives to sustain their self-sufficiency efforts once the program begins. Few if any sanctions were available to program administrators to assure continued compliance with employment plans once participants entered the program, whereas retraction of Section 8 assistance may be considered when FSS participants fail to uphold their self-sufficiency "contracts" with PHAs. FSS rules provide a further inducement to continue pursuing employment through the use of escrow accounts whose proceeds cannot be accessed until public assistance program dependence ends.

In light of these differences, the Operation Bootstrap Program may be most useful to policy makers in illustrating what progress toward self-sufficiency is possible among "self-starting" Section 8 recipients. Given their origins, we would expect program participants to have been highly motivated to receive housing assistance at baseline. They also displayed substantial motivation to work and achieve self-sufficiency by continuing their employment efforts -- on an essentially voluntary basis -- after receiving their certificates. By focusing on these "self-starting" individuals, the program findings can:

1. Determine the availability and likely utilization of the self-sufficiency services on which FSS will depend;
2. Illustrate what the most motivated FSS participants are capable of doing in the self-help realm once housing, referral, and support services are made available;
3. Depending on whether those self-help efforts were sustained or short-lived, anticipate the effort required in enforcing the terms of FSS "contracts"; and
4. Establish realistic expectations as to what is attainable from the FSS program, in terms of increased employment and lessened welfare dependence.

On the first three of these counts, the findings presented here provide the basis for cautious optimism. They show that the majority of Operation Bootstrap participants participated in educational and training activities and (if they had child care responsibilities) received child care assistance following program entry. The ability of these participants to "stay the course" in a self-sufficiency program was also evident over the two-and-one-half year follow-up period. While we cannot know what contribution the program made to these results, we do now know that volunteer

participants will sustain their efforts toward self-sufficiency once enrolled in such a program.

An immediate corollary to these patterns is that volunteers for FSS, if similar to Operation Bootstrap Program participants, are likely to take their commitments to the program seriously and uphold them with little enforcement effort. And while the selection factors leading to voluntary entry into FSS will differ from those of the Operation Bootstrap Program, there is no reason to expect the resulting participant population to be any **less** committed to long-term betterment than were the program participants. Given the threat of sanctions and the requirement of some success before receiving escrow funds, **greater** rather than lesser commitment and voluntary compliance with the program seems likely.

To temper this relatively "up-beat" assessment, however, we must also note that only very modest and at times mixed progress toward self-sufficiency was made by the Operation Bootstrap Program participants. Despite sustained efforts, only about half of those participants worked at all in the final six months of the follow-up period, a rate only 11 percentage points above the equivalent measure for the six months leading into the program. Gains in full-time employment and employment in jobs with fringe benefits and earnings above minimum wage were equally modest. Over the same interval, welfare dependence actually increased, particularly with regard to the Food Stamp Program.

In terms of participants' longer-run potential for greater self-sufficiency, we saw an 8-percentage-point rise in high school attainment and a 21-percent receipt rate for additional degrees/training certificates following program intake. While indicative of some progress, these figures left most program participants no better off in terms of educational credentials two-and-one-half years after program entry than they were at the outset. Later employment and earnings gains--and consequent welfare reductions--due to this modest amount of additional schooling are not likely to be large.

In conclusion, then, it appears that the Operation Bootstrap Program--and possibly the Family Self-Sufficiency Program that will replace it--achieved a result quite often seen among employment and training programs for low-income households: modest but noticeable progress toward employment but not self-sufficiency over a medium-length follow-up period. Unlike the many such experimental impact studies conducted during the last 10 years, we do not know in this instance how much the program intervention contributed to this progress. Given the small, generally favorable trends found for most key outcome measures, the program seems unlikely to have made a large positive difference (unless participants would have shown little or no improvement on their own). It is the size of this **contribution**--measurable only in an

impact analysis--that determines the true worth of a program in relation to its cost. For the Operation Bootstrap Program, we should not assume a favorable balance based on these results, nor should we assume the reverse. And not surprisingly, a "bottom line" assessment of Family Self-Sufficiency will have to await additional impact-oriented research that builds on what we learned here about Section 8 self-sufficiency programs in general.

Appendix A

Key Differences Among HUD Self-Sufficiency Programs: Project Self-Sufficiency, Operation Bootstrap Demonstration, and Family Self-Sufficiency

	Project Self-Sufficiency (1984-85)	Operation Bootstrap Demonstration (1989-90)	Family Self-Sufficiency (1991-)
PHA Participation	Optional, by proposal	Optional, by proposal	Mandatory, PHA may request waiver because of absence of services
Eligibility	Section 8 applicants	Section 8 applicants	Current Section 8 Certificate or Voucher Holders or public housing residents
Accelerated Section 8 benefits	Participants may bypass waiting list	Participants may bypass waiting list	None
Selection	Programs encouraged to screen for motivation, no federal screening criteria established	Programs encouraged to screen for motivation, no federal screening criteria established	Programs may screen for motivation, federal screening factors established
Sanctions for not Following Through with Action Plan	None	None	Section 8 may be terminated for failure to comply with contract of participation
Escrow Account	None	None	Interest-bearing account established, available to families when no longer dependent on welfare assistance

Appendix B (continued)

Selected Characteristics of Intensive-Study Sample of Operation Bootstrap Demonstration Sites

Appendix B

Site	HUD Region	Demonstration Allocation		1990 Total Section 8 Allocation	Prior Self- Sufficiency Program Experience	Located in Metro Area	Lead Agency	Unemployment Rate (%) 1990	Capacity Index
		1989	1990						
PHA-Centered Model Sites									
Schenectady, NY	2	75	0	950	None	x	PHA	4.7	0.39
Huntington, WV	3	64	10	703	None	x	PHA ^a	5.7	0.05
Mobile, AL	4	70	75	1511	PSS	x	PHA	7.1	0.17
St. Clair County, IL	5	80	0	1785	None	x	PHA	7.9	0.15
White River Region, AK	6	50	21	1051	None		PHA	7.9	0.26

Appendix B (continued)

Selected Characteristics of Intensive-Study Sample of Operation Bootstrap Demonstration Sites

Howell County, MO	7	50	16	352	PSS		PHA ^b	6.8	0.14
Sacramento City and County, CA	9	100	0	4751	None	x	PHA	5.1	0.08
San Diego, CA	9	127	0	5974	PSS	x	PHA	4.5	0.08
Contract Model Sites									
Portland, ME	1	65	21	777	Local ^c	x	JOBS	3.6	0.54
Jersey City, NJ	2	104	4	1791	PSS	x	Non-profit	8.3	0.57
Baltimore County, MD	3	25	142	2404	PSS	x	Non-profit	4.5	0.36
Fairfax County, VA	3	50	5	1579	PSS	x	JTPA ^d	2.1	0.24
Clearwater, FL	4	30	38	694	PSS	x	Non-profit ^e	4.4	0.16
Rockford, IL	5	45	30	816	None	x	City CAP	8.3	0.25

Appendix B (continued)

Selected Characteristics of Intensive-Study Sample of Operation Bootstrap Demonstration Sites

				816	None	x	City CAP agency	8.3	0.25
Panhandle, TX	6	45	10	1613	PSS		Non-profit	3.4	0.13
Lincoln, NE	7	72	0	2562	None	x	Non-profit	1.7	1.01
Redding, CA	9	50	5	679	PSS	x	JTPA	8.6	0.24
Snohomish County, WA	10	20	28	1187	PSS	x	County CAP agency	3.9	0.10

**Pass-Through Model
Sites**

New Haven, CT	1	30	13	2213	None	x	JOBS	6.6	0.19
Bloomington, IL	5	20	0	166	None	x	Non-profit	3.9	0.07
Grand Rapids, MI	5	80	64	998	PSS	x	JTPA ^f	6.1	0.23

Appendix B (continued)

Selected Characteristics of Intensive-Study Sample of Operation Bootstrap Demonstration Sites

Kokomo City, IN	5	50	0	511	Local PSS	x	JTPA	8.2	0.15
St. Paul, MN	5	80	16	1294	None	x	JOBS	4.8	0.34
Montana Department of Commerce, MT	8	15	15	2438	None		JOBS	5.8	0.07
Portland, OR	10	50	56	3784	Local PSS	x	JTPA ^g	4.2	0.13
Seattle/King County, WA	10	50	52	5872	Local PSS	x	Non-profit	3.7	0.11

^a Case management in Huntington was originally provided by 15 volunteers who worked full-time in local social service agencies. Responsibility was later transferred to the PHA.

^b The Howell County program is operated by a local CAP agency which serves a seven-county area in Southern Missouri. It is considered a PHA program since the housing division of the CAP agency (which also administers the Section 8 program) directs all aspects of the Operation Bootstrap Demonstration.

^c Several sites did not participate in PSS, but did set aside a share of their regular Section 8 allocation to develop and/or support a local self-sufficiency program.

^d The lead agency in Fairfax County is the County Department of Human Services (DHS). Responsible for the JTPA program, DHS also offers a variety of other social services.

^e The Clearwater program is operated by a non-profit corporation created by the housing authority to operate its Project Self-Sufficiency program.

^f Some case management is also provided by a local community college.

^g Some case management is also provided by two local community colleges.

Appendix C
Operation Bootstrap Demonstration Questionnaire

Hello. My name is _____ from Abt Associates, a research firm in Cambridge, Massachusetts. We are conducting a study of the (LOCAL NAME FOR BOOTSTRAP) Program for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and are speaking to persons who have participated in this program.

Your help with this important study is voluntary and will not affect your benefits under (LOCAL NAME FOR BOOTSTRAP) or the Section 8 housing program in any way. The information you provide will be kept strictly confidential.

The interview will take 30 to 40 minutes, depending on your answers.

HOUSING QUESTIONS:

First, I would like to ask you questions about your participation in the Section 8 housing program.

1. In what month and year were you issued a Section 8 voucher or certificate under the (LOCAL NAME FOR BOOTSTRAP) Program?

_____, 19_____
MONTH YEAR

NEVER ISSUED (TERMINATE) 01

2. What is your current status in the Section 8 program Are you... (READ LIST)?

Currently using Section 8 to pay for housing?
(SKIP TO Q.3) 1

Still searching for unit under Section 8?
(SKIP TO Q.3) 2

Or have you given up or surrendered your certificate or
voucher? (SKIP TO Q.2A) 3

- 2A. What was the reason you gave up or surrendered your certificate or voucher?

3. In what month and year did you first sign your lease using this certificate or voucher?
(PROBE: If you have signed more than one lease, we are interested in the first lease you signed under the [LOCAL NAME FOR BOOTSTRAP] program.)

_____/19_____
MM YY

NEVER SIGNED A LEASE 01

Now I would like to ask you about your present housing situation:

4. What is (your/your family's) current housing situation? Are you: (READ LIST)

Renting (apartment, mobile home, single family house, etc.) 1

Sharing the costs of an apartment, house, etc. with anyone including other family members or other individuals 2

Homeless or in a shelter (SKIP TO Q.11) 3

Living in an institution, such as prison or hospital (SKIP TO Q. 11) 4

Other (Specify) 5

5. Is this residence in a public housing project; that is, is it owned by a local housing authority or other local public agency?

YES 1

NO 2

6. Overall, how would you describe the physical condition of your current housing? Would you say it is in... (READ LIST):

Excellent condition 1

Good condition 2

Fair condition, or 3

Poor condition? 4

7. Altogether, how many bedrooms are there in your (unit/residence)? Please include all rooms that are regularly used for sleeping.

_____BEDROOMS

In these next questions I'd like to ask you your opinion of your current neighborhood.

8. How would you rate (READ ITEM). Would you say it is excellent, good, fair, or poor?

Excellent Good Fair Poor DK/RF

The safety of your neighborhood 1 2 3 4 5

The quality of the schools in your neighborhood 1 2 3 4 5

The general appearance of your neighborhood 1 2 3 4 5

9. Overall, how would you rate your neighborhood? 1 2 3 4 5

10. Did you live in the same place on (DATE IN Q.1) or have you moved since then?

Same unit (GO TO NEXT SECTION) 1

Moved 2

A. How long have you lived in your current residence?

_____ Months

The next questions concern your housing on (DATE IN Q.1).

11. Since (DATE IN Q.1), how many times have you moved?

_____ Times

12. What was your/your family's housing situation on (DATE IN Q.1)? Were you ... (READ LIST.)

Renting (apartment, mobile home, single family house, etc.) 1

Sharing the costs of an apartment, house, etc. with other family or individual 2

Homeless/in a shelter (GO TO NEXT SECTION) 3

Living in an institution, such as prison or hospital (GO TO NEXT SECTION) 4

Other (specify) 5

13. Was this residence in a public housing project; that is, was it owned by a local housing authority or other local public agency?

YES 1
NO 2

14. Altogether, how many bedrooms were there in your (unit/residence)? Please include all rooms that were regularly used for sleeping.

_____ BEDROOMS

15. Overall, how would you describe the physical condition of your housing? Would you say it was in... (READ LIST):

Excellent condition 1
Good condition 2
Fair condition, or 3
Poor condition? 4

These next questions are about your opinion of your old neighborhood.

16. How would you rate...

Excellent Good Fair Poor DK/RF

The safety of your old neighborhood 1 2 3 4 5

The quality of the schools in your old neighborhood 1 2 3 4 5

The general appearance of your old neighborhood 1 2 3 4 5

17. Overall, how would you rate your old neighborhood? 1 2 3 4 5

18. What are the reasons you moved from that (unit/residence)?

A. IF MORE THAN ONE REASON, ASK: What was the main reason?

Q.18	Q.18A	REASONS FOR MOVING	MAIN REASONS
		EMPLOYMENT REASON (JOB CHANGE,COMMUTING)	01
		CHANGE IN MARITAL STATUS	02
		CHANGE IN FAMILY SIZE .	03
		CRIME/WANTED SAFER NEIGHBORHOOD	04
		NEEDED BIGGER HOUSE/APARTMENT	05
		OTHER NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTERISTICS.	06
		WANTED BETTER QUALITY HOUSING	07
		WANTED CHEAPER HOUSING	08
		DISPLACED BY PUBLIC/PRIVATE ACTION	09
		FIRE/FLOOD/OTHER DISASTER	10
		LANDLORD WOULD NOT ACCEPT SECTION 8	11
		OTHER (SPECIFY:)	12

LABOR MARKET QUESTIONS

Work history:

Now I would like to ask you about any job that you have had since (6 MONTHS BEFORE DATE IN Q.1). Please include all jobs for pay that you have had for 2 weeks or longer, full-time or part-time.

I'd like to know about odd jobs as well as regular jobs. If you worked on a family farm or in a family business but weren't paid, please tell me about that too.

19. Since (SIX MONTHS BEFORE DATE IN Q.1), how many jobs have you held?

_____ # OF JOBS

NONE (GO TO NEXT SECTION) .00

20. Do you have a job now?

YES 1

NO 2

FOR EACH JOB, ASK Qs.21-27. PROGRAMMER: REPEAT FOR UP TO 8 JOBS.

Let's start with your (current/most recent/next most recent) job.

21. Where (do/did) you work?

22A. When did you start this job?

MM _____/19
YY

22B. Are you currently employed at (RESTORE FROM Q.21)?

YES (SKIP TO Q.24A) 1

NO 2

22C. When did you leave this job?

_____/19
MM YY

23. What type of work (do/did) you do at (EMPLOYER FROM Q.21)?

24A. Including overtime, how many hours per week (do/did) you usually work on this job?

_____ HRS/WK

24B. Before taxes, how much money (do/did) you earn per pay period including tips?

\$ _____.

24C. Is that per...

Per hour	1	
Per day	2	
Per week	3	
Per month	4	
Every two weeks	5	
Twice a month		6
Per unit (SPECIFY)	7	

25A. (Does/Did) your employer make available any of the following benefits:

Health, medical insurance	1	
Dental benefits	2	
Sick days with pay	3	
Paid vacation	4	
Maternity (paternity) leave	5	
Child care	6	

25B. Overall, how satisfied (are/were) you with this job?

Very satisfied	1	
Satisfied	2	
NEITHER SATISFIED NOR DISSATISFIED		3
Dissatisfied	4	
Very dissatisfied	5	

25C. How satisfied (are/were) you with the opportunities for promotion and long-term growth?

Very satisfied	1	
Satisfied	2	
NEITHER SATISFIED NOR DISSATISFIED		3
Dissatisfied	4	
Very dissatisfied	5	

26A. Were you required to take this job to receive Section 8?

Yes	1	
No (GO TO Q.27)		2

26B. Would you have taken this job even if it had not been required for receipt of Section 8?

Yes	1	
No	2	
DK		8

IF CURRENT JOB, SKIP TO NEXT JOB.

27. Why (on what terms) did you leave this job?

Quit	1	
Laid off		2
Fired	3	
Job ended		4

Other (SPECIFY:) 5

GO TO NEXT JOB.

PROGRAMMER: INCLUDE TEST TO ADJUST THE NUMBER OF TIMES THIS SEQUENCE IS ASKED TO ACCOUNT FOR CHANGES IN RESPONDENT RECALL (E.G., REMEMBERS ADDITIONAL JOBS, RECALLS THAT ONE OR MORE JOBS REPORTED OCCURRED OUTSIDE OF THE REFERENCE PERIOD).

LOOKING FOR WORK

Now, I would like to ask you about any time you spent without a job but were actively looking for work since (6 MONTHS BEFORE DATE IN Q.1). Again, start with your current or most recent experience and work backwards.

28. Thinking back to the time period between now and (6 MONTHS BEFORE DATE IN Q.1), were there any periods in which you were without a job but were actively looking for work?

YES 1
NO (GO TO NEXT SECTION) 2

29. Since (6 MONTHS BEFORE DATE IN Q.1), how many times did you actively look for work while you were without a job?

_____ NUMBER OF TIMES

FOR EACH JOB SEARCH, ASK Qs.30-33L. *PROGRAMMER: REPEAT FOR UP TO 8 SEARCHES.*

30. When did you begin your (most recent/next most recent) period of looking for work?

_____/19_____
MM YY

- A. When did you end that period of looking for work, or are you still looking?

_____/19_____
MM YY

STILL LOOKING 01

The next questions concern the time periods in which you were actively looking for work.

- 31A. Between (DATE IN Q.30) and (DATE IN Q.30A), did you do any of the following activities to try to find work? Go to unemployment office or state employment service?

YES 1
NO (SKIP TO Q.31B) 2

- 32A. Were you required to receive Section 8?

YES 1
NO (SKIP TO Q.33) 2

- 32B. IF YES TO Q.32A: Do you think you would have done so even if it had not been required for the receipt of Section 8?

YES 1
NO 2

33. When you went to the unemployment office or state employment service did you receive

...

- A. Job Counseling, which may have involved an evaluation of your job skills or advice about the kinds of occupations best suited to you?

YES 1
NO (NEXT SERVICE) 2

About how many hours in total did you receive this service?

_____HOURS

- B. Job Search assistance, that is, instruction in how to look for a job, how to prepare a resume, or how to improve your interviewing skills? (You may have received this assistance in a group, such as Job Club.)

YES 1
NO (NEXT SERVICE) 2

About how many hours in total did you receive this service?

_____HOURS

- C. Job Listings or referrals to job openings?

YES 1
NO 2

About how many hours in total did you receive this service?

_____HOURS

D. Overall, how helpful was this experience in getting a job?

- Very helpful 1
- Somewhat helpful 2
- Not at all helpful 3
- HAVE NOT WORKED YET 4
- REFUSED 7
- DON'T KNOW 8

31B. Go to private employment agencies or temporary work agencies?

- YES 1
- NO (SKIP TO Q.31C) 2

32A. Were you required to receive Section 8?

- YES 1
- NO (SKIP TO Q.33) 2

32B. IF YES TO Q.32A: Do you think you would have done so even if it had not been required for the receipt of Section 8?

- YES 1
- NO 2

33. When you went to the private employment agencies or temporary work agencies did you receive . . .

A. Job Counseling, which may have involved an evaluation of your job skills or advice about the kinds of occupations best suited to you?

- YES 1
- NO (NEXT SERVICE) 2

About how many hours in total did you receive this service?

_____ HOURS

B. Job Search assistance, that is, instruction in how to look for a job, how to prepare a resume, or how to improve your interviewing skills? (You may have received this assistance in a group, such as Job Club.)

- YES 1
- NO (NEXT SERVICE) 2

About how many hours in total did you receive this service?

_____ HOURS

C. Job Listings or referrals to job openings?

- YES 1
- NO 2

About how many hours in total did you receive this service?

_____ HOURS

D. Overall, how helpful was this experience in getting a job?

Very helpful 1
Somewhat helpful 2
Not at all helpful 3
HAVE NOT WORKED YET 4
REFUSED 7
DON'T KNOW 8

31C. Go to school placement office, or to teachers/professors?

YES 1
NO (SKIP TO Q.31D) 2

32A. Were you required to receive Section 8?

YES 1
NO (SKIP TO Q.33) 2

32B. IF YES TO Q.32A: Do you think you would have done so even if it had not been required for the receipt of Section 8?

YES 1
NO 2

33. When you went to school placement office, or to teachers/professors did you receive . . .

- A. Job Counseling, which may have involved an evaluation of your job skills or advice about the kinds of occupations best suited to you?

YES 1
NO (NEXT SERVICE) 2

About how many hours in total did you receive this service?

_____HOURS

- B. Job Search assistance, that is, instruction in how to look for a job, how to prepare a resume, or how to improve your interviewing skills? (You may have received this assistance in a group, such as Job Club.)

YES 1
NO (NEXT SERVICE) 2

About how many hours in total did you receive this service?

_____HOURS

- C. Job Listings or referrals to job openings?

YES 1
NO 2

About how many hours in total did you receive this service?

_____HOURS

- D. Overall, how helpful was this experience in getting a job?

Very helpful 1
Somewhat helpful 2
Not at all helpful 3
HAVE NOT WORKED YET 4
REFUSED 7
DON'T KNOW 8

31D. Go to community action groups or Urban League?

YES 1
NO (SKIP TO Q.31E) 2

32A. Were you required to receive Section 8?

YES 1
NO (SKIP TO Q.33) 2

32B. IF YES TO Q.32A: Do you think you would have done so even if it had not been required for the receipt of Section 8?

YES 1
NO 2

33. When you went to community action groups or Urban League did you receive

A. Job Counseling, which may have involved an evaluation of your job skills or advice about the kinds of occupations best suited to you?

YES 1
NO (NEXT SERVICE) 2

About how many hours in total did you receive this service?

_____HOURS

B. Job Search assistance, that is, instruction in how to look for a job, how to prepare a resume, or how to improve your interviewing skills? (You may have received this assistance in a group, such as Job Club.)

YES 1
NO (NEXT SERVICE) 2

About how many hours in total did you receive this service?

_____HOURS

C. Job Listings or referrals to job openings?

YES 1
NO 2

About how many hours in total did you receive this service?

_____HOURS

D. Overall, how helpful was this experience in getting a job?

Very helpful 1
Somewhat helpful 2
Not at all helpful 3
HAVE NOT WORKED YET 4
REFUSED 7
DON'T KNOW 8

31E. Go to local JTPA or JOBS program or welfare agencies?

YES 1
NO (SKIP TO Q.31F) 2

Where did you go?

32A. Were you required to receive Section 8?

YES 1
NO (SKIP TO Q.33) 2

32B. IF YES TO Q.32A: Do you think you would have done so even if it had not been required for the receipt of Section 8?

YES 1
NO 2

33. When you went to the (local JTPA/JOBS program/ welfare agency) did you receive . . .

A. Job Counseling, which may have involved an evaluation of your job skills or advice about the kinds of occupations best suited to you?

YES 1
NO (NEXT SERVICE) 2

About how many hours in total did you receive this service?

_____HOURS

B. Job Search assistance, that is, instruction in how to look for a job, how to prepare a resume, or how to improve your interviewing skills? (You may have received this assistance in a group, such as Job Club.)

YES 1
NO (NEXT SERVICE) 2

About how many hours in total did you receive this service?

_____HOURS

C. Job Listings or referrals to job openings?

YES 1
NO 2

About how many hours in total did you receive this service?

_____HOURS

D. Overall, how helpful was this experience in getting a job?

Very helpful 1

Somewhat helpful 2
Not at all helpful 3
HAVE NOT WORKED YET 4
REFUSED 7
DON'T KNOW 8

31F. Receive placement assistance from a training program?

YES 1
NO (SKIP TO Q.31G) 2

32A. Were you required to receive Section 8?

YES 1
NO (SKIP TO Q.33) 2

32B. IF YES TO Q.32A: Do you think you would have done so even if it had not been required for the receipt of Section 8?

YES 1
NO 2

33. When you received placement assistance from a training program, did you receive . . .

A. Job Counseling, which may have involved an evaluation of your job skills or advice about the kinds of occupations best suited to you?

YES 1
NO (NEXT SERVICE) 2

About how many hours in total did you receive this service?

_____ HOURS

B. Job Search assistance, that is, instruction in how to look for a job, how to prepare a resume, or how to improve your interviewing skills? (You may have received this assistance in a group, such as Job Club.)

YES 1
NO (NEXT SERVICE) 2

About how many hours in total did you receive this service?

_____ HOURS

C. Job Listings or referrals to job openings?

YES 1
NO 2

About how many hours in total did you receive this service?

_____ HOURS

D. Overall, how helpful was this experience in getting a job?

Very helpful 1
Somewhat helpful 2
Not at all helpful 3
HAVE NOT WORKED YET 4
REFUSED 7
DON'T KNOW 8

31G. Contact employers or establishments directly (includes job postings)?

YES 1
NO (SKIP TO Q.31H) 2

32A. Were you required to receive Section 8?

YES 1
NO (SKIP TO Q.33D) 2

32B. IF YES TO Q.32A: Do you think you would have done so even if it had not been required for the receipt of Section 8?

YES 1
NO 2

33D. Overall, how helpful was this experience in getting a job?

Very helpful 1
Somewhat helpful 2
Not at all helpful 3
HAVE NOT WORKED YET 4
REFUSED 7
DON'T KNOW 8

31H. Take civil service test or filled out federal job application?

YES 1
NO (SKIP TO Q.31I) 2

32A. Were you required to receive Section 8?

YES 1
NO (SKIP TO Q.33D) 2

32B. IF YES TO Q.32A: Do you think you would have done so even if it had not been required for the receipt of Section 8?

YES 1
NO 2

33D. Overall, how helpful was this experience in getting a job?

Very helpful 1
Somewhat helpful 2
Not at all helpful 3
HAVE NOT WORKED YET 4
REFUSED 7
DON'T KNOW 8

31I. Answer TV/radio ads?

YES 1
NO (SKIP TO Q.31J) 2

32A. Were you required to receive Section 8?

YES 1
NO (SKIP TO Q.33D) 2

32B. IF YES TO Q.32A: Do you think you would have done so even if it had not been required for the receipt of Section 8?

YES 1
NO 2

33D. Overall, how helpful was this experience in getting a job?

Very helpful 1
Somewhat helpful 2
Not at all helpful 3
HAVE NOT WORKED YET 4
REFUSED 7
DON'T KNOW 8

J. Talk with friends and relatives?

YES 1
NO (SKIP TO Q.31K) 2

32A. Were you required to receive Section 8?

YES 1
NO (SKIP TO Q.33D) 2

32B. IF YES TO Q.32A: Do you think you would have done so even if it had not been required for the receipt of Section 8?

YES 1
NO 2

33D. Overall, how helpful was this experience in getting a job?

Very helpful 1
Somewhat helpful 2
Not at all helpful 3
HAVE NOT WORKED YET 4
REFUSED 7
DON'T KNOW 8

31K. Talk to labor unions or went to union hiring halls?

YES 1
NO (SKIP TO Q.31L) 2

32A. Were you required to receive Section 8?

YES 1
NO (SKIP TO Q.33D) 2

32B. IF YES TO Q.32A: Do you think you would have done so even if it had not been required for the receipt of Section 8?

YES 1
NO 2

33D. Overall, how helpful was this experience in getting a job?

Very helpful 1
Somewhat helpful 2
Not at all helpful 3

HAVE NOT WORKED YET 4
REFUSED 7
DON'T KNOW 8

31L. Between (DATE IN Q.30) and (DATE IN Q.30A), did you do anything else to try to find work?

YES 1
NO (SKIP TO Q.31E) 2

What was that?

32A. Were you required to receive Section 8?

YES 1
NO (SKIP TO Q.34) 2

32B. IF YES TO Q.32A: Do you think you would have done so even if it had not been required for the receipt of Section 8?

YES 1
NO 2

33. When you (INSERT PHRASE) did you receive any of the following services?

A. Job Counseling, which may have involved an evaluation of your job skills or advice about the kinds of occupations best suited to you?

YES 1
NO (NEXT SERVICE) 2

About how many hours in total did you receive this service?

_____ HOURS

B. Job Search assistance, that is, instruction in how to look for a job, how to prepare a resume, or how to improve your interviewing skills? (You may have received this assistance in a group, such as Job Club.)

YES 1
NO (NEXT SERVICE) 2

About how many hours in total did you receive this service?

_____ HOURS

C. Job Listings or referrals to job openings?

YES 1
NO 2

About how many hours in total did you receive this service?

_____ HOURS

D. Overall, how helpful was this experience in getting a job?

Very helpful	1
Somewhat helpful	2
Not at all helpful	3
HAVE NOT WORKED YET	4
REFUSED	7
DON'T KNOW	8

NEXT SEARCH

PROGRAMMER: INCLUDE TEST TO ADJUST THE NUMBER OF TIMES THIS SEQUENCE IS ASKED TO ACCOUNT FOR CHANGES IN RESPONDENT RECALL (E.G., REMEMBERS ADDITIONAL SEARCHES, RECALLS THAT ONE OR MORE SEARCHES REPORTED OCCURRED OUTSIDE OF THE REFERENCE PERIOD).

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Now, I would like to ask you some questions about your education.

34. What is the highest grade of school you completed? (CIRCLE HIGHEST GRADE.)

Elementary: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

High School: 9 10 11 12

College or other higher education: 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

34A. IF ANSWER TO Q.34 IS LESS THAN 12, ASK: Do you have a GED?

YES 1

NO (SKIP TO Q.36) 2

35. What is the highest degree or certificate you have received?

High School Diploma or GED 1

Vocational/Technical Degree/Certificate 2

Junior College (Associate's Degree) 3

Bachelor's Degree 4

Advanced Degree 5

A. When did you receive this degree or certificate?

_____/19_____
MM YY

IF DATE IN Q.35A IS EARLIER THAN 6 MONTHS BEFORE CERTIFICATE RECEIPT, SKIP TO Q.36.

Now, thinking back to (6 MONTHS BEFORE CERTIFICATE RECEIPT), what was the highest grade of school you had completed?

Elementary: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

High School: 9 10 11 12

College or other higher education: 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

Now, I would like to ask you about any education and training programs you may have participated in since (6 MONTHS BEFORE DATE IN Q.1).

FOR EACH EDUCATION OR TRAINING PROGRAM, ASK Qs.36-50. PROGRAMMER:
REPEAT FOR UP TO 8 TRAINING PROGRAMS.

36. Since (6 MONTHS BEFORE DATE IN Q.1), have you attended any school or training programs for a period of one week or more?

YES 1
NO (GO TO NEXT SECTION) 2

37. How many times have you attended school or a training program since (6 MONTHS BEFORE DATE IN Q.1)?

_____ NUMBER OF TIMES

38A. When did you begin this training/education program?

_____/19_____
MM YY

B. When did you stop, or are you currently in the program?

_____/19_____
MM YY

CURRENTLY IN PROGRAM 95

C. Between (DATE IN Q.38A) and (DATE IN Q.38B), was there a period of a month or more when you were not attending the school or training aside from regular school breaks or vacations?

YES 1
NO 2

39. What was the name of the school or training program you attended?

39A. What type of school or training program (is/was) that?

- High School 01
- GED 02
- Other Adult Education:
 - Adult Basic Education 03
 - English as a Second Language 04
- College:
 - 2-year program 05
 - 4-year program 06
 - Graduate, professional program 07
 - Vocational School 08
 - Other Vocational Training 09
- Job-Related Training:
 - On-the-job training 10
 - Training in the military 11
 - Employer training program 12
 - Union or labor/Management association/Apprenticeship 13
 - Job Search Assistance/Job Club 14
- Other
(SPECIFY:) _____ 96

40. On average, how many hours per week (do/did) you attend?

_____ # HRS

41. Did you and/or your family pay anything for this school or training?

- YES 1
- NO (SKIP TO Q.43) 2

42. What was the total amount you or your family paid? (Exclude grants or scholarships.)
NOTE: IF RESPONSE IS AN AMOUNT PER UNIT, E.G., SEMESTER, PROBE TO FIND OUT HOW MANY UNITS AND CALCULATE TOTAL COST.

\$ _____

43. What degree or certificate were you studying for?

- None 1
- High school diploma 2
- Vocational/technical degree or certificate 3
- 2-year (junior) college degree 4
- 4-year college degree 5
- Advanced degree 6
- Other (SPECIFY):_____ 7

44. Did you complete this program? (OR, IF STUDYING FOR A SPECIFIC CREDENTIAL: Did you receive this credential?)

- Yes 1
- No 2
- Still attending 3

45. Were you referred to this program by:

- (LOCAL NAME FOR BOOTSTRAP) 1
- The welfare department 2
- The housing authority 3
- Other government agency (SPECIFY:) 4

Training program was my own idea 5

46. In general, how satisfied were you with this training program?

- Very satisfied 1
- Satisfied 2
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 3
- Dissatisfied 4
- Very dissatisfied 5

47. Other than the educational or training experiences we have already spoken about, since (DATE IN Q.38A) have you received any job or career counseling from (NAME IN Q.39)?

- Yes 1
- No 2

48. Were you required to enroll in this training to receive Section 8?

YES 1

NO (SKIP TO Q.50) 2

49. Do you think you would have enrolled in this training even if it had not been required for receipt of Section 8?

YES 1

NO 2

50. Overall, how helpful was this experience in getting or finding a job?

Very helpful 1

Somewhat helpful 2

Not helpful at all 3

CHILD CARE, TRANSPORTATION ASSISTANCE

The next questions are about child care arrangements you have had while working or in school since (DATE IN Q.1).

51. During the times when you were working or in school since (DATE IN Q.1), have you had to make any child care arrangements for any preschool-age children?

YES 1
NO (SKIP TO Q.53) 2
NOT WORKING OR IN SCHOOL DURING PERIOD
(SKIP TO Q.56) 3

- A. How many pre-school age children?

_____ CHILDREN

52. Over this time who took care of (that pre-school age child/those pre-school age children) while you were at school or at work? CODE ALL THAT APPLY.

Myself (at school or at work) 1
My other children 2
A relative 3
A non-relative 4
Child cares for self 5
Other (SPECIFY): _____ .6

- A. (Has/Have) the (child/children) been cared for: CODE ALL THAT APPLY.

In your home 1
In someone else's home 2
In a day care center or nursery school 3
In a public kindergarten 4
Other (SPECIFY): _____ 5

- B. In a typical month, what does it cost you for child care, including nursery school, daycare, and other care for the (child/children)?

\$_____.

Now we would like to ask about school-age children.

53. During the times when you were working or in school since (DATE IN Q.1), have you had to make any child care arrangements for any school-age children?

YES 1
NO (SKIP TO Q. 55) 2

- A. How many school age children?

_____ CHILDREN

54. While you were at school or at work, did someone besides yourself take care of (this school-age child/these school-age children) when (he or she/they) (was/were) not in school?

YES 1
NO (SKIP TO Q.55) 2

- A. In a typical month, how much did you spend on child care for the school-age (child/children)?

\$ _____.
IF AT LEAST ONE "YES" IN EITHER Q.51 OR Q.53, ASK:

55. Since (DATE IN Q.1), have you received assistance in locating or paying for child care?

YES, HELP IN LOCATING CHILD CARE 1
YES, HELP IN PAYING FOR CHILD CARE 2
YES, LOCATING AND PAYING 3
NO (GO TO Q.56) 4

- A. Overall, how helpful was this assistance?

Very helpful 1
Somewhat helpful 2
Not helpful at all 3

The next questions are about child care arrangements you had before you enrolled in Section 8, that is, between (6 MONTHS BEFORE DATE IN Q.1) and (DATE IN Q.1).

56. During the times when you were working or in school between (6 MONTHS BEFORE DATE IN Q.1) and (DATE IN Q.1), did you have to make any child care arrangements for any preschool-age children?

Yes	1
No (GO TO Q.58)	2
NOT WORKING/IN SCHOOL DURING PERIOD (SKIP TO Q.61)	3

- A. How many pre-school age children?

_____ CHILDREN

57. Over this time who took care of these pre-school age children while you were in school or at work? CODE ALL THAT APPLY.

Myself (at school or at work)	1
My other children	2
A relative	3
A non-relative	4
Child cares for self	5
Other (SPECIFY): _____	6

- A. Were the pre-school age children cared for: CODE ALL THAT APPLY.

In your home	1
In someone else's home	2
In a day care center or nursery school	3
In a public kindergarten	4
Other (SPECIFY): _____	6

- B. In a typical month, how much did you spend on child care, including nursery school, daycare, etc., for the pre-school age children?

\$_____.

58. During the times when you were working or in school between (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1) and (DATE IN Q.1), did you have to make any child care arrangements for school-aged children?

YES 1
NO (SKIP TO Q.60) 2

A. How many school age children?

_____ CHILDREN

59. While you were in school or at work, did someone besides yourself take care of the school age children when they were not in school?

YES 1
NO (SKIP TO Q.60) 2

A. In a typical month, how much did you spend on child care for the school age children?

\$ _____.

IF AT LEAST ONE "YES" IN EITHER Q.56 OR Q.58, ASK:

60. Between (INSERT DATES), did you receive any assistance in locating or paying for child care? What kind of assistance?

YES, HELP IN LOCATING CHILD CARE 1
YES, HELP IN PAYING FOR CHILD CARE 2
YES, LOCATING AND PAYING 3
NO 4

The next questions are about transportation assistance.

61. Since (DATE IN Q.1), have you received any transportation assistance to help you go to work, find a job, or attend education and training programs? For example, was transportation provided for you or did you receive free or reduced fares?

YES	1
NO (SKIP TO Q.62)	2

A. Overall, how helpful was this assistance?

Very helpful	1
Somewhat helpful	2
Not helpful at all	3

62. Between (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1) and (DATE IN Q.1), did you receive any transportation assistance to go to work, find a job, or attend education and training programs? For example, was transportation provided for you or did you receive free or reduced fares?

YES	1
NO	2

DEPENDENCY; OTHER SOURCES OF INCOME

People often have different sources of income. I'm going to read you a list of possible sources of income. When answering these questions, if we have already discussed your income from that source, please let me know that we have already talked about that income so that we don't record it twice.

63. Since (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1), did you or any member of your household receive income in the form of AFDC or welfare?

YES	1
NO (SKIP TO Q. 66)	2

PROGRAMMER: ALLOW Q.64A -65 SERIES TO REPEAT UP TO NINE TIMES TO ACCOUNT FOR DIFFERENT AMOUNTS.

64. Since (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1), has the amount of these payments changed or remained the same?

CHANGED (ASK A)	1
REMAINED THE SAME	2

- A. How many times has the amount changed?

_____ TIMES AMOUNT CHANGED

PROGRAMMER: ALLOW Q. 65 SERIES TO REPEAT UP TO THREE TIMES FOR EACH AMOUNT.

65. How much did you receive in AFDC or welfare (most recently/the time before that)?

\$_____.

- A. Was that per week, per month, or some other payment schedule, or was it a one-time or lump-sum payment?

PER WEEK	1
PER MONTH	2
OTHER SCHEDULE (SPECIFY:)	3

ONE-TIME OR LUMP SUM PAYMENT	4

B. During which period or periods since (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1) did you receive this amount?

From _____/19_____ to _____/19_____
MONTH YEAR MONTH YEAR

From _____/19_____ to _____/19_____
MONTH YEAR MONTH YEAR

From _____/19_____ to _____/19_____
MONTH YEAR MONTH YEAR

66. Since (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1), did you or any member of your household receive income in the form of general assistance or general relief?

YES 1
NO (SKIP TO Q. 69) 2

PROGRAMMER: ALLOW Q.67A -68 SERIES TO REPEAT UP TO NINE TIMES TO ACCOUNT FOR DIFFERENT AMOUNTS.

67. Since (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1), has the amount of these payments changed or remained the same?

CHANGED (ASK A) 1
REMAINED THE SAME 2

A. How many times has the amount changed?

_____ TIMES AMOUNT CHANGED

PROGRAMMER: ALLOW Q. 68 SERIES TO REPEAT UP TO THREE TIMES FOR EACH AMOUNT.

68. How much did you receive in general assistance or general relief (most recently/the time before that)?

\$_____.

A. Was that per week, per month, or some other payment schedule, or was it a one-time or lump-sum payment?

- PER WEEK 1
- PER MONTH 2
- OTHER SCHEDULE (SPECIFY:) 3
- ONE-TIME OR LUMP SUM PAYMENT 4

B. During which period or periods since (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1) did you receive this amount?

From _____/19 to _____/19
MONTH YEAR MONTH YEAR

From _____/19 to _____/19
MONTH YEAR MONTH YEAR

From _____/19 to _____/19
MONTH YEAR MONTH YEAR

69. Since (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1), did you or any member of your household receive income in the form of food stamps?

- YES 1
- NO (SKIP TO Q. 72) 2

PROGRAMMER: ALLOW Q.70A -71 SERIES TO REPEAT UP TO NINE TIMES TO ACCOUNT FOR DIFFERENT AMOUNTS.

70. Since (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1), has the amount of these payments changed or remained the same?

- CHANGED (ASK A) 1
- REMAINED THE SAME 2

A. How many times has the amount changed?

_____ TIMES AMOUNT CHANGED

PROGRAMMER: ALLOW Q. 71 SERIES TO REPEAT UP TO THREE TIMES FOR EACH AMOUNT.

71. How much did you receive in food stamps (most recently/the time before that)?

\$_____.

A. Was that per week, per month, or some other payment schedule, or was it a one-time or lump-sum payment?

PER WEEK	1
PER MONTH	2
OTHER SCHEDULE (SPECIFY:)	3
<hr/> ONE-TIME OR LUMP SUM PAYMENT	4

B. During which period or periods since (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1) did you receive this amount?

From _____/19_____ to _____/19_____
MONTH YEAR MONTH YEAR

From _____/19_____ to _____/19_____
MONTH YEAR MONTH YEAR

From _____/19_____ to _____/19_____
MONTH YEAR MONTH YEAR

72. Since (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1), did you or any member of your household receive income in the form of alimony?

YES	1
NO (SKIP TO Q. 75)	2

PROGRAMMER: ALLOW Q.73A -74 SERIES TO REPEAT UP TO NINE TIMES TO ACCOUNT FOR DIFFERENT AMOUNTS.

73. Since (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1), has the amount of these payments changed or remained the same?

CHANGED (ASK A)	1
REMAINED THE SAME	2

A. How many times has the amount changed?

_____ TIMES AMOUNT CHANGED

PROGRAMMER: ALLOW Q. 74 SERIES TO REPEAT UP TO THREE TIMES FOR EACH AMOUNT.

74. How much did you receive in alimony (most recently/the time before that)?

\$_____.

A. Was that per week, per month, or some other payment schedule, or was it a one-time or lump-sum payment?

- | | |
|------------------------------|---|
| PER WEEK | 1 |
| PER MONTH | 2 |
| OTHER SCHEDULE (SPECIFY:) | 3 |
| <hr/> | |
| ONE-TIME OR LUMP SUM PAYMENT | 4 |

B. During which period or periods since (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1) did you receive this amount?

From _____/19_____ to _____/19_____
MONTH YEAR MONTH YEAR

From _____/19_____ to _____/19_____
MONTH YEAR MONTH YEAR

From _____/19_____ to _____/19_____
MONTH YEAR MONTH YEAR

75. Since (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1), did you or any member of your household receive income in the form of child support?

- | | |
|--------------------|---|
| YES | 1 |
| NO (SKIP TO Q. 78) | 2 |

PROGRAMMER: ALLOW Q.76A -77 SERIES TO REPEAT UP TO NINE TIMES TO ACCOUNT FOR DIFFERENT AMOUNTS.

76. Since (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1), has the amount of these payments changed or remained the same?

CHANGED (ASK A)	1
REMAINED THE SAME	2

A. How many times has the amount changed?

_____ TIMES AMOUNT CHANGED

PROGRAMMER: ALLOW Q. 77 SERIES TO REPEAT UP TO THREE TIMES FOR EACH AMOUNT.

77. How much did you receive in child support (most recently/the time before that)?

\$_____.

A. Was that per week, per month, or some other payment schedule, or was it a one-time or lump-sum payment?

PER WEEK	1
PER MONTH	2
OTHER SCHEDULE (SPECIFY:)	3

ONE-TIME OR LUMP SUM PAYMENT	4

B. During which period or periods since (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1) did you receive this amount?

From _____/19 to _____/19
MONTH YEAR MONTH YEAR

From _____/19 to _____/19
MONTH YEAR MONTH YEAR

From _____/19 to _____/19
MONTH YEAR MONTH YEAR

78. Since (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1), did you or any member of your household receive income in the form of unemployment insurance compensation?

YES	1
NO (SKIP TO Q. 81)	2

PROGRAMMER: ALLOW Q.79A -80 SERIES TO REPEAT UP TO NINE TIMES TO ACCOUNT FOR DIFFERENT AMOUNTS.

79. Since (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1), has the amount of these payments changed or remained the same?

CHANGED (ASK A)	1
REMAINED THE SAME	2

A. How many times has the amount changed?

_____ TIMES AMOUNT CHANGED

PROGRAMMER: ALLOW Q. 80 SERIES TO REPEAT UP TO THREE TIMES FOR EACH AMOUNT.

80. How much did you receive in unemployment insurance compensation (most recently/the time before that)?

\$ _____.

A. Was that per week, per month, or some other payment schedule, or was it a one-time or lump-sum payment?

PER WEEK	1
PER MONTH	2
OTHER SCHEDULE (SPECIFY:)	3

ONE-TIME OR LUMP SUM PAYMENT	4

B. During which period or periods since (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1) did you receive this amount?

From _____/19_____ to _____/19_____
MONTH YEAR MONTH YEAR

From _____/19_____ to _____/19_____
MONTH YEAR MONTH YEAR

From _____/19_____ to _____/19_____
MONTH YEAR MONTH YEAR

81. Since (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1), did you or any member of your household receive income in the form of disability payments or workers' compensation?

YES 1
NO (SKIP TO Q. 84) 2

PROGRAMMER: ALLOW Q.82A -83 SERIES TO REPEAT UP TO NINE TIMES TO ACCOUNT FOR DIFFERENT AMOUNTS.

82. Since (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1), has the amount of these payments changed or remained the same?

CHANGED (ASK A) 1
REMAINED THE SAME 2

A. How many times has the amount changed?

_____ TIMES AMOUNT CHANGED

PROGRAMMER: ALLOW Q. 83 SERIES TO REPEAT UP TO THREE TIMES FOR EACH AMOUNT.

83. How much did you receive in disability insurance or workers' compensation (most recently/the time before that)?

\$_____.

A. Was that per week, per month, or some other payment schedule, or was it a one-time or lump-sum payment?

- PER WEEK 1
- PER MONTH 2
- OTHER SCHEDULE (SPECIFY:) 3

- ONE-TIME OR LUMP SUM PAYMENT 4

B. During which period or periods since (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1) did you receive this amount?

From _____/19_____ to _____/19_____
MONTH YEAR MONTH YEAR

From _____/19_____ to _____/19_____
MONTH YEAR MONTH YEAR

From _____/19_____ to _____/19_____
MONTH YEAR MONTH YEAR

84. Since (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1), did you or any member of your household receive income in the form of Social Security Income (SSI)?

PROGRAMMER: ALLOW Q.85A -86 SERIES TO REPEAT UP TO NINE TIMES TO ACCOUNT FOR DIFFERENT AMOUNTS.

85. Since (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1), has the amount of these payments changed or remained the same?

- CHANGED (ASK A) 1
- REMAINED THE SAME 2

A. How many times has the amount changed?

_____ TIMES AMOUNT CHANGED

PROGRAMMER: ALLOW Q. 86 SERIES TO REPEAT UP TO THREE TIMES FOR EACH AMOUNT.

86. How much did you receive in Social Security Income (SSI) (most recently/the time before that)?

\$ _____.

A. Was that per week, per month, or some other payment schedule, or was it a one-time or lump-sum payment?

- | | |
|------------------------------|---|
| PER WEEK | 1 |
| PER MONTH | 2 |
| OTHER SCHEDULE (SPECIFY:) | 3 |
| _____ | |
| ONE-TIME OR LUMP SUM PAYMENT | 4 |

B. During which period or periods since (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1) did you receive this amount?

From _____/19_____ to _____/19_____
MONTH YEAR MONTH YEAR

From _____/19_____ to _____/19_____
MONTH YEAR MONTH YEAR

From _____/19_____ to _____/19_____
MONTH YEAR MONTH YEAR

87. Since (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1), did you or any member of your household receive income from any other source other than the programs we've just talked about or from jobs you told me about earlier?

- | | |
|--------------------|---|
| YES | 1 |
| NO (SKIP TO Q. 90) | 2 |

A. What (was that source/were those sources)?

88. Since (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1), has the amount of these payments changed or remained the same?

- | | |
|-------------------|---|
| CHANGED (ASK A) | 1 |
| REMAINED THE SAME | 2 |

A. How many times has the amount changed?

_____ TIMES AMOUNT CHANGED

PROGRAMMER: ALLOW Q. 89 SERIES TO REPEAT UP TO THREE TIMES FOR EACH AMOUNT.

89. How much did you receive from (that source/these sources)?

\$ _____.

A. Was that per week, per month, or some other payment schedule, or was it a one-time or lump-sum payment?

- PER WEEK 1
- PER MONTH 2
- OTHER SCHEDULE (SPECIFY:) 3
- ONE-TIME OR LUMP SUM PAYMENT 4

B. During which period or periods since (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1) did you receive this amount?

From _____/19_____ to _____/19_____
 MONTH YEAR MONTH YEAR

From _____/19_____ to _____/19_____
 MONTH YEAR MONTH YEAR

From _____/19_____ to _____/19_____
 MONTH YEAR MONTH YEAR

90. Since (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1), did you or any member of your household receive Medicaid?

- Yes 1
- No (SKIP TO Q.91) 2

A. During which period or periods since (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1) did you receive Medicaid?

From _____/19_____ to _____/19_____
MONTH YEAR MONTH YEAR

From _____/19_____ to _____/19_____
MONTH YEAR MONTH YEAR

From _____/19_____ to _____/19_____
MONTH YEAR MONTH YEAR

91. Did you at any time since (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO DATE IN Q.1) have medical coverage besides Medicaid?

- YES, FROM AN EMPLOYER 1
- YES, FROM ANOTHER SOURCE 2
- NO 3

BACKGROUND, HOUSEHOLD INFORMATION

And what is...

92. Your age (years)?

- 25 and under 1
- 26-35 2
- 36-45 3
- 46 and over 4

93. Your race?

- White/Caucasian 1
- Black/African-American 2
- Asian (Pacific Islander, Filipino) 3
- American Indian or Alaskan Native 4
- Other (SPECIFY) _____ 5

A. Are you of Hispanic descent?

- YES 1
- NO 2

94. Were you born in the United States?

- YES (GO TO Q.96) 1
- NO 2

94A. What month and year did you move to the U.S.?

_____/19_____
MONTH YEAR

95. Is English your first language?

- YES 1
- NO 2

96. I would like to ask you about the other members of your household:

PROGRAMMER: ALLOW FOR UP TO SEVEN ADDITIONAL HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS.

- A. Please give me the first names of all people who usually live with you, in order of age starting with the oldest. RECORD ON GRID. IF THERE ARE ANY PEOPLE IN A, ASK B-D, OTHERWISE GO TO Q.96E.
- B. What is ____'s relationship to you?
- C. What is ____'s current age?
- D. As of (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO RECEIPT OF CERTIFICATE), did ____ usually live with you as well?

ASK ALL RESPONDENTS:

- E. As of (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO RECEIPT OF CERTIFICATE), were there people usually living with you who do not usually live with you now?

PROGRAMMER: ALLOW FOR REPORTS OF UP TO SIX ADDITIONAL PEOPLE HERE

YES (ASK Q.96F-H)	1
NO (SKIP TO Q.97)	2

- F. Who was that?
- G. What was ____'s relationship to you?
- H. What is ____'s current age?

97. What is your current marital status?

Never married (SKIP TO Q.99)	1
Divorced/Separated	2
Widowed	3
Married	4

98. What was your marital status on (6 MONTHS PRIOR TO RECEIPT)

Same	1
Never married	2
Divorced/Separated	3
Widowed	4
Married	5

SELF-ESTEEM

How do you currently feel about (READ STATEMENT)? Do you...

	Strongly	Agree	Disagree	Strongly	Agree	Disagree	No	
				Opinion				
99. You take a positive attitude toward yourself				1	2	3	4	5
100. At times, you think you are no good at all			1	2	3	4	5	
101. You do not have much to be proud of				1	2	3	4	5

And thinking back to how you felt about yourself on (DATE RECEIVED CERTIFICATE), how do you think you would have felt about each statement at that time?

102. You took a positive attitude toward yourself				1	2	3	4	5
103. At times, you thought you were no good at all			1	2	3	4	5	
104. You did not have much to be proud of				1	2	3	4	5
105. RECORD WITHOUT ASKING:								

RESPONDENT IS FEMALE 1
RESPONDENT IS MALE 2

This is the end of the interview. Thank you very much for your time.

Appendix D (continued)

Employment Activities of Operation Bootstrap Program Participants by Six-Month Time Intervals
Following Program Entry, by Program Model ^a
Appendix D

PHA-Centered Model	Six Month Intervals Defined Relative to Program Entry					
	Pre-Entry Six Months	Months 1-6	Months 7-12	Months 13-18	Months 19-24	Months 25-30
Number of Respondents ^b	288	288	264	207	168	66
Percent Who Looked for Work	17	10	24	22	27	24
Change from Pre-Entry	0	-7*	25*	22*	11*	9
Percent In School/Training	41	54	53 [‡]	46	47 [‡]	48
Change from Pre-Entry	0	13*	12*	10*	11*	13
Percent Employed in Any Job	37	19	28	31	38	47
Change from Pre-Entry	0	-18*	-8*	-5	3	9
Percent Employed Full- Time	14	10	17	18	22	27
Change from Pre-Entry	0	-4	3	4	7*	9

Appendix D (continued)

Employment Activities of Operation Bootstrap Program Participants by Six-Month Time Intervals
Following Program Entry, by Program Model ^a

Percent Employed At Same Job 6 Months or More	28	12	19	24	30	38
Change from Pre-Entry	0	-16*	-8*	-2	6	17*

Appendix D (continued)

Employment Activities of Operation Bootstrap Program Participants by Six-Month Time Intervals
Following Program Entry, by Program Model ^a

PHA-Centered Model	Six Month Intervals Defined Relative to Program Entry					
	Pre-Entry Six Months	Months 1-6	Months 7-12	Months 13-18	Months 19-24	Months 25-30
Number of Respondents ^b	288	288	264	207	168	66
Percent With Job That Provided:						
Health Insurance	12	6	11	14	18	21
Change from Pre-Entry	0	-6*	-1	2	7*	7
Paid Vacation	12	6	9	13	15	20
Change from Pre-Entry	0	-6*	-4	0	4	8
Child-Care	2	0	1	1	2	3
Change from Pre-Entry	0	-2*	-1	-1	1	0
Wage Rate > \$4.25	27	13	22	23	29	41
Change from Pre-Entry	0	-14*	-5	-4	3	14*
Hours Worked Per Week > 30	22	11	17	19	24	29
Change from Pre-Entry	0	-11*	-3	-2	4	5

Appendix D (continued)

Employment Activities of Operation Bootstrap Program Participants by Six-Month Time Intervals
Following Program Entry, by Program Model ^a

High Overall Satisfaction	25	13	21	25	30	41
Change from Pre-Entry	0	-12 [*]	-3	0	7	17 [*]

‡ Outcome for the indicated time period is significantly different from that of remaining models.

* Change in outcome from the pre-entry period is statistically significant at the 10 percent level based on a chi-square test.

^a Except for Months 1-6, change measures do not necessarily equal differences shown in the preceding row, since each change measure is derived using its own sample-specific pre-entry participation level.

^b Number of respondents with follow-up data for complete six-month period. (For pre-entry six months, table shows only those with data for Months 1-6 of followup period.)

Appendix D (continued)

Employment Activities of Operation Bootstrap Program Participants by Six-Month Time Intervals
Following Program Entry, by Program Model ^a

Contract Model	Six Month Intervals Defined Relative to Program Entry					
	Pre-Entry Six Months	Months 1-6	Months 7-12	Months 13-18	Months 19-24	Months 25-30
Number of Respondents ^b	248	248	218	181	110	64
Percent Who Looked for Work	14	6	17	19	23	23
Change from Pre-Entry	0	-8*	4	8*	9	13*
Percent In School/Training	51	69 [‡]	62 [‡]	69 [‡]	62 [‡]	53
Change from Pre-Entry	0	18*	12*	18*	23	19*
Percent Employed in Any Job	47	19	32	39	43	50
Change from Pre-Entry	0	-28*	-11*	-3	2	12
Percent Employed Full-Time	19	7 [‡]	11 [‡]	17	23	27
Change from Pre-Entry	0	-12*	-8*	-2	3	8
Percent Employed At Same Job 6 Months or						

Appendix D (continued)

Employment Activities of Operation Bootstrap Program Participants by Six-Month Time Intervals
Following Program Entry, by Program Model ^a

More	35	14	22	27	35	44
Change from Pre-Entry	0	-21*	-12*	-8*	-2	10

Appendix D (continued)

Employment Activities of Operation Bootstrap Program Participants by Six-Month Time Intervals Following Program Entry, by Program Model ^a

Contract Model	Six Month Intervals Defined Relative to Program Entry					
	Pre-Entry Six Months	Months 1-6	Months 7-12	Months 13-18	Months 19-24	Months 25-30
Number of Respondents ^b	248	248	218	181	110	64
Percent With Job That Provided:						
Health Insurance	19	4 [‡]	7 [‡]	12	15 [‡]	22
Change from Pre-Entry	0	-15 [*]	-10 [*]	-5	-6	5
Paid Vacation	18	4 [‡]	7 [‡]	12	17 [‡]	22
Change from Pre-Entry	0	-14 [*]	-10 [*]	-4	-1	5
Child-Care	2	0	0	1	0	3
Change from Pre-Entry	0	-2 [*]	-2 [*]	-2	-3 [*]	-2
Wage Rate > \$4.25	35	15	22	29	33	42
Change from Pre-Entry	0	-20 [*]	-11 [*]	-3	-2	9
Hours Worked Per Week > 30	27	7 [‡]	11 [‡]	18	24	31

Appendix D (continued)

**Employment Activities of Operation Bootstrap Program Participants by Six-Month Time Intervals
Following Program Entry, by Program Model ^a**

Change from Pre-Entry	0	-20*	-14*	-6	0	8
High Overall Satisfaction	34	15	27	29	34	41
Change from Pre-Entry	0	-19*	-3	1	9	16*

‡ Outcome for the indicated time period is significantly different from that of remaining models.

* Change in outcome from the pre-entry period is statistically significant at the 10 percent level based on a chi-square test.

^a Except for Months 1-6, change measures do not necessarily equal differences shown in the preceding row, since each change measure is derived using its own sample-specific pre-entry participation level.

^b Number of respondents with follow-up data for complete six-month period. (For pre-entry six months, table shows only those with data for Months 1-6 of followup period.)

Appendix D (continued)

Employment Activities of Operation Bootstrap Program Participants by Six-Month Time Intervals
Following Program Entry, by Program Model ^a

Pass-Through Model	Six Month Intervals Defined Relative to Program Entry					
	Pre-Entry Six Months	Months 1-6	Months 7-12	Months 13-18	Months 19-24	Months 25-30
Number of Respondents ^b	171	171	162	102	59	28
Percent Who Looked for Work	18	12	25	22	22	25
Change from Pre-Entry	0	-6	7	6	7	11
Percent In School/Training	58	61 [‡]	44 [‡]	43 [‡]	44 [‡]	39
Change from Pre-Entry	0	3	-15 [*]	-10	-7	-4
Percent Employed in Any Job	35	20	37	40	46	50
Change from Pre-Entry	0	-15 [*]	2	10	19 [*]	28 [*]
Percent Employed Full- Time	10	10 [‡]	23 [‡]	23	31	21
Change from Pre-Entry	0	0	13 [*]	13 [*]	23 [*]	7
Percent Employed At Same Job 6 Months or						

Appendix D (continued)

Employment Activities of Operation Bootstrap Program Participants by Six-Month Time Intervals
Following Program Entry, by Program Model ^a

More	22	13	20	33	34	32
Change from Pre-Entry	0	-9*	0	13*	15*	4

Appendix D (continued)

Employment Activities of Operation Bootstrap Program Participants by Six-Month Time Intervals
Following Program Entry, by Program Model ^a

Pass-Through Model	Six Month Intervals Defined Relative to Program Entry					
	Pre-Entry Six Months	Months 1-6	Months 7-12	Months 13-18	Months 19-24	Months 25-30
Number of Respondents ^b	171	171	162	102	59	28
Percent With Job That Provided:						
Health Insurance	8	5 [‡]	12 [‡]	16	27 [‡]	14
Change from Pre-Entry	0	-3	4	6	24 [*]	7
Paid Vacation	8	6 [‡]	14 [‡]	17 [‡]	25 [‡]	21
Change from Pre-Entry	0	-2	7 [*]	12 [*]	23 [*]	17 [*]
Child-Care	1	1	2	2	3	4
Change from Pre-Entry	0	0	2 [*]	2	3	4
Wage Rate > \$4.25	30	16	31	35	41	43
Change from Pre-Entry	0	-14 [*]	0	8	17 [*]	11
Hours Worked Per Week > 30	18	11 [‡]	25	23	32	21

Appendix D (continued)

**Employment Activities of Operation Bootstrap Program Participants by Six-Month Time Intervals
Following Program Entry, by Program Model ^a**

Change from Pre-Entry	0	-7*	8*	8	22*	4
High Overall Satisfaction	25	16	28	30	37	43
Change from Pre-Entry	0	-9*	3	5	15*	32*

‡ Outcome for the indicated time period is significantly different from that of remaining models.

* Change in outcome from the pre-entry period is statistically significant at the 10 percent level based on a chi-square test.

^a Except for Months 1-6, change measures do not necessarily equal differences shown in the preceding row, since each change measure is derived using its own sample-specific pre-entry participation level.

^b Number of respondents with follow-up data for complete six-month period. (For pre-entry six months, table shows only those with data for Months 1-6 of followup period.)