
Where Are They Now?

*A Study To Identify, Locate,
and Survey Former Residents
of Subsidized Housing*



U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Policy Development and Research



Visit PD&R's Web Site

www.huduser.org

to find this report and others sponsored by

HUD's Office of Policy Development and Research (PD&R).

Other services of HUD USER, PD&R's Research Information Service, include listservs;

special interest, bimonthly publications (best practices, significant studies from other sources);

access to public use databases; hotline 1-800-245-2691 for help accessing the information you need.

Where Are They Now?

*A Study To Identify, Locate,
and Survey Former Residents
of Subsidized Housing*

Prepared for:

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Policy Development and Research

Prepared by:

Lalith de Silva
Planmatics, Inc
and

Laura E. Harris
The Urban Institute

February 2004

Acknowledgments

This report was written under the direction of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD's) Office of Policy Development and Research (PD&R). A number of people participated in the study over the past 1-1/2 years and contributed to the results. At HUD, we received support and assistance from Jennifer Stoloff, the project manager.

Lalith de Silva of Planmatics, Inc., and Laura E. Harris of the Urban Institute prepared the report. Imesh Wijewardena of Planmatics and Deborah Kaye and Kadija Ferryman of the Urban Institute contributed valuable assistance and input into the design, implementation, and final results. The authors extend special thanks to Sue Popkin of the Urban Institute.

The contents of this report are the views of the contractor and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development or the U.S. Government.

Preface

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) operates about four million units of subsidized housing for needy families. The purpose of this study was to develop measures of self-sufficiency for families that reside in subsidized housing, during and after their stays. Families that leave housing assistance may represent success stories or they may stop receiving assistance because they are evicted or cannot find suitable, affordable housing units that accept vouchers. No studies provide adequate information to determine the status of households that have stopped receiving assistance; such information could inform ongoing debates about the role of housing assistance in helping families attain economic self-sufficiency.

The project involved three phases: obtaining HUD administrative data for a single jurisdiction to determine which households had left assistance; using passive tracking methods to locate the identified households; and developing and pre-testing a survey instrument that would gather information about issues of self-sufficiency and well-being. Passive tracking involves name or social security number searches of national public databases such as U.S. Postal Service records and telephone directories. These methods are relatively inexpensive and do not involve contacting respondents directly, eliminating the problem of respondent burden.

HUD administrative data were used to identify an initial group of residents who were receiving some form of housing subsidy in the years 2000 and 2002. Those who no longer appeared in the administrative records in 2002 were selected for passive tracking. A great deal of missing data in these files prevented a larger group from being targeted.

In the next phase, passive tracking methods were used to locate the households that were identified from administrative records. The tracking efforts returned a large number of addresses and telephone numbers, but most of the contact information was not current. This finding is not unexpected among a low-income and highly mobile population, but it was a critical problem for developing a successful methodology for tracking and locating households no longer receiving housing assistance.

The pre-testing of the survey led to minor changes and edits and it is likely that this instrument could be used with success in a larger scale project. However, based on the results of this project, using HUD's administrative records for selecting a sample of former recipients of housing assistance is problematic because passive tracking was not an effective way to identify a sufficient number of households. A more traditional sampling method will be necessary if a larger scale study is pursued.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	vii
Section 1: Introduction.....	1
Research Background	1
Policy Considerations	2
Section 2: Conceptual Framework.....	4
“Self-Sufficiency” Outcomes.....	4
Research Questions.....	7
Survey Design.....	9
Section 3: Methods and Findings.....	11
Identifying Households That No Longer Receive Housing Assistance.....	11
Locating Former Recipients of Housing Assistance.....	14
Conducting Survey Pretests	17
Section 4: Conclusions and Recommendations	20
Recommendations.....	20
References.....	23
Appendix A: Technical Issues	A-1
Determining Housing Assistance Status.....	A-1
Matching Challenges	A-5
Appendix B: Crosswalk of Hypotheses and Survey Topics	B-1
Appendix C: Field Documents.....	C-1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) operates about 4 million units of assisted housing for needy families. Some policymakers and researchers believe that housing assistance should be temporary and used as a transition from dependence on public assistance to self-sufficiency. It may be the case that households that stop receiving housing assistance represent the success stories—that is, they become “self-sufficient” and no longer rely on government housing assistance. On the other hand, some households may stop receiving assistance because they are evicted or they cannot find suitable, affordable housing units where they can use vouchers. Currently, no studies provide adequate information to determine the status of households that have stopped receiving assistance; such information could inform ongoing debates about the role of housing assistance in helping families attain self-sufficiency. This project lays the groundwork for such a study.

The project involved three phases: obtaining HUD administrative data to determine which households had left assistance over a two-year time frame; using passive tracking methods to locate the identified households; and developing and pretesting a survey instrument focusing on issues of self-sufficiency and well-being for those households.

Study Methods

The first phase of this project involved examining data for the selected city¹ to identify households that received housing assistance in 2000 but no longer received assistance in 2002. HUD provides several types of housing assistance, including conventional public housing, Housing Choice Vouchers (HCVs; formerly Section 8 certificates and vouchers), project-based Section 8, and multifamily housing. HUD maintains automated data systems on households in these programs in two databases: the Multifamily Tenant Characteristics System² (MTCS) and the Tenant Rental Assistance Certification System (TRACS). These databases provided a list of households that stopped receiving assistance between 2000 and 2002.

After identifying these households, the next step involved using passive tracking methods³ to identify the current addresses and telephone numbers for the households. These methods included searching national credit databases, U.S. Postal Service records, and telephone directories by using the Social Security Numbers of the former recipients of housing assistance as the key identifier. These searches identified addresses and telephone numbers for the past few years for each person, sometimes resulting in 10 addresses and several phone numbers for one person.

¹ For the pretest activities, the sample was drawn from households receiving assistance in Washington, D.C., in 2000.

² As of 2003, the information from the HUD 50058 form that had been included in MTCS is now part of the Public and Indian Housing Information Center (PIC).

³ Passive tracking methods, compared to active tracking methods, are less expensive, are less time consuming, and do not involve contacting respondents, eliminating the problem of respondent burden.

Once the information was obtained from the passive tracking, a sample of respondents was contacted to pretest the survey. The survey covered a wide range of information, including housing mobility, housing characteristics, neighborhood characteristics, employment status, barriers to employment, sources of income, financial hardship, mental health, and physical health. Some interviews were conducted in-person and others by telephone, generally lasting less than 30 minutes. Later, a brief postsurvey cognitive interview covered some questions that might be confusing or of a sensitive nature.

Findings

This study identified three key barriers that may affect the successful implementation of a national pilot study of households that stop receiving housing assistance:

1. HUD's MTCS and TRACS files contained a large amount of missing data on key variables necessary to identify housing assistance status. In particular, 94 percent of cases that had terminated assistance in 2000 were missing the code that describes the reason for termination in TRACS. Some of the missing cases were likely to have stopped receiving assistance, while others had experienced late recertification. Without this information, it is not possible to accurately determine whether a household continued receiving housing assistance.
2. Passive tracking efforts returned a large number of addresses and telephone numbers, but most of the contact information was not accurate. The U.S. Postal Service returned 41 percent of the letters marked "Return to Sender," and 66 percent of the telephone numbers called were out of service. This finding is not unexpected among a low-income and highly mobile population, but it does demonstrate a critical problem for developing a successful methodology for tracking and locating households no longer receiving housing assistance.
3. Several survey respondents reported information about their housing assistance receipt that differed from the MTCS or TRACS data. Some respondents reported that they never received housing assistance, although the MTCS or TRACS data had listed them as receiving assistance in 2000. Others reported that they had continued to receive housing assistance since 2000, though the 2002 administrative records did not document that they still received assistance. Finally, some respondents said they did not receive assistance, but mentioned that they paid a reduced rent based on their income. Earlier studies have documented these types of reporting errors pertaining to households participating in the public housing and voucher programs, and researchers should seriously consider such errors in future studies. Based on the results of the postsurvey interviews, no other questions required substantial revisions. Only minor wording changes and corrections to skip patterns were made.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The results of this project suggest that using HUD's administrative records for selecting a sample of former recipients of housing assistance is problematic. Passive tracking is not an effective way

to conduct a research study of such households. This report provides two recommendations that will help identify a more accurate sample and achieve an adequate response rate, as well as two recommendations that will improve the quality of the findings in a large-scale study.

1. Improve Tracking

- a. **Improve the access to and accuracy of administrative data sources.** This project identified some problems in HUD's administrative records that raise serious concerns about the accuracy of the estimates of households that stopped receiving housing assistance during the 2-year timeframe investigated. If a national study of the outcomes for households that have received housing assistance is to rely on these administrative data, researchers should address these problems.
- b. **Develop alternative ways to contact respondents.** The most effective way to achieve a higher response rate over time with a sample of this type is to use both active and passive tracking methods. Such a study could develop a sample of households receiving assistance at one point in time, track that sample over 2 years or more and survey them, at which point some of the households will still be receiving assistance while others will not. This methodology would provide a comparison group over time, although researchers should give some attention to selection effects concerning the characteristics of households that continued receiving assistance compared to those that stopped receiving assistance.

2. Improve Data Quality

- a. **Use additional administrative records from other federal sources.** Another strategy for examining outcomes over time is to use administrative records such as Federal-State Unemployment Insurance Program to compare households that stop receiving housing assistance with those that continue receiving assistance. HUD would need to establish data sharing agreements with the relevant organizations. This strategy is relatively inexpensive, but may not include data for the entire sample.
- b. **Incorporate qualitative work to better understand the complex issue of self-sufficiency among poor households.** The problem of misreporting the type of housing assistance received is particularly problematic. People frequently provide misleading answers (most likely unintentionally) to simple questions about the receipt of housing assistance. Additional qualitative research could explore the types of questions that may help respondents more accurately report their housing assistance, as well as shed some light on strategies that "self-sufficient," lower-income households implement to adequately support their families.

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

Planmatics and The Urban Institute are pleased to submit this report to document their research for the project *Self-Sufficiency Outcomes for Residents of Subsidized Housing*. This report lays the groundwork for a study that could examine a range of outcomes, such as housing quality, hardship, and self-sufficiency, for households that stop receiving housing assistance. This project represents the first attempt to target such a population. The study was undertaken to assess the effectiveness of using passive tracking to identify a sample of households that no longer receive housing assistance, develop a survey instrument that measures the general well-being and self-sufficiency of such households, and conduct a pretest of the survey instrument in the Washington, D.C. area.

The report has four sections. Section 1 briefly reviews relevant research on self-sufficiency and housing assistance and addresses some key policy considerations. Section 2, outlines the conceptual framework for the project by exploring definitions of self-sufficiency and defining key research questions and hypotheses. Section 3 includes detailed information about the research methods pertaining to data matching, tracking activities for the sample, and implementing the survey pretest. Section 4 summarizes the project findings and makes recommendations for implementing a pilot test of the survey.

Research Background

Those who study and work in the housing assistance arena know little about what happens to households that stop receiving housing assistance. Households may stop receiving housing assistance voluntarily to find better housing or to move to different areas. Those using vouchers may no longer qualify because their earnings exceed the program limit. Households using vouchers, living in public housing, or living in assisted housing units may have experienced changes in household composition (for example, through marriage or a child's leaving home) that make them ineligible for housing assistance. Others may have lost their assistance involuntarily through eviction or lease termination. For those who have very low income or unsteady employment, housing assistance may provide stability and security, guaranteeing that the family will at least have adequate shelter. Thus, it is necessary to develop a research study that will gather information that researchers can use to examine outcomes for households no longer receiving housing assistance.

The issue of self-sufficiency and subsidized housing receives increasing attention because of concerns about the potential impacts of welfare reform on very poor households. For example, recent research by The Urban Institute using the National Survey of American Families (NSAF) found that although subsidized housing residents tend to be more disadvantaged than those without assistance, poor families who leave welfare but maintain their housing assistance are more likely to be employed (Zedlewski 2002). Other research on welfare reform has found that housing assistance significantly reduces the rent burden for welfare leavers, but that assisted families are more likely to reside in very poor, inner-city neighborhoods (Quane, Rankin, and Joshi 2002). Such studies suggest that housing assistance, both in the form of housing vouchers

and conventional public housing, may play a key role in helping very low income families sustain employment and to experience less hardship than those who do not receive housing assistance.

Although ongoing research exists on welfare leavers, there are few systematic studies of subsidized housing leavers. Newman and Harkness (2002), using a sample from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID),⁴ have suggested that housing assistance provides stability for adults and children that may enable them to improve their lives and become self-sufficient. They examined the effects of public housing residence in childhood on outcomes for young adults. Their research showed that living in public housing as a child increased employment, raised earnings, and reduced welfare use later in life, compared with other children living in poor households. The authors speculate that these benefits are the result of stable housing and possibly better housing quality; the results, however, are based on experiences of adults who lived in assisted housing before 1982, when they were under 18. Changing demographic, economic, and neighborhood conditions for households in public housing and other assisted housing might lead to different conclusions if the same study were conducted with more recent data.

Shroder (2002) provides a detailed overview of the literature on the relationship between housing assistance and employment and earnings outcomes. Many of the 18 studies included in his review primarily focused on welfare reform issues. Overall, Shroder finds that the research to date fails to provide systematic, compelling evidence that housing assistance has significant effects on employment. Some evidence, however, supports the theory that living in public housing may have negative effects on adult and child well-being because the housing is located in neighborhoods of concentrated poverty. Data from early evaluations of the Moving to Opportunity (MTO) program have shown that moving to a lower poverty community with a voucher may reduce some of these effects (Goering and Feins, 2003). Forthcoming research from the MTO Interim Evaluation (Orr et al. 2003) and the Welfare to Work (WtW) Voucher demonstration program will examine impacts on both human capital and household composition (Shroder 2002).

Policy Considerations

Understanding how households fare after exiting subsidized housing has implications for the policy debate about the best strategies to help extremely low-income families become self-sufficient. In recent years, HUD policy has increasingly focused on promoting self-sufficiency. HUD has supported deconcentration and dispersal strategies such as HOPE VI and mobility efforts such as MTO to try to reduce the concentration of poverty in subsidized housing and promote self-sufficiency (Popkin et al. 2000). HUD also has experimented with providing intensive employment programs onsite in distressed developments (Bliss and Riccio 2001). Under HOPE VI and Moving to Work, some housing authorities have begun imposing time limits and other requirements (for example, participation in Family Self-Sufficiency programs) as a condition of residence in particular developments. As Shroder's review indicates, however,

⁴ Newman and Harkness used a version of the PSID that includes data from HUD about assisted housing. This data set is not publicly available.

little consistent evidence is available about the effects of providing housing assistance on economic self-sufficiency.

Finally, it is important to note that not all types of assisted housing have comparable populations, at least partly because the public housing and the HCV programs have different income eligibility requirements. These differences affect the characteristics of those enrolled in the programs, which, in turn, may influence the reasons households leave assisted housing programs. This income targeting represents an attempt to promote the deconcentration of poor households by allowing somewhat higher income groups into public housing and distributing vouchers to households with lower incomes, with the idea that voucher holders could move to lower poverty neighborhoods and therefore better meet the aim of deconcentrating poverty.

Section 2: Conceptual Framework

This section of the report describes some of the conceptual issues that form the framework for the project. First, this section discusses issues relevant to operationalizing the term “self-sufficiency.” Next, the section lays out the two research questions with some key hypotheses based on each question. The final part of this section describes the survey design based on the definitions, research questions, and hypotheses.

“Self-Sufficiency” Outcomes

Usually, a discussion of self-sufficiency focuses on economic self-sufficiency. The strictest definition of economic self-sufficiency would allow for no receipt of public assistance, either in the form of a housing subsidy, transfer payment (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families [TANF]), or noncash benefit (food stamps, Medicare). No single definition of self-sufficiency, however, is wholly suitable. Being completely free of public aid would not mean that a family had obtained a decent standard of living, or even earned enough to rise above the poverty line. Even a strict definition of self-sufficiency would not bar families from receiving monetary help from their friends, siblings, or parents, but not all definitions consider standard of living or poverty level as part of the definition. Determining the meaning of self-sufficiency is necessarily subjective. For this project, the study team has designed a survey instrument that would allow for multiple definitions of self-sufficiency.

Households may stop receiving housing assistance for a wide variety of reasons. Some households may experience an increase in income and no longer qualify for assistance. These households may become self-sufficient and no longer need any government assistance. Some households may choose to move from public housing or from a unit where they use a voucher, and incur a greater rent burden to access the private housing market, even though such a move would cause them economic hardship. The households that no longer receive public assistance may face economic hardship and regularly rely on food banks or other nongovernmental resources to meet their basic needs. Similarly, households that stop receiving housing assistance may move in with relatives or friends, have excessive rent burdens, or live in inadequate housing or shelters. Thus, some households that no longer receive either cash or housing assistance still may be poor.

The survey instrument developed for this project addresses housing-related outcomes and employment and earnings outcomes to better understand self-sufficiency issues.

Housing Outcomes

Little research has been conducted on the housing quality and rent burdens of households that no longer receive housing assistance. Addressing such housing outcomes is a key part of measuring overall well-being. For example, do housing conditions improve or worsen when households leave subsidized housing?

A few studies have examined housing outcomes for former residents of subsidized housing, such as the *HOPE VI Resident Tracking Study* (Buron et al. 2002). The study used administrative data

provided by HUD (MTCS) to identify original residents of eight public housing developments after initial moves had occurred. The study tracked a sample of these former residents. Among the original residents from the eight sites, 18 percent had left assisted housing 2 to 5 years after relocation. The Urban Institute's *HOPE VI Panel Study* is tracking residents relocated from five HOPE VI developments to assess long-term effects on housing, socioeconomic status, and overall well-being (Popkin et al. 2002a). Similarly, the *CHA Relocation Assessment* has tracked samples of public housing tenants in Chicago as they are relocated from their public housing units (Popkin and Cunningham 2002). The *Moving to Opportunity for Fair Housing Demonstration* studies public housing residents randomly assigned to three groups: (1) those who receive a voucher to use only in low-poverty census tracts, (2) those who receive a regular voucher with no location restrictions, or (3) those who receive no voucher (the control group). The study tracks these residents intensively over time and surveys them at regular intervals. The *Welfare to Work Voucher Demonstration* tracks households from the housing authority waiting list that were randomly assigned to either receive a special voucher or remain on the waiting list.

These studies focus on a more narrowly defined population of housing assistance recipients than the proposed national study of self-sufficiency. The HOPE VI studies are limited to residents in severely distressed public housing developments, and the MTO demonstration was limited to a sample of residents of public housing in high-poverty areas. Furthermore, many of the households in these studies continue to receive housing assistance in some form, which means that they continue to be included in housing authority or HUD administrative data files, making them somewhat easier to track over time. While these studies can offer insight into the experiences of a subset of assisted housing leavers, they do not provide systematic evidence about the experience of former residents because of the specialized nature of the samples. A study that focuses on the full range of assisted housing leavers, including programs other than public housing, however, could provide detailed information on how these former residents fare in terms of housing quality, hardship, and self-sufficiency.

Employment and Earnings Outcomes

The research on economic outcomes for households that received welfare assistance is much more extensive than similar research on outcomes for subsidized housing leavers. Since the 1996 Personal Work and Opportunity Reconciliation Act, research on welfare reform has shown mixed results regarding short-term outcomes. While welfare rolls have decreased in the past few years, a substantial share of the families who left welfare may be struggling to make ends meet. Many studies have found employment rates of those who continuously remained off welfare to be between 65 and 80 percent. Although many welfare leavers find employment, a substantial portion does not earn enough to raise them out of poverty (Brauner and Loprest 1999). Instead, many rely on noncash government services, such as housing assistance, food stamps, child support, and health insurance. Research shows that those who receive these other types of assistance have the greatest likelihood of remaining off welfare (Loprest 2002a). Even though many families that remain off welfare rely on non-TANF programs, a study of Wisconsin welfare leavers found indications that many faced substantial economic hardship. More than two-thirds said that they were "barely making it," and 32 percent stated they have problems

providing enough food for their families, paying their utility bills, and paying their rent (Brauner and Loprest 1999). National analyses have shown similar patterns (Loprest 2002b).

Households receiving housing assistance and those receiving welfare and food stamps often overlap. It is necessary to consider how the situations of households change with regard to each of these types of assistance. One way to produce a detailed definition of self-sufficiency is to consider two dimensions: public assistance receipt (housing, cash, or food stamps) and household income relative to AMI. It may be useful to further disaggregate the category of “public assistance receipt” to detail whether the assistance provides housing, cash, or food. Other sources of assistance could be included, such as Supplemental Security Income (SSI), veteran’s benefits, and unemployment compensation, depending on the specific area of interest.

Table 1 presents four categories of self-sufficiency using the main three categories of public assistance (housing, cash, and food stamps), ordered from most economically self-sufficient to least. The table presents the categories as possible gradations of more nuanced definitions of self-sufficiency.

<u>Fully</u> self-sufficient	<u>NOT</u> receiving housing assistance, TANF, or food stamps	Above 50 percent AMI ⁵
<u>Housing</u> self-sufficient	<u>NOT</u> receiving housing assistance, but receiving TANF or food stamps	Below 50 percent AMI
<u>Nonassisted precariously</u> self-sufficient	<u>NOT</u> receiving housing assistance, TANF, or food stamps	Below 50 percent AMI
<u>Not</u> self-sufficient	Receiving housing assistance, TANF, and/or food stamps	Below 50 percent AMI

The receipt of assistance is a straightforward measurement, if one examines only whether or not a household receives one or more types of government assistance. Receipt could be determined by survey questions administered to respondents or by matching administrative records from each of the assistance programs. Matching may be more accurate, but could be more expensive and time-consuming than simply including questions on a survey. Deciding what income threshold to use is somewhat arbitrary. Using the federal poverty level allows comparisons across metropolitan areas, but varies tremendously in how well it captures a household’s relative economic status in its own area. A more useful measure is a share of the AMI because it takes into account local cost and income variations. The threshold for income chosen for analysis should reflect the place-specific income necessary to purchase housing and basic necessities.

Research Questions

The research questions and hypotheses described in this section lay the groundwork for developing a survey instrument that researchers will use to measure self-sufficiency outcomes. Previous research and current policy concerns inform two key research questions, which in turn generate nine hypotheses. The first question addresses the differences between households that continue receiving housing assistance and households that stop receiving housing assistance. The second research question focuses on economic and general well-being outcomes.

RESEARCH QUESTION 1: Do the baseline characteristics differ between households that leave housing assistance and households that continue to receive housing assistance (for example, *family composition, presence of children, elderly householder, welfare receipt, employment status, and income*)?

To answer this question, we compare the MTCS and TRACS data for the two groups. Identifying differences among the “stayers” and leavers provides context for interpreting survey results.

We have formulated four hypotheses about the differences between households that no longer receive housing assistance and those households that continue to receive assistance. Each hypothesis is worded in terms of the group most likely to leave housing assistance, followed by the rationale behind the theory. The first two hypotheses pertain only to households leaving *public housing*, and the second two pertain to those who no longer receive *HCVs or other types of assistance*.

Hypothesis 1 (public housing): Households that have lived in public housing less than 5 years are more likely to leave public housing than households that have lived there longer. Households that have lived in public housing for a short time may have had more education and employment experience, and thus were able to find employment or earn more income over the 2-year period examined in this research. Alternatively, households that have lived in public housing for a longer period may have less human capital or may experience barriers to work such as health problems for themselves or other family members.

Hypothesis 2 (public housing): Households with fewer than 3 children under 18 are more likely to leave public housing than households with more children. Households in public housing with 3 or more children under 18 may have difficulty finding adequate housing in the private market.

Hypothesis 3 (HCV, other programs): Households where the head is under 35 years old are more likely to exit housing assistance than households where the head is over 35 years old. In general, older adults receiving housing assistance experience less human capital and more health barriers than younger people, thus, younger heads of households (those under age 35) may be more likely to transition to the workforce or find a better paying job than older heads of household.

The three previous hypotheses deal with leaving assisted housing for positive reasons (for example, an increase in income). Some households stop receiving assistance because their leases are terminated for cause, they are evicted, or in the case of voucher holders, they cannot find a suitable affordable unit. This suggests the need for a hypothesis about people who leave subsidized housing involuntarily.

Hypothesis 4 (HCV, other programs): Households receiving HCVs are more likely to exit housing assistance involuntarily than households living in public housing.

Households living in private market units may have more problems with landlords (for example, noise, teenagers hanging out, and other similar reasons) and/or problems with the financial hardships (such as the cost of utilities) than households living in public housing. In addition, housing units may fail inspection by falling below the Housing Quality Standards, landlords may decide not to accept vouchers, and, when forced to move, voucher holders may be unable to find another unit.

RESEARCH QUESTION 2: How do assisted housing leavers and stayers compare in terms of economic and overall well-being (for example, housing cost burden, housing quality, employment status, wages, duration of welfare receipt, food insecurity, mental health, physical health, marital status, number of children)? Are leavers self-sufficient?

We have formulated five hypotheses about the difference in overall economic and social well-being between households that no longer receive housing assistance and households that continue to receive assistance.

Hypothesis 5: Households that left assistance for voluntary reasons are more likely to be fully self-sufficient than households that left involuntarily. Public housing residents may be terminated through a lease violation and voucher holders may not be able to find new units if they are compelled to move. Leaving subsidized housing under these circumstances would not be associated with self-sufficiency.

Hypothesis 6: Leaver households with two or fewer children are more likely to be self-sufficient than leaver households with more children. Because expenses increase with the number of adults and children in a household, those households with fewer children need less money to support themselves than households with more children do.

Hypothesis 7: Leaver households in looser metropolitan housing markets are more likely to be self-sufficient than leaver households in tight housing markets.⁵ Tight housing markets make life more difficult for low-income households for two reasons: higher housing costs and landlords who are often less willing to accept vouchers when a large pool of nonvoucher families flood the rental market. In a loose housing market, low-income families have more choices and may have an easier time making the transition to private, nonsubsidized housing.

⁵ The housing market analysis could use either vacancy rates or recent average cost increases as an indicator of the “tightness” of the metropolitan area market.

Hypothesis 8: Adults and children in leaver households have better overall health than households that continue receiving assistance.⁶ Research on the MTO demonstration suggests that improvements in neighborhoods positively affect health, particularly mental health. In MTO, this affect was observed among households that moved to low-poverty neighborhoods. Because assisted housing leavers may move to any type of neighborhood, this hypothesis probably only applies to families who move to low-poverty neighborhoods.

Hypothesis 9: Heads of leaver households are more likely to be employed than households that continue receiving assistance. For leavers, more job opportunities may exist in the household's new neighborhoods. Also, Gautreaux (Rubinowitz and Rosenbaum 2000) and MTO research (Goering and Feins 2003) have suggested that when families live in safer neighborhoods, parents (particularly mothers) report feeling more comfortable going to work and being able to leave their children in a safer environment. If leavers, in fact, choose to move to safer neighborhoods, then this hypothesis would pertain.

Survey Design

Using these hypotheses, the study team developed a data collection instrument to gather data on the economic, social, health, and overall well-being of households that no longer receive housing assistance. When possible, the study team used questions that have been included in previous surveys in order to have comparable results. Many of the questions have been used in national surveys (for example, the American Housing Survey [AHS] the NSAF, and the National Health Interview Survey [NHIS]), as well as in surveys that have focused on a range of issues for residents of public housing (for example, the MTO Baseline and Interim Evaluations and the HOPE VI Panel Study). Appendix B contains a list of hypotheses and survey topics.

Table 2 provides an overview of the topics the survey covers and notes the source of the questions, where applicable. (A copy of the survey instrument is attached in Appendix C, which notes the source for every question drawn from another survey.) Some topics were included because they relate to self-sufficiency (such as employment status, income, barriers to work, hardship, health) and others because they pertain to housing status (for example, housing quality, housing status, neighborhood).⁷

⁶ There is no baseline information about health of households in the administrative records. The selectivity factors will be demographic factors such as age, race, and number of children.

⁷ After conducting the pretests, the study team made slight revisions to the survey instrument; however, no topics were eliminated or added as a result.

Housing Quality	Satisfaction Specific problems	AHS, HOPE VI, MTO
Housing Status	Type of public assistance Reason for no longer receiving assistance	Original, AHS
Mobility	Reason for choosing house or apartment Length of residence Type of housing assistance Housing costs Housing hardship	Original, HOPE VI, MTO, NSAF
Neighborhood	Length of residence <i>General neighborhood characteristics/ problems</i> Safety	HOPE VI, MTO
Employment	<u>Employed:</u> Number of jobs currently Hours, wages, and benefits at main job Length of employment at current job Transportation to work How respondent found employment Disability as barrier to retaining employment Type of child care while at work, government assistance <u>Unemployed:</u> Length of unemployment Type of job search Reason for not working Disability status (of self or HH member) Currently enrolled in school Education/training class completion Obstacles for getting a job Child care as barrier to employment	HOPE VI, MTO
Sources of Income and Support	SSI, Social Security Disability Insurance, AFDC, or TANF (current and past receipt), food stamps, WIC (Women, Infants, Children) Unemployment compensation Other work income Child support Money from family and friends	HOPE VI, MTO, NSAF
Finances	Bank account Use of check-cashing businesses	MTO
Hardship	Food shortage Telephone cut off or difficulty paying telephone bills Difficulty paying utility bills Assistance received for mortgage, rent, and/or utilities <u>Renter:</u> Late payments, eviction threats, or complaints from owner or manager <u>Owner:</u> Late payments or threat of foreclosure (or actual foreclosure)	HOPE VI, MTO, NSAF
Health	General health Asthma (presence, asthma attack, visit to ER) Site of routine medical care (for adults and children) Alcohol effects on work, school, or home Activities of daily living Mental health	HOPE VI, MTO, NHIS

SECTION 3: METHODS AND FINDINGS

The first step in this project was to identify the sample using administrative records from HUD, followed by passive tracking methods to obtain current contact information for the respondents. This section of the report details the efforts to identify, locate, and interview former recipients of housing assistance.

Identifying Households That No Longer Receive Housing Assistance

The baseline information on the sample was derived from two administrative data sets maintained by HUD: the MTCS and TRACS. Each of these two data sets comprises several different files, some of which contain household-level information and others that contain individual-level information for all household members.

MTCS is a national database containing information extracted from HUD Form 50058. The local public housing authority inputs the information and transmits it to HUD electronically. This database contains information on the following subsidy programs: Public Housing, HCVs (including Section 8 certificates and vouchers), Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation, and Indian Housing. The MTCS database contains basic demographic and identifying information including Social Security number, name, age, sex, date of birth, ethnicity, race, number of dependents, income, disability, and elderly status. It also notes the type of program, admission date, rent calculation information, gross rent, rent paid by tenant, address, size of unit, household size, inspection date, and utility allowance.

TRACS contains tenant data submitted by owners and management agents of multifamily housing projects, local public housing authorities, and state housing agencies acting as subsidy contract administrators for HUD. The basis for these electronic submissions to TRACS is HUD Form 50059, Owner's Certification of Compliance with HUD's Tenant Eligibility and Rent Procedures, and HUD Form 52670, Housing Owner's Certification & Application for Housing Assistance Payments. The programs covered in TRACS include Section 236 Interest Reduction and Rental Assistance Payments; Section 8 New Construction/Substantial Rehabilitation Housing Assistance Payments; Section 8 Loan Management/Property Disposition Set-Aside Housing Assistance Payments; Section 221(d)(3) Below Market Interest Rate mortgage insurance; and Rent Supplement Payments. TRACS contains the same personal and program information as MTCS.

To identify a sample of households that no longer receive housing assistance, the study team used MTCS and TRACS data for two points in time, 2000 and 2002 (the most recent year for which data were available). The team compiled a list of heads of household in 2000 and determined whether those individuals also headed a household that received assistance in 2002.⁸

⁸ For this project, the study team only tracked the head of each household. It was not determined whether *other* household members receive assistance; however, because the MTCS and TRACS data contain Social Security Numbers for each individual in the household, it would be possible to track each adult member of the household.

The study team then compared the lists of leavers from each file to identify instances where households had stopped receiving one type of assistance and started receiving another type of assistance. (One example would be a household that had received a voucher in 2000 [MTCS], but by 2002 had moved to a subsidized unit in a multifamily housing development [TRACS]). Using this method, the study team estimated the number of 2000 households that still received assistance in 2002.⁹ Starting with the MTCS and TRACS population in Washington D.C, researchers used the following selection criteria:

- The household received housing assistance in 2000.
- The head of the household was not elderly or disabled.¹⁰
- The household did not receive housing assistance in 2002.

Researchers used two methods to determine that households present in 2000 no longer received assistance in 2002: (1) no record of the household existed in 2002 or (2) records indicated that the household exited assistance in 2002. Because, for the most part, only the former method was available for the TRACS files (see section below on “Missing Data”), the number of leavers from TRACS is underestimated.

The study team began with a database of approximately 15,500 MTCS and 12,000 TRACS records for heads of households from administrative files for the District of Columbia and determined that of these 27,500 households, 580 households no longer received assistance (see Table 3). Researchers selected a sample of 107 of the 580 and used passive tracking methods to locate them. Appendix A contains the details of the process used to identify those who no longer receive assistance.

	<i>Stopped receiving assistance</i>	<i>Continued receiving assistance</i>
MTCS	6.1% (513)	93.9% (7,856)
TRACS	2.5% (91)	97.5% (3,557)
Total	580*	11,413

*A total of 604 households stopped receiving the type of assistance they had received in 2000; however, 24 of those households moved between the MTCS and TRACS files between 2000 and 2002.

⁹ It is possible that a household received housing assistance in 2000 and 2002, but did not receive it in 2001. In addition, the authors' estimates assume accurate reporting by housing authorities.

¹⁰ These households are excluded from this research project because they are not subject to the same expectations for self-sufficiency as able-bodied, working-age adults.

Missing Data

Missing data made it difficult to identify leavers in the TRACS files. Two fields in the TRACS files are used to determine whether a household has left subsidized housing. The first field shows the type of transaction that took place (for example, move out or termination of assistance). The second field indicates the reason for termination. Several of the reasons for termination do not actually involve an exit from subsidized housing, but rather are due to temporary problems such as missing information or late recertification, which would not be considered an exit from assisted housing.

For the 2000 TRACS files, about 17 percent of the households that were coded as “move out” or “termination of assistance” in the type of transaction field were missing a code in the reason for termination field. In the 2002 TRACS files, *94 percent* of cases with a “move out” or “termination of assistance” code in the type of transaction field were missing an entry in the reason for termination field. These cases probably represent late recertification. Thus, the count of leavers from the TRACS data is a lower bound estimate. A large proportion of missing data raises concerns for being able to use these data for a national pilot. The data may be missing because housing authorities and owners failed to complete the required information or because of problems in the database. This issue needs to be addressed before researchers can rely on these administrative data for information about terminations.

Analysis of Characteristics of Leavers and Nonleavers

The study team conducted a simple analysis that compares the demographic characteristics of households that stopped receiving housing assistance between 2000 and 2002 and those that continued to receive housing assistance in 2000 and 2002 in the District of Columbia. Overall, only slight differences separated those who remained in public housing and those who left, with the notable exception of income. Table 4 presents these analyses separately for households in MTCS and TRACS.

	<i>Leavers</i>	<i>Stayers</i>	<i>Leavers</i>	<i>Stayers</i>
Average age of householder	37.2	37.7	33.9	34.9
Male householder	12.0%	8.0%	10.0%	15.0%
Children under 18 in household	80.0%	79.0%	75.0%	77.0%
Average household income in 2000	\$10,208	\$8,883	\$15,111	\$10,446
N*	469	7856	84	3557

* Some cases were missing data for relevant demographic characteristics (44 in MTCS and 7 in TRACS).

Source: 2000 MTCS and 2000 TRACS data

The average age and percentage of male householders was similar for leavers and stayers in 2000, as indicated in Table 4. Furthermore, these characteristics were similar for the households

receiving assistance in both the MTCS and TRACS files. The average income was higher for both stayers and leavers in TRACS compared with MTCS. The data also demonstrated that households that left housing assistance by 2002 had higher incomes in 2000 than households that continued receiving assistance. It is possible that those who left the voucher program had an increase in their income that no longer qualified them to receive assistance. All leaver households had consistently higher incomes than stayer households across all categories.

Locating Former Recipients of Housing Assistance

After identifying the sample of leaver households, the next step involved obtaining current contact information to conduct survey pretests. Because this sample had stopped receiving assistance by 2002, the researchers based the searches for current contact information on the addresses and telephone numbers in the 2000 data files.

Active and passive are two types of tracking researchers use to find individual contact information (for a fuller discussion of these techniques, see Feins, McInnis, and St. George 1999). Active tracking techniques involve direct contact with the potential respondent, either by phone, mail, or in person. Passive tracking techniques do not require direct contact with the sample member, but use other sources that contain information about that person (for example, credit databases, U.S. Postal Service databases, telephone directories, internet searches, and so forth). Passive tracking is usually used in combination with active tracking to make it easier to (re)contact a sample for a follow-up survey. Relying solely on passive tracking methods, the study team attempted to locate a sample identified from administrative records that contained information approximately 3 years old. Passive methods have the benefit of being relatively inexpensive and they do not burden respondents; they may fail, however, to provide sufficient information to successfully contact households.

Other studies that have investigated outcomes for households moving from assisted housing have used passive tracking methods to locate their baseline samples, but only after having had the opportunity to establish direct contact with the sample population through recruitment or other methods. The HOPE VI Tracking Study, the HOPE VI Panel Study, the MTO demonstration, and the WtW demonstration have used similar tracking methodologies. Each of these studies gathered detailed contact information from respondents at baseline, while they were living in public housing or actively enrolled in a program, and at subsequent rounds of the study gathered current contact information on the same sample. These studies combined active tracking methods (such as interwave mailings) and passive tracking methods (such as regular searches of MTCS, the National Change of Address [NCOA] database, and credit bureaus) to keep in contact with the sample.

The current study tests the efficacy of relying solely on the use of passive tracking methods to contact households identified as leavers from the MTCS and TRACS administrative files. Using the name, Social Security number (SSN), and most recent address and telephone number for each leaver household, the study team attempted to find current information from several sources. The team drew a random sample of 100 households from the list of 580 households that had stopped receiving housing assistance between 2000 and 2002. This sample was used for two purposes: to

test tracking techniques and to provide a pool of respondents to conduct a pretest of the survey instrument.

After compiling the list of leavers from MTCS and TRACS, the study team searched for their current addresses and telephone numbers using the Lexis-Nexis Risk Management System. In a single search, this system identifies a person by accessing information from multiple sources, including the following: NCOA from the U.S. Postal Service; credit bureaus, such as Equifax; the Department of Motor Vehicles; voter registrations; tax liens; uniform commercial code liens; state professional licenses; and inmate records. The system also includes information from other sources about real estate assets, bankruptcy records, jury verdicts, civil and criminal filings, and news articles that may contain the person's name.

To conduct a search, Lexis-Nexis requires a single identifier, which could be an SSN, first name, last name, address, or other term (such as words associated with that person). Because SSNs are unique, they are the best and most reliable identifier with which to conduct searches. All searches conducted through Lexis-Nexis were done using SSNs.

Lexis-Nexis offers various types of searches to obtain different kinds of information, including bankruptcy records and information on the person's spouse, business partners, and even neighborhoods. (This detailed report is called the "SmartLinx™ Comprehensive Person Report.") The study team only searched for the most recent contact information. The search results for each SSN produced an HTML file, which included name variations, phone numbers, addresses, spousal information, and the date that the record was last updated. In cases in which multiple records had the same date and conflicting contact information, all records were retained. For some SSNs, Lexis-Nexis returned information on several different people who might be matches. To resolve this, the name and previous addresses produced by the search was compared to the name and address in the HUD databases.

When the list of 100 leavers was matched with Lexis-Nexis data, 7 SSNs were returned with unusable results. Six searches had names that did not match the name attached to that SSN in MTCS or TRACS. It is likely that these SSNs were incorrectly entered in the original files. The seventh case returned no information. To have 100 households as a base sample to use for tracking and conducting the pretest, the study team added an additional seven households to the sample to replace the cases where Lexis-Nexis searches provided incomplete information. Thus, the final sample included 107 cases, 7 of which did not have useful contact information.

Considerable difficulties were encountered contacting the first 40 households in the sample at the most recent addresses listed in Lexis-Nexis (detailed later in the Survey Implementation section), at which point another search was conducted using the NCOA. NCOA data are included in the Lexis-Nexis database; however, the study team wanted to use the direct source to confirm that time lags or data-cleaning procedures had resulted in less recent information when obtaining the data through Lexis-Nexis. The vendor that was used to get the NCOA data updates its files every weekend, while some Lexis-Nexis sources are updated only monthly. The study team retained the information (names and SSNs) about the seven households for whom they did not originally receive data from the Lexis-Nexis searches. The team included these households in the NCOA searches, and used their baseline data to continue to attempt to locate them.

The final updated files for all 107 households included *all* addresses and phone numbers obtained from MTCS, TRACS, the Lexis-Nexis searches, and the updated NCOA data. The details are summarized in Table 5 below.

<p>499 addresses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ 85 from MTCS/TRACS○ 373 from Lexis-Nexis○ 41 from NCOA database <p>125 phone numbers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ 95 from MTCS/TRACS and Lexis-Nexis○ 30 from NCOA database
--

Some of the 499 addresses were similar but not exact (i.e., the same street but a different apartment number), and the study team attempted to contact respondents at all of the address variations. Most of the phone numbers did not have area codes. Because all respondents were originally from the Washington, D.C., area, all three local area codes (202, 301, and 703) were tried when dialing the numbers. After the search, however, 25 households still lacked telephone numbers.

Tracking Costs

The basic cost for a search for name and contact information from Lexis-Nexis is \$5 per search. The more detailed searches that include an individual's financial, criminal, and marital information cost \$20 per search. For the purposes of this project, such detailed information was not necessary. For this relatively small-scale project, it was easier to search using the web-based interface Lexis-Nexis offered. For a larger-scale version, however, it would be possible to run a batch search to locate several thousand people. Lexis-Nexis offers discounted rates for processing large numbers of searches. Alternatively, Lexis-Nexis will negotiate a monthly flat fee that enables an organization to conduct unlimited searches. For the full-scale pilot of this research project, such a negotiated agreement would be the most cost-efficient means to obtain contact information for thousands of households.

The study team also obtained updated phone numbers and addresses from Lorton Data, another company that packages data from several sources. The cost for the address search from Lorton Data is \$4.75 per 1,000 records, with a minimum project charge of \$65. The address data are provided to Lorton Data by the NCOA database, which is maintained and updated weekly by the U.S. Postal Service. The phone number information, which is updated daily, was provided from telephone directories, Department of Motor Vehicle files, credit card companies, and magazine subscriptions. The cost for the most comprehensive residential phone number search is \$82 per 1,000 records, with a minimum project charge of \$200.

Conducting Survey Pretests

Contacting Respondents

As discussed in the section on locating former residents of subsidized housing, the study team encountered much difficulty contacting survey respondents. Before the team began telephoning respondents, we sent letters to all 499 addresses informing the potential respondents that interviewers would be contacting them by phone in the next few weeks and requesting their participation in the research project. (The letter is included in Appendix C.) Because the study team did not have accurate phone numbers for most of the sample, the letter provided two ways for respondents to make contact : (1) a telephone number to call and provide contact information and (2) a self-addressed stamped envelope with a form to provide a phone number and a convenient time to call.

About a week after the letters, were sent, the interviewers made initial phone calls to briefly explain the purpose of the research and ask respondents if they were willing to participate in the survey. If they made contact, interviewers conducted the survey, scheduled a time to visit the household, or scheduled a time to call back to conduct the survey. Table 6 summarizes the results of the attempts to contact the respondents.

<p>Of the 499 addresses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 173 were returned to sender• 8 returned forms with updated phone information• 9 called in willing to participate
<p>Of the 125 phone numbers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 83 were disconnected/not in service or wrong numbers• 28 had working phone numbers but researchers were unable to make contact• 9 completed surveys

Interviewers were unable to contact approximately half of the original sample of 107 households (see Table 7). They were successful in confirming a correct telephone number or address for 28 households; however, they were unable to contact them to conduct the survey. Ultimately, interviewers completed nine pretests.

Table 7. Disposition of Final Sample		
107 (original size)	-52	No accurate contact information
55	-28	Did not complete survey, but confirmed that all contact data was accurate
27	-18	Misclassification of housing assistance status (in 2000 or current)
9 (successful completions)		

The large amount of incorrect or out-of-date contact information demonstrates that either additional sources of contact information for tracking respondents or a different sample selection method is necessary to ensure a better response rate. Some suggestions for more effective research designs are discussed in Section 4: Conclusions and Recommendations.

Conducting Interviews

The study team developed different versions of the survey instrument, each to be administered to no more than nine households in order to comply with Office of Management and Budget requirements. Because interviewers conducted a total of only nine pre-tests, however, they did not have a need to use different versions of the survey. All pretests were conducted using the full-length survey instrument.

Before administering the surveys, interviewers were trained to conduct the survey and the postsurvey interview. Interviewers were also instructed on the proper procedures for making initial contact with the respondents, scheduling interviews, and completing the postsurvey form.

Interviewers conducted nine surveys with respondents in households that were no longer receiving assistance. Two surveys were administered in person and seven were conducted by telephone.¹¹ For the in-person surveys, before beginning the interview, each respondent signed a consent form. For surveys conducted over the phone, interviewers obtained verbal consent. The main survey lasted approximately 30 minutes, with follow-up questions taking approximately 10 minutes. Respondents were paid \$20 for their participation.¹²

¹¹ Interviewers conducted the surveys both in person and by telephone to maximize the utility of this pretest. The full-scale survey would likely have to be conducted by telephone because of costs, although if a smaller scale pilot survey were planned, in-person surveys would be preferable.

¹² The interviewers gave cash to those with whom they met in person and mailed cashiers' checks to respondents who completed the survey by phone.

The follow-up questions focused on items in the survey that seemed confusing to the respondents, as well as probes for additional information about the respondents' experiences since leaving housing assistance. (The questions are included as Appendix C, "Cognitive Questions.") Primarily, researchers were interested in why families left assistance and how they have fared since leaving assistance. These issues are difficult to cover in a survey format, but the follow-up discussions helped researchers identify a few additional items that they could add to the survey to help better understand the experiences of families who leave housing assistance.

Lessons from the Pretest

Based on the pretests, the study team made several types of changes to the survey instrument: (1) edited introductions throughout the survey, (2) edited the wording of specific questions, (3) added answer categories, and (4) edited skip patterns.

Two key issues were also identified from the cognitive interviews:

- 1. Some respondents do not know they are living in subsidized housing.** A few people who passed the two screener questions on the survey about whether they receive a housing subsidy (they said that they did not) told interviewers later in the survey, in response to questions about how much they pay for rent, that their rent varied according to what their income was in a given month. These respondents were likely living in project-based multifamily housing but were unaware that they were receiving assistance. In such situations, building management, not the housing authority, usually does the rent calculations; therefore, respondents may not consider the rent reductions as assistance. This issue is not unique to the current survey, but it points out that further work is needed to develop questions to accurately measure housing assistance status. One solution to this problem would be to use HUD's administrative records that list addresses of all multifamily projects, so that researchers could search for the respondent's address to confirm whether or not that household was living in assisted housing.
- 2. Some respondents who appear self-sufficient are actually experiencing financial strains.** Some respondents who answered that they had not experienced hardship with food, housing payments, or utilities talked about other financial challenges they experienced that were not captured in the survey questions. For example, one woman had stopped receiving voucher assistance when she bought a condominium. She has a full-time job, but her husband has recently gone on temporary disability, and they were struggling to pay the mortgage. Studies of families cycling in and out of welfare receipt suggest that households that appear to attain self-sufficiency may be barely above that threshold and minor fluctuations in their employment status or an unexpected expense may cause them to experience serious financial difficulties.

SECTION 4: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Both researchers and policymakers are interested in the role housing assistance plays in helping individuals become self-sufficient. Without understanding how housing assistance has affected the socioeconomic well-being of former residents, it is impossible to assess the impact of additional efforts by HUD or local housing authorities to promote self-sufficiency. This study is a test of a method to locate residents who have left assisted housing in order to provide detailed information about their current self-sufficiency outcomes.

This report describes the methodology developed to identify, locate, and survey households that have stopped receiving housing assistance. The report has described the administrative data sources used to identify the households and noted several critical problems with the data files. The study team found that reliance on passive tracking to locate households that have left subsidized housing is not effective in generating a sufficient sample size to conduct a full-scale survey. Finally, this report describes the survey design and highlights a few concerns about asking respondents to self-report their housing assistance status. Based on these findings, the most critical need is to design an alternative sampling strategy to obtain better contact information on former residents of subsidized housing.

Recommendations

Clearly defining what kinds of outcomes households experience after leaving housing assistance is one key task of a full-scale pilot project. The more pressing task, however, is to design a strategy to contact and elicit responses from a reasonable share of respondents in a cost-effective manner. Based on our experiences in obtaining current data files, matching MTCS and TRACS administrative data, locating the sample of respondents, and conducting a pretest, we have made recommendations for a pilot phase of the project. The first two recommendations (1.a. and 1.b.) are intended to help identify the sample more accurately and achieve an adequate sample size for inferential analysis. The second two recommendations (2.a. and 2.b.) are intended to improve the quality of the data and utility of the findings in a larger scale study.

1. Improve Tracking

a. Improve the access to and accuracy of administrative data sources

The sample for the pretest was drawn from HUD administrative data sources. Analysis using the HUD data was also conducted for a few demographic characteristics of the sample. The first task was to receive all pertinent data files from HUD, but there was a delay of several months in receiving the complete set of files. Such a delay could be a major obstacle for a pilot or full-scale implementation of this survey project. *Timely release of the data is critical.*

The TRACS data files contained missing data for a majority of households on a variable that is key for this project—namely, the reason for termination of assistance. (This issue was discussed

in the matching section earlier in the report.) The data may be missing because housing authorities and owners fail to complete the required information or because of problems in the database. The amount of missing data was large and led to what is certainly an underestimate of the number of households that left housing assistance. ***HUD should determine the causes for missing data and then provide technical assistance to those responsible for reporting, with a specific focus on those variables that are considered critical for measuring program performance.***

Correctly determining a household's assistance status is difficult to ascertain from survey questions. It has been documented that households often incorrectly report the type of assistance they receive and even whether they receive assistance. While it was not a focus of this pretest to determine who incorrectly identified their housing status, a number of instances occurred in which discrepancies between survey responses and the MTCS and TRACS data existed. For instance, some respondents reported that they had never received housing assistance, despite the fact that they were listed in the 2000 files as receiving assistance. Others reported that they were receiving the same assistance since 2000, whereas the records for 2002 did not list them, suggesting a failure on the part of the housing authority to accurately report the information in a timely manner. Finally, a few households that initially stated that they were not receiving assistance indicated later in the cognitive interview that their rent fluctuates depending on their income, indicating that they are in a project-based unit where rent is tied to income. This problem results from two errors: incorrect administrative data and misreporting on the part of respondents. This problem is currently being investigated in another research project: results of that project should be used to revise the survey. ***Further efforts to refine survey questions to accurately identify respondents' housing assistance status will benefit a pilot survey.***

b. Develop alternative ways to contact respondents

Even if the MTCS and TRACS files were complete and accurate, locating and contacting respondents would still be challenging. Exclusive reliance on passive tracking to obtain telephone and address contacts does not produce a reasonable response rate. The Lexis-Nexis searches and NCOA database searches returned information for a substantial share of the target sample; however, the information was often out of date or incorrect. Poor households have higher mobility rates than nonpoor households, and any available administrative contact information for this population may quickly become out of date. Furthermore, an increasing share of households rely on the cell phone as their only phone, and the study team is not aware of any databases that include cell phone numbers. ***Another method is needed to locate these households.***

Recent studies about households that no longer receive welfare (TANF or [AFDC]) have used a variety of methods for defining and successfully contacting their samples. Many of these studies have focused on a single city or state, drawn a sample of households currently receiving assistance, and then tracked those households over time (Acs and Loprest 2001; Jarchow, Tweedie, and Wilkins 2002). Some of the most effective methods of improving sample response rates are the following:

1. Complete special forms at program intake to gather detailed contact and household information.

2. Build tracking into preexisting automated systems.
3. Verify address and phone numbers with different sources.
4. Be persistent and flexible in scheduling (Ganzglass et al. 1998).

The pretests conducted for this project used options 3 and 4 (using outside sources for contact information and flexibility in scheduling). Using special forms and building in tracking involve establishing a baseline sample that is followed over time. These methods are effective for retaining a sample, but they add to the overall cost and increase the time needed to complete a project. ***Random sampling of respondents at a limited number of sites, as opposed to a full-scale national study, would provide a strategic use of limited resources that would likely result in a higher response rate for households that stop receiving housing assistance.***

2. Improve Data Quality

a. Use additional administrative records from other federal sources

Another way to examine the economic well-being of former housing assistance recipients is to enter into data sharing agreements with other state and federal organizations, such as the U.S. Department of Labor and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. HUD could access unemployment insurance, wage records, and new hires databases to obtain additional data on whether the respondents are employed or unemployed in legal occupations, type of occupation, income, amount of child support, and so forth, which would significantly contribute to the analysis. ***Data sharing agreements with state and federal organizations would provide a low-cost source of additional data about self-sufficiency outcomes.***

b. Incorporate qualitative work

While surveys are an efficient way to gather data on large samples, it may be fruitful to conduct in-depth interviews with a small sample of households. In-depth interviews in the HOPE VI and MTO studies (Popkin, Harris, and Cunningham 2001; Popkin et al. 2002a; Buron et al. 2002) have yielded important information that would not have been learned from quantitative survey work. From the pretest and other studies, we understand some of the ways that low-income families' lives are complex and may change relatively quickly. For low-income families, even slight changes in income can mean that they do not have enough food, their utilities are disconnected, or they are unable to pay their housing costs and may face eviction. ***Qualitative interviews can provide a better understanding of the survival strategies of families who are tenuously self-sufficient.***

REFERENCES

- Acs, Gregory and Pamela Loprest with Tracy Roberts. 2001. *Final Synthesis Report of Findings from ASPA "Leavers" Grants*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press.
- Bliss, Steven, and James Riccio. 2001. *Promoting Employment in Public Housing Communities: Learning from the Jobs-Plus Demonstration*. Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation Policy Brief. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.
- Brauner, S. and P. Loprest. 1999. *Where Are They Now? What States' Studies of People Who Left Welfare Tell Us*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press.
- Buron, L., S. Popkin, D. Levy, L. Harris, and J. Khadduri. 2002. *The HOPE VI Resident Tracking Study: A Snapshot of the Current Living Situation of Original Residents from Eight Sites*. Report to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Bethesda, MD: Abt Associates, Inc.
- Feins, Judith D., Debra McInnis, and Anne St. George. 1999. *Moving to Opportunity Tracking and Data Systems: Tracking Effectiveness Report*. Prepared for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, Inc.
- Ganzglass, Evelyn, Susan Golonka, Jack Tweedie, and Suzanne Fialk. 1998. "Tracking Welfare Reform: Designing Followup Studies of Recipients Who Leave Welfare." Report prepared for the conference, "Tracking and Followup Under Welfare Reform," sponsored by the National Governors' Association Center for Best Practices, the National Conference of State Legislatures, and the American Public Welfare Association (February 26–27, 1998). Accessed September 2003 at <http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/isp/ngancsl.htm> Falls Church, VA.
- Goering, John and Judith D. Feins (eds.). 2003. *Choosing a Better Life?: Evaluating the Moving to Opportunity Social Experiment*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press.
- Jarchow, Courtney, Jack Tweedie, and Andrea Wilkins. 2002. *Description of State Leaver Studies*. Washington, D.C.: National Conference of State Legislatures.
- Loprest, P. 2002a. *Who Returns to Welfare?* Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press.
- 2002b. "Making the Transition from Welfare to Work: Successes but Continuing Concerns." In Alan Weil and Kenneth Feingold (eds) *Welfare Reform: The Next Act*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press: 17–32.
- Newman, S. and J. Harkness. 2002. "The Long-Term Effects of Public Housing on Self-Sufficiency." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 21(1).
- Orr, Larry, Judith D. Feins, Robin Jacob, Erik Beecroft, Lisa Sanbonmatsu, Lawrence F. Katz, Jeffrey B. Liebman, and Jeffrey R. Kling. 2003. *Moving to Opportunity Interim Impacts Evaluation*. Prepared for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research.
- Popkin, S. and M. Cunningham. 2002. *CHA Relocation Counseling Assessment*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press.

- Popkin, S., D. Levy, L. Harris, J. Comey, M. Cunningham, and L. Buron. 2002a. *HOPE VI Panel Study: Baseline Report*. Report to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.
- Popkin S.J., D.K. Levy, L.E. Harris, J. Comey, Mary K. Cunningham, Larry F. Buron, with William T. Woodley. 2002b. *HOPE VI Panel Study: Baseline Report*. Report to The Annie E. Casey Foundation, The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, and U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press, September.
- Popkin, Susan J., and Mary K. Cunningham. 2002. *CHA Relocation and Mobility Counseling Assessment Final Report*. Report prepared by the Urban Institute for the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.
- Popkin, Susan J., Larry Buron, Diane Levy, and Mary Cunningham. 2000. "The Gautreaux Legacy: What Might Mixed-Income and Dispersal Strategies Mean for the Poorest Public Housing Tenants?" *Housing Policy Debate* 11(4): 911–42.
- Popkin, Susan J., Laura Harris, and Mary Cunningham. 2001. *Families in transition: A qualitative analysis of the MTO experience, final report*. Report prepared by the Urban Institute for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.
- Quane, J.M., B. Rankin, and P. Joshi. 2002. *Housing Assistance, Housing Costs, and Welfare Reform*. Welfare Children and Families Policy Brief 02-4. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University.
- Rubinowitz, Leonard S., and James E. Rosenbaum. 2000. *Crossing the Class and Color Lines: From Public Housing to White Suburbia*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Shroder, Mark. 2002. "Does Housing Assistance Perversely Affect Self-Sufficiency? A Review Essay." *Journal of Housing Economics* 11:381–417.
- Zedlewski, S. 2002. *The Importance of Housing Benefits to Welfare Success*. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution and The Urban Institute Press.

APPENDIX A: TECHNICAL ISSUES

Determining Housing Assistance Status

To identify households that had received housing assistance in 2000 but no longer received assistance in 2002, the study team worked with Multifamily Tenant Characteristics System (MTCS) and Tenant Rental Assistance Certification System (TRACS) databases for both years. For MTCS and TRACS, several files make up each database (see Tables A1 and A2 below). These data files came with minimal documentation, which made this step in the research project relatively time-consuming.

CERTADD (program data)	TRANS_TYPE, EFF_DT and unit address for tenants receiving certificates
PUBLIC (program data)	Ceiling rent, tenant rent, utility allowance, and the number of people in the family for tenants in public housing
S8GEO (program data)	Households enrolled in Section 8 rental subsidy programs
VOUCH (program data)	TRANS_TYPE, EFF_DT and address for households receiving Housing Choice Vouchers (HCVs)
FAMILY (households)	Name, age, date of birth, and disability information for all household members
HSH (households)	Information about household heads using the TRANS_TYPE and EFF_DT fields in this table (including income and assets)

For this study, we used data in seven MTCS fields, drawn from the six main data files that compose the MTCS database (see Table A1 above). “Head_SSN” identifies the head of household’s Social Security number (SSN) and this field links records across different MTCS tables. To identify when a tenant left subsidized housing, we looked at both the “TRANS_TYPE” and “EFF_DT” fields. TRANS_TYPE shows the type of transaction for an entry; whether the entry is for a new admission, re-examination, move-out, or end of

participation. The EFF_DT field represents the date on which the transaction took (or will take) place. In addition, we also used the fields that include name, age, elderly, and disability status.

ARCHIVE_CERTIFIED_HOUSEHOLD	Contains information such as certification dates, family income, area code of the unit, project number, project name, move in date, rent, utility allowance, and dependent information
ARCHIVE_HOUSEHOLD_MEMBER	Holds personal information such as the name, sex, and date of birth of the tenant and any dependents also in subsidized housing
ARCHIVE_MEMBER_INCOME	Contains information about the tenant's income

In TRACS, the common field linking the records across tables is the SSN for the head of household. TRACS also has a “TRANSACT_TYPE” field, which shows the type of transaction the entry represents, “TRANS_EFF_DT” shows when the transaction took (or will take) effect, and “TERMINATION_REASON” shows the reason why the TRANSACT_TYPE might show a termination of assistance (which could be due to a genuine termination or a late recertification). Using these three fields, it is possible to determine if and when a tenant left subsidized housing. The fields were drawn from the three main data files that compose the TRACS database (see Table A2 above).

The remaining sections of this appendix describe in detail how the sample was determined for the two databases in the 2 years of interest.

From MTCS 2000 – Total 15,839 tenant records

Selected only cases where the household was currently receiving assistance (transaction type=new admission, annual reexamination, interim reexamination, portability move-in, or change of unit). The MTCS has five tables, which correspond to the five programs covered by MTCS. The transaction type field can be found either in the program table or in the household table for each program file.

Reduced the initial data set by 1,757 records to 14,082 records.

Removed records where the head of household was coded as elderly or disabled.

Reduced data set in Step 1 by 5,530 records to 8,552 records.

From MTCS 2002 – Total 15,394 tenants records

Used two approaches to identify leavers:

Using the type of action field (the equivalent of the transaction type field in MTCS 2000), where type of action = 6 (end of participation); effective date; elderly; and disabled fields, selected those tenants that left subsidized housing between 2000 and 2002 who are not disabled or elderly.

Reduced the initial data set by 15,250 records to 144 records.

Compared a list of all tenant SSNs in MTCS 2002 with a list of continuing tenants from MTCS 2000. Obtained a list of tenants present in 2000 and not present in 2002 and assumed that those not in the 2002 database have left subsidized housing.

Resulted in 369 records.

The final list of leavers between 2000 and 2002 from MTCS was comprised of 513 records (144 in step 3 and 369 in step 4).

From TRACS 2000 – Total 9,528 records

Selected only cases where transact field indicated that the household was currently receiving assistance (all except “move out” and “termination of assistance”).

Reduced initial data set by 7,255 records to 2,273 records.

Removed cases where the head of household was coded as elderly or disabled.

Reduced data set by 923 records to 1,350 records.

From TRACS 2002 – Total 11,941 records

Using transact and termination reason fields where transact = move out, or termination of assistance and reason = subsidy contract expired or contract terminated through enforcement action, got a list of tenants who have left subsidized housing.

Resulted in 0 records.

Note: Using just the transact field without the termination reason clause resulted in 898 records of which:

4 records had termination reason = LR (temporarily paying market rent till re-certification)

8 records had termination reason = TM (unknown—not in data dictionary)

11 records had termination reason = TR (did not recertify in time)

35 records had termination reason = TI (TTP equals/exceeds gross rent)

840 records had no termination reason

It is necessary to use the termination reason to determine if the record represents a genuine termination as opposed to a late recertification.

Compared a list of all tenant SSNs in TRACS 2002 with list of continuing tenants from TRACS 2000, which resulted in a list of tenants present in the 2000 list and not in the 2002 list. Assumed that those not in the 2002 database have left subsidized housing.

Resulted in 91 records.

The final list of leavers from TRACS had 91 records (0 records from step 3 and 91 records from step 4).

Compare MTCS 2002 List and TRACS 2002 List

Excluded all tenants that had crossed over from the MTCS final list to TRACS 2002.

Reduced MTCS final list from 513 to 496.

Excluded all tenants that had crossed over from the TRACS final list to the MTCS 2002.

Reduced TRACS final list from 91 to 84.

The final sample of households leaving assistance was composed of 580 records (496 records from MTCS in step 1 and 84 records from TRACS in step 2).

Matching Challenges

The study team encountered some challenges in the process of extracting data to select the sample. This information will be useful if data are extracted for a full-scale pilot study. The key challenges are described below.

1. When trying to import files using the Access import feature, Access did not recognize the dbf files if they did not conform to its naming conventions.

Resolution: The files were renamed to be less than eight characters, and eliminated punctuation marks and underscores. The database tables resulting from the import may have the full name that the original files had.

2. Sometimes it was necessary to compare the same table across different years; however, some field names have changed and this created conflicts with the tables.

Resolution: It is possible to use aliasing within SQL, but this can sometimes present problems when using imported files. It was better to re-name the fields in both tables and then compare.

3. During the import process, the equivalent data-type of the field changed for one of the key identifiers – the SSN.

Resolution: Since the SSN was the primary identifier in most tables, it was necessary to check the SSN through different tables to be sure that the fields were consistent.

4. Sometimes when running a query, the query took a long time to execute and after execution, the program Access ‘hung’ when scrolling through results

Resolution: Since we worked with static tables, it was more efficient to create the query as a Make Table Query, which created a new table with the results.

APPENDIX B: CROSSWALK OF HYPOTHESES AND SURVEY TOPICS

The study team selected survey topics based on the research questions and hypotheses laid out in the Research Design phase of this project. The hypotheses presented below pertain to analyses that require survey data, followed by the relevant survey data that may be used to test each hypothesis.

Main topics: Reason for leaving (Housing Status)
TANF
Food stamps
HH Income

*Related topics: Other Sources of Income and Support
Other Hardship questions*

Main topics: Roster Information – Number of children
TANF
Food stamps
HH income

*Related topics: Hardship questions
Employment status
Unemployed
Child care as barrier to employment
Reason for not working
Other sources of income
Owner or manager complaints about interviewee as a renter*

Main topics: TANF

Food stamps

HH income

Related topics: Reason for choosing house or apartment

Satisfaction (Housing quality)

Housing costs

Housing hardship

(Additional Local Housing Market Data)

Main topics: Length of residence

General health

Asthma

Alcohol effects on work, school, or home

Mental health

Related topics: Specific problems (Housing Quality)

Reason for choosing house or apartment

Length of residence

General neighborhood characteristics or problems

Employment status

HH income

Main topics: Length of residence

Employment status

Length of employment at current job

Related topics: Specific problems (Housing Quality)

Reason for choosing house or apartment

Length of residence (Neighborhood)

General Neighborhood Characteristics/Problems

Safety (Neighborhood)

General Health

APPENDIX C: FIELD DOCUMENTS



Laura E. Harris
Research Associate
Metropolitan Housing and Communities

Direct Dial: (202) 261-5332
Fax: (202) 87-9322
E-mail: lharris@ui.urban.org

DATE
NAME
ADDRESS
CITY, STATE ZIP

Dear NAME,

The Urban Institute is conducting a study funded by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). As part of this study, we are conducting interviews with people who used to receive housing assistance (public housing, Section 8, vouchers, or other housing programs). Our records indicate that you were receiving federal housing assistance in 2000, but that you no longer receive assistance.

In the next few weeks, we will be conducting interviews with a small sample of households. We are interested in the experiences of people since they have stopped receiving housing assistance. The interview includes questions about housing, neighborhoods, and general topics about the household.

- The interviews will last approximately 30-45 minutes. Selected households will receive **\$20** to cover their time.
- We will conduct some interviews on the phone and others in-person.
- The interviews will be held during **August 2003**.

If selected, your participation will in no way affect your housing and your comments will not be linked to your name. We want participants to speak openly and honestly, and will keep names confidential.

If you would be willing to participate in our study, please contact Deborah at **202/261-5567** or return the enclosed postcard with a number where you can be reached. Your cooperation and support are vital to making this study a success. We hope to hear from you soon.

Sincerely,

Laura Harris

CONSENT FORM

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION

This survey is being conducted by the Urban Institute. The survey should last approximately 30 - 45 minutes.

I have volunteered to be interviewed to discuss my experiences after I stopped receiving housing assistance.

- I understand that participating is completely voluntary. I can choose not to answer any question.
- I understand that the researchers on this study will keep identifying information about me confidential; my name and contact information will not be released to anyone.
- I understand that the information I provide will never be linked with my name.
- I understand I will receive \$20 for my participation in this interview.

If I have any questions about this study, I may contact the project director, Laura Harris, at 202/261-5332.

Signature
.....
.....
.....Date

Respondent Name (please print)

ID # _____

***Survey Pre-test for
Former Assisted Housing Residents***

2003

KEY:

CAPI stands for Computer Aided Personal Interview. These remarks in the survey indicate places where CAPI should already know certain information - either from the MTCS/TRACS data, tracking information, or previous answers given in this survey.

Answers typed in ALL CAPS are not read aloud to respondent.

Many of the questions in this survey have been used in other surveys so that the data could be comparable, where possible. This version of the survey is 'marked-up' to detail the source for the questions – the survey title (acronym) and question number or variable name are listed in the margin next to the question. When the wording is not exactly the same, there is an asterisk after the source listed. The acronyms for the surveys are as follows:

AHS	American Housing Survey, 2002
HOPE VI	HOPE VI Baseline Survey, 2001 (The Urban Institute)
MTO-IE	Moving to Opportunity, Interim Evaluation, 2002
NHIS	National Health Interview Survey, 2001
NSAF	National Survey of American Families, 1999

Introduction

Hello, my name is _____ and I work for The Urban Institute, an independent research firm located in Washington D.C. We spoke with you on [DATE] and arranged this time to speak with you. We are conducting a survey with households who used to receive housing assistance (in public housing, on Section 8, vouchers, or other housing programs).

We do not work for the housing authority or HUD. From what you told us when we called to schedule this interview, it seemed that you are eligible for the survey.

We are currently conducting a research study about what is happening in people's lives after they no longer receive housing assistance. The survey includes questions about your house, your neighborhood, as well as some questions about you and your family. Taking this survey has no effect on your housing situation. Any information you provide me will remain confidential; your answers will never be linked with your name or anything that could identify you.

Your participation in this survey is voluntary, but very important to our work. The interview takes about 30 minutes. When we are done, you will receive \$20 to compensate you for your time.

ON PHONE:

After we complete this interview, we will send you a \$20 cashier's check.

Do you have any questions before we start the survey?

IN-PERSON:

CONSENT FORM to be read and signed

MOBILITY

M1. Do you currently receive any governmental housing assistance in paying rent, such as through public housing or Section 8 or Housing Choice Voucher?

- YES01 SKIP TO M1b • MTO-IE, A26
- NO02
- DON'T KNOW-01
- REFUSED-03

a. Are you paying lower rent because the Federal, state, or local government is paying for part of your rent?

- YES01 • MTO-IE, A26a
- NO02 SKIP TO M3
- DON'T KNOW-01 SKIP TO M3
- REFUSED-03 SKIP TO M3

b. Is this assistance: public housing, a Section 8 or Housing Choice Voucher, Project-based Section 8 or some other type of assistance?

- PUBLIC HOUSING01
- A SECTION 8 OR VOUCHER02 • MTO-IE, A26b
- PROJECT-BASED SECTION 8.....03
- OTHER (SPECIFY) _____04
- DON'T KNOW-01
- REFUSED-03

M2. Has there been a time in the past three years when you did not receive any type of housing assistance?

- YES01 SKIP TO M4
- NO02 SKIP TO M4
- DON'T KNOW-01 SKIP TO M4
- REFUSED-03 SKIP TO M4

M3. What was the most recent type of housing assistance you received? Was it public housing, a Section 8 Certificate or Voucher, or some other type of assistance? [DO NOT READ CHOICES]

- PUBLIC HOUSING.....01
- SECTION 8 OR VOUCHER02 • MTO-IE, A27
- PROJECT-BASED SECTION 8.....03
- OTHER (SPECIFY): _____04
- DON'T KNOW-01
- REFUSED-03

a. People stop receiving housing assistance/public housing/Section 8/vouchers for different reasons. What would you say was the main reason you are no longer getting assistance? [DO NOT READ CHOICES]

- INCOME TOO HIGH/OVER INCOME/NO LONGER ELIGIBLE 01
- RENT OR UTILITIES GOT TOO HIGH 02
- EVICTED 03
- LOST SUBSIDY DUE TO PROBLEM WITH PHA (BROKE RULES, ETC.) 04
- RELOCATED FROM PUBLIC HOUSING AND COULD NOT MOVE BACK..... 05
- LANDLORD WOULD NOT TAKE SECTION 8 06
- WANTED TO OWN A HOME..... 07
- BOUGHT A HOME 08
- OTHER (SPECIFY) _____ 09
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

*
• MTO-IE, A27a

M4. Is your current address (2000 ADDRESS)?

- YES01 SKIP TO M8
- NO02
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

M5. Is this the place you first moved when you moved from (2000 ADDRESS)?

- YES01 SKIP TO M7
- NO02
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

a. How many times have you moved since you lived at (2000 ADDRESS)?

- NUMBER OF MOVES..... 02-99
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

**'1' IS NOT AN OPTION ** IF R SAYS '1', THEN PROBE:

In 2000, you lived at (2000 ADDRESS). How many times have you moved since then?

M6. You indicated that you no longer live in the place where you *first* moved when you left housing assistance. Why did you move out of that first place?

- Because you wanted to,.....01
- Because you were evicted, or02
- For some other reason? (specify: _____)03
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

M7. What was the MAIN reason you chose this house or apartment? [DO NOT READ CHOICES]

- BETTER SCHOOLS FOR MY CHILDREN 01
- CHANGE IN MARITAL/ROMANTIC STATUS 02
- TO HAVE BETTER TRANSPORTATION..... 03
- A BETTER, OR BIGGER APARTMENT/HOUSE..... 04
- CHANGE OF JOB/TO BE NEAR MY JOB 05
- NO OR LESS DRUGS AND GANGS 06
- TO BE NEAR MY FAMILY 07
- HOUSING AUTHORITY OR PROGRAM FOUND IT FOR ME 08
- SAFETY CONCERNS/FELT NEIGHBORHOOD WAS SAFER 09
- THE ONLY ONE I COULD AFFORD 10
- THE ONLY ONE THAT WAS AVAILABLE 11
- OTHER (SPECIFY) _____ 12
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

• MTO-IE, A24f *

M8. I'd like to ask you some questions about your housing situation. Do you...

- Rent your own room, apartment, or home..... 01 SKIP TO M9
- Own your own home 02 SKIP TO M9
- Live with family or friends and pay part of the rent or mortgage 03
- Live with family or friends and DO NOT pay rent, or..... 04
- Live in a group shelter?..... 05 SKIP TO M9
- HOMELESS..... 06 SKIP TO M9
- INCARCERATED..... 07 SKIP TO M9
- GROUP HOME, DORM OR BARRACKS 08 SKIP TO M9
- HOSPITAL/NURSING HOME/SPECIAL SCHOOL..... 09 SKIP TO M9
- OTHER 10 SKIP TO M9
- REFUSED -01 SKIP TO M9
- DON'T KNOW -03 SKIP TO M9

• MTO-IE, A1

a. What is your relationship to the head of the household in which you are living? [IF RELATIONSHIP IS SPOUSE, GO BACK TO 1 AND SELECT 'RENT' OR 'OWN' DEPENDING ON WHETHER THE SPOUSE RENTS OR OWNS THIS PROPERTY.]

- RELATIVE01
- PARTNER/BOYFRIEND/GIRLFRIEND02
- FRIEND03
- OTHER (SPECIFY).....04
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

• MTO-IE, A2

b. What is the main reason you are living in someone else's housing unit? [DO NOT READ CHOICES]

- COULDN'T PAY RENT ON OWN UNIT01
- LOST JOB OR ENDED JOB02
- WAS DOING DRUGS03
- LANDLORD MADE ME LEAVE.....04
- DIDN'T GET ALONG WITH PEOPLE
WHERE I LIVED BEFORE.....05
- RESPONDENT OR A CHILD ABUSED/
VIOLENCE IN THE HOUSEHOLD06
- CHANGE IN FAMILY STATUS.....07
- MOVED IN WITH PARTNER/BOYFRIEND/
GIRLFRIEND08
- OTHER (SPECIFY).....09
- DON'T KNOW-01
- REFUSED-03

• MTO-IE, A2a

M9. How long have you lived at your current address? (RECORD AND CIRCLE)

- (NUMBER OF YEARS _____).....01-96 SKIP TO M10
- LESS THAN ONE YEAR 97
- DON'T KNOW-01 SKIP TO M10
- REFUSED-03 SKIP TO M10

a. PROBE IF NECESSARY: How many months have you lived at your current address? (RECORD)

- (NUMBER OF MONTHS _____)..... 01-11
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

IF M8=02 (OWNER), THEN SKIP TO M13

IF M8=05-10 (NOT OWNER OR RENTER) THEN SKIP TO M16

IF RENTER OR LIVING WITH OTHERS (M8=1,3,4)

Now I'd like to talk about how much you pay each month for housing.

M10. Altogether in the month just past, what did you pay as rent? We are interested only in knowing your part of the payment.

- PER MONTH \$ _____.....0-9999
- DON'T KNOW-01
- REFUSED-03

• MTO-IE, A25a

M11. What is the total current monthly payment on this house or apartment?

- PER MONTH \$ _____.....0-9999
- DON'T KNOW-01
- REFUSED-03

• MTO-IE, A25b

M12. Does anyone else in the household contribute to the rent?

- YES01
- NO02 SKIP TO M13
- DON'T KNOW-01 SKIP TO M13
- REFUSED-03 SKIP TO M13

a. What is the relationship to you of the other person or people who contribute to the rent? Are they your... (RECORD ALL THAT APPLY)

- Spouse/partner/girlfriend/boyfriend, 1
- Son,2
- Daughter,3
- Grandchild,4
- Other relative, or5
- Other non-relative?6
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

SKIP TO M16

IF OWNER (M8=2)

M13. What is the monthly amount you pay for owning this house or apartment? We are interested in the payment you make to the bank or mortgage company.

- PER MONTH \$ _____ 0-9999
- DON'T KNOW-01
- REFUSED-03

• MTO-IE, A28

M14. Did a government agency or nonprofit agency help you with the purchase of your home by providing down-payment assistance or help with fixing or building the home? For example, Habitat for Humanity, the housing authority, or the HOPE VI office.

- YES01
- NO02
- DON'T KNOW-01
- REFUSED-03

• MTO-IE, A29*

M15. Did anyone else help you purchase your home by providing down-payment assistance or help with fixing up the home?

- YES01
- NO02
- DON'T KNOW-01
- REFUSED-03

IF M8=6,7 (homeless or incarcerated); SKIP TO NEXT SECTION

IF M5=1 (first placed moved since 2000); SKIP TO NEXT SECTION

M16. Was there ever a time during the past year (that is, since MONTH/YEAR) when you did not have your own place to stay?

- YES01
- NO02 SKIP TO NEXT SECTION
- DON'T KNOW-01 SKIP TO NEXT SECTION
- REFUSED-03 SKIP TO NEXT SECTION

• MTO-IE, A7

M17. During the past year, when you did not have your own place to stay, we would like to know about any places where you stayed. Did you...

- a. ...stay with a relative
 - YES01
 - NO02
 - DON'T KNOW-01
 - REFUSED-03

- b. ...stay with a friend
 - YES01
 - NO02
 - DON'T KNOW-01
 - REFUSED-03

- c. ...stay in a shelter
 - YES01
 - NO02
 - DON'T KNOW-01
 - REFUSED-03

[INTERVIEWER: A SHELTER IS A HOMELESS SHELTER, EMERGENCY SHELTER, OR DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SHELTER]

- d. ...stay on the street
 - YES01
 - NO02
 - DON'T KNOW-01
 - REFUSED-03

• MTO-IE, A8a-d

IF NOT CURRENTLY RENTING/OWNING OWN UNIT (IF M8=3-10)

M18. How long has it been since you rented or owned your own unit: (RECORD AND CIRCLE)

- (NUMBER OF YEARS _____).....01-96 SKIP TO NEXT SECTION
- LESS THAN ONE YEAR97
- DON'T KNOW-01 SKIP TO NEXT SECTION
- REFUSED-03 SKIP TO NEXT SECTION

• MTO-IE, A9

a. How many months have you lived at your current address? (RECORD)

- (Number of months _____)..... 01-11
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

HOUSING QUALITY

The next questions ask about the (apartment/house) where you live now.

Q1. Overall, how satisfied are you with the (apartment/house) where you live now? Would you say that you are:

- very satisfied,01
- somewhat satisfied,02
- somewhat dissatisfied, or03
- very dissatisfied?.....04
- neither satisfied nor dissatisfied05
- DON'T KNOW-01
- REFUSED-03

• HOPE VI, 4

Q2. Overall, how would you describe the condition of your current (apartment/house)? Would you say it was in excellent, good, fair, or poor condition?

- excellent01
- good.....02
- fair03
- poor04
- DON'T KNOW-01
- REFUSED-03

• MTO -IE, A3

IF MOVER

Q3. How would you compare this (apartment/house) to the place you lived at [2000 ADDRESS]? Would you say that this (apartment/house) is in better condition, worse condition, or about the same condition as that (apartment/house)?

- CURRENT HOUSE IS BETTER01
- CURRENT HOUSE IS WORSE02
- ABOUT THE SAME03
- DON'T KNOW-01
- REFUSED-03

EVERYONE

I am going to ask you some questions about specific conditions of your current (apartment/house).

Q4. During this past winter, was there any time when the (apartment/house) was so cold for 24 hours or more that it caused anyone in your household discomfort?

- YES01
- NO02 SKIP TO Q5
- DID NOT LIVE HERE03 SKIP TO Q5
- DON'T KNOW-01 SKIP TO Q5
- REFUSED-03 SKIP TO Q5

• AHS 'FREEZE'

• HOPE VI, 5

a. Was that because the heating system broke down, you could not pay your utility bill, or some other reason?

- HEATING SYSTEM BROKE DOWN01
- COULD NOT PAY UTILITY BILLS02
- SOME OTHER REASON03
- KEEP COSTS DOWN04
- DON'T KNOW-01
- REFUSED-03

• HOPE VI, 5a

- Q5. In the last 3 months, was there any time when all the toilets in the home were not working? (WHILE HOUSEHOLD WAS LIVING HERE IF LESS THAN 3 MONTHS)**
- YES01 • AHS 'IFTLT'*
- NO02 • HOPE VI, 6
- DON'T KNOW-01
- REFUSED-03
- Q6. Have there been water leaks in the (apartment/house) in the last 3 months? (WHILE HOUSEHOLD WAS LIVING HERE IF LESS THAN 3 MONTHS)**
- YES01 • AHS 'ILEAK'
- NO02 • HOPE VI, 7
- DON'T KNOW-01
- REFUSED-03
- Q7. Does the (apartment/house) have any area of peeling paint or broken plaster bigger than 8 inches by 11 inches? (the size of a standard letter)**
- YES01 • HOPE VI, 8
- NO02 • MTO-IE, A5a*
- DON'T KNOW-01
- REFUSED-03
- Q8. Does your (apartment/house) have an exposed radiator without a cover?**
- YES01 • HOPE VI, 9
- NO02
- DON'T KNOW-01
- REFUSED-03
- Q9. Is your (apartment/house) infested with cockroaches?**
- YES01 • HOPE VI, 10
- NO02 • MTO-IE, A5d
- DON'T KNOW-01
- REFUSED-03
- Q10. Is your (apartment/house) infested with rats or mice?**
- YES01 • MTO-IE, A5c
- NO02 • AHS 'RATS' *
- DON'T KNOW-01 • 'MICE' *
- REFUSED-03 • 'EVROD' *
- HOPE VI, 11
- Q11. Does your (apartment/house) have significant problems with mold on walls or ceilings, for example in your bathroom?**
- YES01 • HOPE VI, 12
- NO02
- DON'T KNOW-01
- REFUSED-03

NEIGHBORHOOD

These questions ask about what it's like to live in your current neighborhood.

N1. How many months or years have you lived in your current neighborhood?

- (NUMBER OF YEARS _____).....1-96 SKIP TO N2
- LESS THAN ONE YEAR97
- DON'T KNOW-01 SKIP TO N2
- REFUSED-03 SKIP TO N2

MTO-IE, A10

a. PROBE IF NECESSARY: How many months have you lived at your current neighborhood? [RECORD NUMBER OF MONTHS]

- (Number of months _____)..... 1-11
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

N2. Now, please think about the area that you consider your neighborhood and tell me if the following items are - a big problem, some problem, or no problem at all.

a. In your neighborhood, is unemployment a...

- big problem,01
- some problem, or.....02
- no problem at all?.....03
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

• HOPE VI, 17a

b. Groups of people just hanging out

- big problem,01
- some problem, or.....02
- no problem at all?.....03
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

• HOPE VI, 17b

• MTO-IE, A12e

c. Lack of public transportation

- big problem,01
- some problem, or.....02
- no problem at all?.....03
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

• HOPE VI, 17d

d. Quality of schools

- big problem,01
- some problem, or.....02
- no problem at all?.....03
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

• HOPE VI, 17e

e. Graffiti, that is, writing or painting on the walls of the buildings

- big problem,01
- some problem, or.....02
- no problem at all?.....03
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

• HOPE VI, 17f

• MTO-IE, A12b*

- f. **Trash and junk in the parking lots, streets, lawns, and sidewalks**
 - big problem,01
 - some problem, or.....02
 - no problem at all?.....03
 - DON'T KNOW-01
 - REFUSED.....-03

• HOPE VI, 17g
 • MTO-IE, A12a*

N3. **Still thinking about the area that you consider your neighborhood, please tell me if these next items are - a big problem, some problem, or no problem at all**

- a. **In your neighborhood, is police not coming when called a...**
 - big problem,01
 - some problem, or.....02
 - no problem at all?.....03
 - DON'T KNOW-01
 - REFUSED.....-03

← • MTO-IE, A12f

- b. **People being attacked or robbed**
 - big problem,01
 - some problem, or.....02
 - no problem at all?.....03
 - DON'T KNOW-01
 - REFUSED.....-03

- c. **People selling drugs**
 - big problem,01
 - some problem, or.....02
 - no problem at all?.....03
 - DON'T KNOW-01
 - REFUSED.....-03

- d. **People using drugs**
 - big problem,01
 - some problem, or.....02
 - no problem at all?.....03
 - DON'T KNOW-01
 - REFUSED.....-03

• HOPE VI,
17h-17n

- e. **Gangs**
 - big problem,01
 - some problem, or.....02
 - no problem at all?.....03
 - DON'T KNOW-01
 - REFUSED.....-03

- f. **Rape or other sexual attacks**
 - big problem,01
 - some problem, or.....02
 - no problem at all?.....03
 - DON'T KNOW-01
 - REFUSED.....-03



g. Shootings and violence

big problem,	01
some problem, or.....	02
no problem at all?.....	03
DON'T KNOW	-01
REFUSED	-03



EMPLOYMENT & HARDSHIP

Next, I have a few questions about work.

E1. Do you currently work for pay?

- YES 1
- NO 2 SKIP TO E11
- DON'T KNOW -01 SKIP TO E11
- REFUSED -03 SKIP TO E11

• HOPE VI, 38a

E2. Do you currently have more than one job?

- YES 1
- NO 2 SKIP TO E3
- DON'T KNOW -01 SKIP TO E3
- REFUSED -03 SKIP TO E3

• HOPE VI, 38b

a. Including part-time and full-time jobs, how many jobs do you have?

- (NUMBER OF EMPLOYERS) 1-97
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

E3. On average, about how many hours a week do you work at your (main) job?

- LESS THAN 20 HOURS A WEEK 1
- BETWEEN 20 AND 35 HOURS A WEEK 2
- MORE THAN 35 HOURS A WEEK 3
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

• HOPE VI, 39

E4. What is your hourly wage at your (main) job?

- \$. / HOUR
- \$. / DAY
- \$. / WEEK
- \$. / MONTH
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

• HOPE VI, 40

E5. How long have you been working at your (main) job?

- LESS THAN 3 MONTHS 1
- FROM 3 MONTHS TO JUST UNDER 6 MONTHS 2
- FROM 6 MONTHS TO JUST UNDER ONE YEAR 3
- FROM ONE YEAR TO JUST UNDER 3 YEARS 4
- THREE YEARS OR MORE 5
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

• HOPE VI, 41

E6. How do you get to work?

- BUS OR OTHER PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION 1
- CAR (OWN CAR) 2
- CAR (BORROWED CAR) 3
- CAB 4
- WALK 5
- WORK AT HOME 6
- RIDE WITH A FRIEND (CARPOOL) 7
- OTHER (SPECIFY) 8
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

• HOPE VI, 43

E7. Please tell me how you found your current job. Did you find it...

- Through a friend or relative who lives
in your neighborhood, 1
- Through a friend or relative who lives someplace else, 2
- Through the newspaper or radio, 3
- By visiting employers to see if they had openings, 4
- Through a private employment agency, 5
- Through the welfare office, 6
- Through an unemployment office, 7
- Through a neighborhood agency, or 8
- Something else? 9
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

• HOPE VI, 44

E8. Through your employer, are you eligible for any of the following benefits? By eligible, we mean that the benefit is available to you now, even if you have decided to not receive it or have not needed it.

a. Health insurance?

- YES 1
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

b. Sick leave?

- YES 1
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

c. Paid vacation?

- YES 1
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

E9. Do you have a disability that has made it difficult for you to keep a job in the last six months?

- YES 1
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW-01
- REFUSED-03

E10. Does a child or another member of the household have a disability or health problem that has made it difficult for you to keep a job in the last six months?

- YES 1
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW-01
- REFUSED-03

SKIP TO E16

IF NOT CURRENTLY EMPLOYED

E11. How long has it been since you were last employed full or part time? (RECORD AND CIRCLE)

- (NUMBER OF YEARS _____).....01-96 SKIP TO M9
- LESS THAN ONE YEAR 97
- DON'T KNOW-01 SKIP TO M9
- REFUSED-03 SKIP TO M9

a. How many months has it been since you were last employed full or part time? (RECORD)

- (Number of months _____)..... 01-11
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

E12. Have you looked for a job in the last 12 months?

- YES 1
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW-01
- REFUSED-03

E13. What is the main reason you are not working? (DO NOT READ CHOICES)

- ILL 1
- DISABLED AND UNABLE TO WORK..... 2
- RETIRED 3
- TAKING CARE OF HOME OR FAMILY 4
- GOING TO SCHOOL..... 5
- CANNOT FIND WORK..... 6
- TEMPORARILY NOT WORKING BECAUSE OF SICK LEAVE, A STRIKE, BAD WEATHER, OR TEMPORARY LAY-OFF 7
- OTHER (SPECIFY _____)..... 8
- DON'T KNOW-01
- REFUSED-03

• HOPE VI, 48

E14. Do you have a disability that prevents you from working during the next six months?

YES 1
 NO 2
 DON'T KNOW -01
 REFUSED -03

E15. Does a child or another member of the household have a disability or health problem that prevents you from working during the next six months?

YES 1
 NO 2
 DON'T KNOW -01
 REFUSED -03

EVERYONE

E16. Are you currently taking any classes or enrolled in any training programs?

YES 1
 NO 2
 DON'T KNOW -01
 REFUSED -03

[FROM ROSTER: IF GRADUATED HS/GED OR HIGHER, SKIP E17.]

E17. In the past 12 months, did you *complete* any classes to earn a regular high school diploma or GED?

YES 1
 NO 2
 DON'T KNOW -01
 REFUSED -03

E18. In the past 12 months, did you *complete* any college courses or programs for credit toward a college degree, such as an AA, BA, or advanced degree?

YES 1
 NO 2
 DON'T KNOW -01
 REFUSED -03

E19. In the past 12 months, did you *complete* any welfare-to-work training programs or classes?

YES 1
 NO 2
 DON'T KNOW -01
 REFUSED -03

IF CURRENTLY WORKING (E1=1) OR HAS RECENTLY LOOKED FOR A JOB (E12=1) OR HAS BEEN EMPLOYED IN THE LAST YEAR (E11=97)

E20. Think about your own experience with looking for a job or working during the last twelve months. Please tell me whether any of the following factors have made it difficult for you to look for a job, get a job, or keep a job.

		YES	NO	DK	REF
A	Not having work experience	1	2	-01	-03
B	Lack of transportation	1	2	-01	-03
C	Not speaking English well	1	2	-01	-03
D	Discrimination	1	2	-01	-03
E	Lack of jobs in the neighborhood	1	2	-01	-03
F	Having a drug or alcohol problem	1	2	-01	-03
G	Having a criminal record	1	2	-01	-03

.HOPE VI, 50

IF HH INCLUDES ANYONE UNDER 18 (FROM ROSTER), ELSE SKIP TOE24

E21. During the past 12 months, was child care or lack of child care ever such a problem that you could not take a job or had to stop working, or could not attend education or training activities?

- YES 1
- NO 2 SKIP TO E22
- DON'T KNOW -01 SKIP TO E22
- REFUSED -03 SKIP TO E22

a. What were the problems you had with child care or lack of child care? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY) PROBE: Any other problems? [DO NOT READ CHOICES]

- COST TOO MUCH 1
- COULDN'T FIND CHILD CARE FOR TIMES YOU NEEDED 2
- TOO FAR FROM WORK OR HOME 3
- CAREGIVER UNAVAILABLE OR NOT RELIABLE 4
- WORRY ABOUT CHILD ABUSE OR UNSAFE ENVIRONMENT 5
- CHILD SICK OR DISABLED 6
- SUBSIDY PAYMENT LATE, SO LOST PROVIDER 7
- OTHER (SPECIFY) _____ 96
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

E22. In the past 6 months, have you or anyone in your household received any government funds to help with the cost of child care?

- YES 1
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

SOURCES OF INCOME AND IN-KIND SUPPORT

The next questions are about types of income or benefits you may receive.

. MTO-IE

E23. In the past 12 months, have you or anyone in your household received . . .

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>DK</u>	<u>REF</u>
a. SSI (Supplemental Security Income)?.....	1	2	-01	-03
b. Other disability pay such as SSDI (Social Security Disability Income), a veteran's disability benefit or workers compensation for a work-related injury?.....	1	2	-01	-03
c. Unemployment compensation because you were laid off from a job?	1	2	-01	-03
d. Income from casual work or under-the-table jobs? Please include babysitting, housecleaning, or working in exchange for food.....	1	2	-01	-03
e. Child support?	1	2	-01	-03
f. Food stamps or money for food on the EBT card (the Electronic Benefits Transfer Card)?.....	1	2	-01	-03
g. WIC (Assistance from the Woman, Infants and Children Supplemental Nutrition Program)?	1	2	-01	-03

E24. In the past 12 months, have you or anyone in your household received cash from public assistance, including AFDC or TANF (Aid to Families with Dependent Children or Temporary Assistance to Needy Families)?

- YES 1
- NO 2 SKIP TO E25
- Don't know.....-01 SKIP TO E25
- REFUSED.....-03 SKIP TO E25

a. What year did you (or this person) first receive cash from [NAME OF STATE WELFARE PROGRAM] including AFDC or TANF as an adult?
 _____ (year)

b. How many years in total have you (or this person) received TANF (or AFDC)? (RECORD AND CIRCLE)
 (NUMBER OF YEARS _____).....1-9
 LESS THAN ONE YEAR97
 DON'T KNOW01
 REFUSED03

E25. In the past 6 months, have you (IF ONLY ONE PERSON IN HH: or anyone in your household) received money from family or friends to cover basic living expenses?

- YES 1
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

FINANCES

E26. Do you have a bank account of any kind, such as checking or savings?

- YES 1
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

E27. Do you have a place that you use for cashing checks, other than a bank?

- YES 1
- NO 2 SKIP TO E28
- DON'T KNOW -01 SKIP TO E28
- REFUSED -03 SKIP TO E28

a. Is this place a credit union, a pay-day lender, or some other place?

- CREDIT UNION 01
- PAY-DAY LENDER 02
- OTHER (_____) 03
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

HARDSHIP

Now I'm going to read you some statements that people have made about their food situation and their housing situation. For these statements, please tell me whether the statement was often, sometimes, or never true for your family in the last 12 months, that is, since (NAME OF CURRENT MONTH) of last year.

E28. The first statement is "(I/We) worried whether (my/our) food would run out before (I/we) got money to buy more." Was that often, sometimes, or never true for (you/your family) in the last 12 months.

- OFTEN TRUE 1
- SOMETIMES TRUE 2
- NEVER TRUE 3
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

• NSAF, M9A
• HOPE VI, 57

E29. "The food that (I/we) bought just didn't last, and (I/we) didn't have money to get any more." Was that often, sometimes, or never true for (you/your family) in the last 12 months.

- OFTEN TRUE 1
- SOMETIMES TRUE 2
- NEVER TRUE 3
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

• NSAF, M9B

E30. In the last 12 months, since (NAME OF CURRENT MONTH) of last year, did (you/you or other adults in your family) ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?

- YES 1
NO 2 SKIP TO E31
DON'T KNOW -01 SKIP TO E31
REFUSED -03 SKIP TO E31

• NSAF, M9C

b. How often did this happen? Was it...

- Almost every month.....01
Some months but not every month, or02
Only 1 or 2 months?.....03
DON'T KNOW -01
REFUSED -03

• NSAF, M9D

E31. Do you currently have a telephone in your household?

- YES 1 SKIP TO E32
NO 2
DON'T KNOW -01
REFUSED -03

a. Do you have a cell phone that you use as your regular phone?

- YES 1
NO 2 SKIP TO E33
DON'T KNOW -01 SKIP TO E33
REFUSED -03 SKIP TO E33

E32. During the last 12 months, has your household ever been without telephone service for more than 24 hours because you could not afford to pay the telephone bill?

- YES 1
NO 2
DON'T KNOW -01
REFUSED -03

• HOPE VI, 58

E33. People sometimes have trouble paying their utility bills on time. During the past 12 months, were you ever more than 15 days late paying your electric, gas or water bill?

- YES 1
NO 2 SKIP TO E34
NOT APPLICABLE 3 SKIP TO E34
UTILITIES INCLUDED IN RENT/CONDO FEES 4 SKIP TO E34
DON'T KNOW -01 SKIP TO E34
REFUSED -03 SKIP TO E34

• MTO-IE, A31

a. When you had trouble paying for utilities, were you ever charged a fee for late payment?

- YES 1
NO 2
DON'T KNOW -01
REFUSED -03

• MTO-IE, A32

b. Did you receive a notice that your gas, water, or electricity would be shut off if you did not pay your bill?

- YES 1
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

c. In the past 12 months, was your gas, water, or electricity ever shut off for nonpayment?

- YES 1
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

E34. During the last 12 months, did you (or your children) move in with other people even for a little while because you could not afford to pay your mortgage, rent or utility bills?

- YES 1
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

IF NOT RENTER OR OWNER (M8=03-10) THEN SKIP TO NEXT SECTION ON HEALTH

IF OWNER (M8=02) THEN SKIP TO E40

IF RENTER

E35. During the past 12 months, were you ever more than 15 days late paying your rent?

- YES 1
- NO 2 SKIP TO E36
- NOT APPLICABLE 3 SKIP TO HEALTH SECTION
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

a. Did you get any help when you were not able to pay the rent?

- YES 1
- NO 2 SKIP TO E36
- DON'T KNOW -01 SKIP TO E36
- REFUSED -03 SKIP TO E36

b. Who did you get help from? [READ CHOICES] (CODE ALL THAT APPLY)

- Family or friends 1
- Clergy (minister, priest, rabbi) 2
- Bank, loan company, other commercial source 3
- Community program 4
- Housing authority 5
- Government program 6
- Other (specify) _____ 7
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

- E36. In the last 12 months, has your current or a previous landlord ever threatened to evict you for non-payment of rent?**
- YES 1
 - NO 2
 - DON'T KNOW.....-01
 - REFUSED-03

- E37. During the last 12 months, have you been evicted from a home for any reason?**
- YES 1
 - NO 2 SKIP TO E38
 - DON'T KNOW.....-01 SKIP TO E38
 - REFUSED-03 SKIP TO E38

a. Why was that?

- NON-PAYMENT OF RENT01
- LANDLORD WANTED UNIT FOR
SELF OR RELATIVE02
- HOUSEKEEPING03
- DAMAGE TO UNIT04
- BEHAVIOR OF CHILDREN05
- NUISANCE (LOUD MUSIC, PARTIES, ETC.)06
- OTHER (SPECIFY) _____ .07
- REFUSED -01
- DON'T KNOW -03

- E38. In the past 12 months, has the owner or manager complained about your housekeeping, visitors, life style, partner's behavior, damage to the unit, or your children's behavior?**
- YES 1
 - NO 2
 - DON'T KNOW.....-01
 - REFUSED-03

SKIP TO NEXT SECTION (HEALTH)

IF OWNER (M8=02)

- E39. During the past 12 months, were you ever more than 15 days late paying your mortgage?**
- YES 1
 - NO 2
 - DON'T KNOW.....-01
 - REFUSED-03

• MTO-IE, A38

a. Did you get any help when you were not able to pay the mortgage?

- YES 1
- NO 2 SKIP TO E40
- DON'T KNOW..... -01 SKIP TO E40
- REFUSED -03 SKIP TO E40

b. Who did you get help from? [READ CHOICES] (CODE ALL THAT APPLY)

- Family or friends 1
- Clergy (minister, priest, rabbi) 2
- Bank, loan company, other commercial source 3
- Community program 4
- Housing authority 5
- Government program 6
- Other (specify) _____ 7
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

E40. In the last 12 months, has the bank ever threatened to foreclose on your mortgage for any reason?

- YES 01
- NO 02 SKIP TO NEXT SECTION
- DON'T KNOW -01 SKIP TO NEXT SECTION
- REFUSED -03 SKIP TO NEXT SECTION

• MTO-IE, A39

E41. During the last 12 months, did the bank foreclose on your mortgage?

- YES 01
- NO 02
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

• MTO-IE, A40

HEALTH

The next few questions ask about your health.

H1. In general, would you say your health is:

- Excellent,..... 1
- Very good,.....2
- Good,.....3
- Fair, or4
- Poor?5
- DON'T KNOW.....-01
- REFUSED-03

- HOPE VI, 60
- MTO-IE, F1

Now I am going to ask you about certain medical conditions.

H2. Has a doctor or other health professional ever told you that you had asthma?

- YES 1
- NO2 SKIP TO H5
- DON'T KNOW.....-01 SKIP TO H5
- REFUSED-03 SKIP TO H5

- NHIS, ACN.080
- HOPE VI, 62
- MTO-IE, F2

a. Do you still have symptoms? (coughing, wheezing, shortness of breath)

- YES 1
- NO2
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

- NHIS, ACN.085*
- HOPE VI, 62a

H3. During the PAST 12 MONTHS, have you had an episode of asthma or an asthma attack?

- YES 1
- NO2 SKIP TO H5
- DON'T KNOW.....-01 SKIP TO H5
- REFUSED-03 SKIP TO H5

- NHIS, ACN.090
- HOPE VI, 63
- MTO-IE, F3

H4. During the PAST 12 MONTHS, did you have to visit an emergency room or urgent care center because of asthma?

- YES 1
- NO2
- DON'T KNOW.....-01
- REFUSED-03

- NHIS, ACN.100
- HOPE VI, 64

- H5. Where do you go for routine medical care? [DO NOT READ]**
- DOCTOR'S OFFICE OR PRIVATE CLINIC (INCLUDING HMO'S)..... 1
 - HOSPITAL OUTPATIENT CLINIC 2
 - HOSPITAL EMERGENCY ROOM..... 3
 - PUBLIC HEALTH DEPARTMENT..... 4
 - COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTER 5
 - MIGRANT CLINIC..... 6
 - INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES..... 7
 - OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY) _____ 8
 - NO ROUTINE MEDICAL CARE..... 9
 - DON'T KNOW.....-01
 - REFUSED-03

• NHIS, AAU.030

The next questions are about your use of alcohol. When I use the word "drink" in the next questions, I mean either a glass of wine, a can or bottle of beer, or a shot or jigger of liquor either alone or in a mixed drink.

- H6. In any one year, have you had at least 12 drinks of any type of alcoholic beverage?**
- YES 1
 - NO 2 SKIP TO H12
 - DON'T KNOW.....-01 SKIP TO H12
 - REFUSED-03 SKIP TO H12

- H7. In the past 12 months, how often did you usually have at least one drink – nearly every day, three to four days a week, one to three days a month, less than once a month, or not at all in the past 12 months?**
- NEARLY EVERY DAY..... 1
 - THREE TO FOUR DAYS PER WEEK 2
 - ONE TO TWO DAYS PER WEEK 3
 - ONE TO THREE DAYS PER MONTH..... 4
 - LESS THAN ONCE A MONTH..... 5
 - NOT AT ALL IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS..... 6 SKIP TO H12
 - DON'T KNOW-01 SKIP TO H12
 - REFUSED-03 SKIP TO H12

- H8. On the days you drank in the past 12 months, about how many drinks did you usually have per day?**
- NUMBER OF DRINKS.....
 - DON'T KNOW.....-01
 - REFUSED-03 SKIP TO H12

- H9. In the past 12 months, on how many days did you have 5 or more drinks of any alcoholic beverage?**
- NUMBER OF DAYS.....
 - DON'T KNOW.....-01
 - REFUSED-03 SKIP TO H12

IF (H7=1,2,3) OR (H7=4 and H8=3+), THEN CONTINUE. ELSE, SKIP TO END.

• MTO-IE, F33-F38



H10. Did your drinking or being hung over frequently interfere with your work or responsibilities at school, on a job, or at home during the past 12 months?

- YES 1 SKIP TO H12
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW.....-01
- REFUSED-03 SKIP TO H12

H11. During the past 12 months, did your drinking cause arguments or other serious or repeated problems with your family, friends, neighbors, or co-workers?

- YES 1
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW.....-01
- REFUSED-03



ACTIVITIES OF DAILY LIVING

The next questions ask about difficulties you may have doing certain activities because of a health problem. By "health problem" we mean any physical, mental, or emotional problem or illness (not including pregnancy).

H12. By yourself, and without using any special equipment, how difficult is it for you to...

a. ... walk a quarter of a mile – about 3 city blocks? Would you say it is...

- Not at all difficult 1
- Only a little difficult.....2
- Somewhat difficult3
- Very difficult, or4
- You can't do this at all?5
- DO NOT DO THIS ACTIVITY6
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

b. ... walk up 10 steps without resting? Would you say this is...

- Not at all difficult 1
- Only a little difficult.....2
- Somewhat difficult3
- Very difficult, or4
- You can't do this at all?5
- DO NOT DO THIS ACTIVITY6
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

c. ... stand or be on your feet for about 2 hours?

- Not at all difficult 1
- Only a little difficult.....2
- Somewhat difficult3
- Very difficult, or4
- You can't do this at all?5
- DO NOT DO THIS ACTIVITY6
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03



• NHIS,
AHS.091

d. ... sit for about 2 hours?

- Not at all difficult1
- Only a little difficult.....2
- Somewhat difficult3
- Very difficult, or4
- You can't do this at all?5
- DO NOT DO THIS ACTIVITY6
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

e. ... stoop, bend, or kneel?

- Not at all difficult1
- Only a little difficult.....2
- Somewhat difficult3
- Very difficult, or4
- You can't do this at all?5
- DO NOT DO THIS ACTIVITY6
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

f. ... reach up over your head?

- Not at all difficult1
- Only a little difficult.....2
- Somewhat difficult3
- Very difficult, or4
- You can't do this at all?5
- DO NOT DO THIS ACTIVITY6
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03



H13. During the past 12 months, was your physical health ever such a problem that you could not take a job or had to stop working, or could not attend education or training activities?

- YES01
- NO02
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

ANXIETY SERIES

Now I'm going to change topics and ask you some questions about some of the ways you might have felt in the past month. For each question, please indicate whether you have felt this way all of the time, most of the time, some of the time, or none of the time.

H14. How much of the time during the past month have you ...

a. ... felt nervous? Have you felt this way...

- All of the time1
- Most of the time2
- Some of the time, or3
- None of the time?4
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

- MTO-IE, F20b
- HOPE VI, 65
- NSAF, N1a*

b. ... felt calm and peaceful? Have you felt this way...

- All of the time1
- Most of the time2
- Some of the time, or3
- None of the time?4
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

- MTO-IE, F20g
- HOPE VI, 66
- NSAF, N1b

c. ... felt downhearted and blue?

- All of the time1
- Most of the time2
- Some of the time, or3
- None of the time?4
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

- HOPE VI, 67
- NSAF, N1c

d. ... felt happy?

- All of the time1
- Most of the time2
- Some of the time, or3
- None of the time?4
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

- HOPE VI, 68
- NSAF, N1d*

e. ... felt so down in the dumps that nothing could cheer you up?

- All of the time1
- Most of the time2
- Some of the time, or3
- None of the time?4
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

- HOPE VI, 69
- NSAF, N1e

CHILD HEALTH

IF MORE THAN ONE CHILD IN THE HOUSEHOLD, ask: Of the children under 18 who live here, which child has had the most recent birthday? (RECORD CHILD'S NAME)

Next, we have a few questions about [NAME].

H15. Has a doctor or other health professional ever said that [NAME] has asthma?

- YES 1
- NO 2 SKIP TO H18
- DON'T KNOW -01 SKIP TO H18
- REFUSED -03 SKIP TO H18

- NHIS, CHS 080
- HOPE VI, 94, 114

b. Does (he/she) still have symptoms? (coughing, wheezing, shortness of breath)

- YES 1
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

- NHIS, CHS 085*
- HOPE VI, 94a, 114a

H16. During the PAST 12 MONTHS, has (he/she) had an episode of asthma or an asthma attack?

- YES 1
- NO 2 SKIP TO H18
- DON'T KNOW -01 SKIP TO H18
- REFUSED -03 SKIP TO H18

- NHIS, CHS 090
- HOPE VI, 95, 115

H17. During the PAST 12 MONTHS, did (he/she) have to visit an emergency room or urgent care center because of asthma?

- YES 1
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW -01
- REFUSED -03

- NHIS, CHS 100
- HOPE VI, 96, 116

H18. Where does [NAME] usually go for routine medical care? [DO NOT READ]

- DOCTOR'S OFFICE OR PRIVATE CLINIC (INCLUDING HMO'S)..... 1
- HOSPITAL OUTPATIENT CLINIC 2
- HOSPITAL EMERGENCY ROOM..... 3
- PUBLIC HEALTH DEPARTMENT 4
- COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTER 5
- MIGRANT CLINIC..... 6
- INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES..... 7
- OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY) _____ 8
- NO ROUTINE MEDICAL CARE..... 9
- DON'T KNOW..... -01
- REFUSED -03

- NHIS, CAU030*
- MTO-IE, F7a*

FINAL SECTION

These are the last few questions.

F1. Do you describe your ethnicity as:

Hispanic or Latino/a 1
 Non-Hispanic or non-Latino/a 2
 DON'T KNOW -01
 REFUSED -03

F2. Do you describe your race as:

White 1
 Black or African American 2
 American Indian or Alaska Native 3
 Asian 4
 Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander 5
 Other (SPECIFY) _____ 6
 DON'T KNOW -01
 REFUSED -03

F3. What is the highest grade or year of school that you have ever completed?

None 00
 Grade School 01-08
 High School/GED 09-12
 College 13-16
 Some graduate school 17
 Graduate or professional degree 18
 DON'T KNOW -01
 REFUSED -03

F4. Are you currently . . .

married 1
 not married, but living with partner 2
 not married, and not living with a partner? 3
 WIDOWED, DIVORCED OR SEPARATED 4
 Other (specify _____) 5
 DON'T KNOW -01
 REFUSED -03

F5. What year were you born?

YEAR 1900-1985
 DON'T KNOW -01
 REFUSED -03

F6. RECORD GENDER OF RESPONDENT (IF UNSURE, ASK RESPONDENT THEIR GENDER)

MALE 1
 FEMALE 2
 DON'T KNOW -01
 REFUSED -03

F7. I'd like you to tell me which category best estimates your total household income for 2002. Please include all income including money earned from jobs, public assistance, or social security. In the year 2002, what was your household income, before taxes?

- Less than \$5,000..... 1
- \$5,000 to \$9,999..... 2
- \$10,000 to \$14,999..... 3
- \$15,000 to \$19,999..... 4
- \$20,000 to \$29,999..... 5
- \$30,000 to \$39,999..... 6
- \$40,000 or more 7
- DON'T KNOW-01
- REFUSED-03

ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM RESPONDENT

F8. Are there any comments you would like to add to at this time?

- Yes 1 RECORD COMMENTS
- No..... 2 SKIP TO CLOSING

COMMENTS: _____

Thank you for taking the time to participate in our survey.

HUD USER
P.O. Box 23268
Washington, DC 20026-3268

POSTAGE & FEES PAID
HUD
Permit No. G-795

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use \$300

Return Service Provided



June 2004