

Association between Education and Job Training Program Enrollment

by

Gloria T. Yim

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

Approved May 2011 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Sarah Hayford, Chair
Laura Peck
Scott Yabiku

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

December 2011

ABSTRACT

Welfare recipients must engage in a specified number of hours of work-based activities. Work-based activities include providing childcare for others, enrolling to obtain a GED, participating in job clubs, and working for pay. Welfare recipients may choose to get a GED or participate in job clubs to improve their chances of finding employment. As some states require participation in job clubs to receive welfare benefits, this study examined the likelihood of job club participation by low-income females in states where job club participation is optional, not mandatory. Using data from a sample of 3,642 low-income mothers participating in the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), I explored the relationship between educational attainment and the probability of attending job club or searches in the past month. Sociodemographic and state-level characteristics were used to control for other factors in logistic regression models. Results show that low-income women with higher educational attainment were more likely to attend a job club. Other significant factors were marital status, metropolitan residence, number of children, number of family members, and state poverty rate. Policy implications suggest that attendees already have the necessary skills to obtain a job and time limits and enrollment caps may hinder the changes of the targeted population.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background.....	1
Outline of Thesis	3
2 WELFARE REFORM AND JOB CLUBS AND SEARCHES	4
Welfare Reform History	4
Eligibility Requirements.....	5
Welfare Demographics.....	8
Job Clubs and Search Programs.....	11
Similarities of Job Clubs and Searches across States	13
Mixed Results from Previous Studies.....	15
Educational Influences on the Attendance of Job Clubs	19
Other Factors Leading to the Attendance of Job Clubs.....	21
3 RATIONAL CHOICE THEORY	26
Framework.....	26
4 HYPOTHESIS.....	30
5 RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	32
Data.....	32
Sample	34
Variables	37

CHAPTER	Page
Dependent Variable	37
Independent Variable.....	37
Control Variables.....	38
Statistical Analysis	39
Logistic Regression Equations	41
6 DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION	43
Results and Discussion.....	43
7 RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS	58
Implications	58
Limitations.....	60
Conclusion.....	63
REFERENCES	65
APPENDIX	
A INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPLICATION.....	71

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	LIST OF JOB CLUB PARTICIPATION BY STATE	35
2.	SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF LOW-INCOME MOTHERS	39
3.	ODDS RATIO ESTIMATES OF THE EFFECTS OF EDUCATIONAL LEVEL ON JOB CLUBS AND SEARCHES IN SINGLE MOTHER FAMILIES	43
4.	SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF LOW-INCOME MOTHERS IN MANDATING STATES.....	52
5.	ODDS RATIO ESTIMATES OF THE EFFECTS OF EDUCATIONAL LEVEL ON JOB CLUBS AND SEARCHES IN SINGLE MOTHER FAMILIES IN MANDATING STATES.....	55

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Background

Promoting self-sufficiency and transitioning from welfare to work is the purpose of the federally funded welfare system. Throughout the 1980s and into the early 1990s, the United States social welfare system began to be overwhelmed by the number of new welfare cases each year. In order to cut down on the number of new recipients each year, the current welfare system needed to be revitalized in a way that would drive these recipients off of welfare. The Personal Responsibility and Work Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) replaced the historical welfare program known as Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) (Daguerre 2008; Gennetian and Miller 2004).

President Bill Clinton signed PRWORA legislation into law on August 22, 1996. Of the four established goals for the new program, only one focused on job training and job placement as a means of reducing poverty (Blum and Francis 2001; Christopher 2004). Although the newly designed welfare program implemented the condition of a work requirement, the majority of the goals support a different form of reducing poverty. Recipients are pushed to fulfill work-based activities without much help from the program. If recipients are unable to follow through and obtain a job, they may be sanctioned and become ineligible for cash benefits (Corcoran et al. 2000; Keiser, Mueser and Choi 2001). However, the welfare system does allow certain job training to be counted towards the necessary requirements. Because of the goal of focusing on job training and job placement, recipients can use this to help them search for jobs

that provide upward mobility and out of the hands of government assistance. This option is available, however, to only 30 percent of the welfare population in particular states with twelve months for education and six weeks for job training (Kim 2009). Since a limited number of welfare recipients are allowed to enroll in a given time frame, we can determine which types of recipients are more likely to enroll. Since states offered no more than sixty consecutive months (Gennetian and Miller 2004; Rowe, Murphy and Williamson 2006) to receive welfare benefits, the main focus of the program was the idea of employment (Daguerre 2008).

The norms of fulfilling work-based activities usually involve going into the field and obtaining employment. However, recipients may also find that participating in job clubs or searches also fulfills this requirement. The down side of using this method is that there is no income in return. As job clubs tend to be reminiscent of schooling, this paper will examine whether the educational level of recipients predicts the decision to attend these activities. Using data from the first wave of the 2004 panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), this study will investigate the association of educational level and the usage of job clubs and searches. This study does not look at the effectiveness of job clubs and searches, but describes the type of recipients that do use it with regard to education. The study will utilize logistic regression to see how educational levels would affect the usage of job clubs and searches. This type of analysis is most appropriate to address the prediction of probability on the dependent variable. Two models will be used to test the hypothesis, with the first

including just the independent and dependent variables and the second with the addition of control variables.

Outline of the Paper

The following section will outline a brief history of welfare reform and the presence of job club programs. I will describe the similarities in structure many states have when organizing this program and how some studies have shown job clubs to be successful or not. Factors that may affect the decision to enroll in job clubs will be mentioned to understand the reasons for including specific control variables. The next section will illustrate how the rational choice theory plays a part in understanding the research question. Using a rational choice framework, a hypothesis will be provided and used to test the research question. The design and methodology section will describe the dataset and variables. Using logistic regression, a discussion will allow for an explanation of the findings, implications, and provide limitations to the study. Concluding remarks will highlight the overall study with a brief summary of the findings.

CHAPTER 2: WELFARE REFORM AND JOB CLUBS AND SEARCHES

Welfare Reform History

Prior to 1996, the welfare system was considered an entitlement program that was available to any family needing assistance. Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) was the previous welfare system that provided cash benefits to low-income families for an extended period of time with little or no state-imposed requirements on the recipients (Fitzgerald and Ribar 2004). Many of the recipients relied heavily on AFDC subsidies to get by because of the entitlement characteristic. With the passage of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) in 1996, the United States welfare system was dramatically altered and the result was a work-first program that focused on improving the lives of welfare families. PRWORA was a big turning point in reestablishing the welfare system and its goals for recipients. Instead of allowing a lifetime of federal cash assistance to eligible individuals, stricter requirements and limitations were put in place. In order to meet the outcomes of the four objectives that were implemented, the Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF) system was established to replace the previous AFDC system.

Welfare reform began with the establishment of four primary goals developed through PRWORA legislation. These goals are to provide assistance to needy families; end dependence on welfare by promoting job preparation, work, and marriage for needy families; prevent and reduce the incidence of out-of-wedlock pregnancies and establish annual numerical goals for preventing and

reducing the incidence of these pregnancies; and encourage the formation and maintenance of two-parent families (Christopher 2004). Only one of the four purposes focuses on promoting employment as a means to reducing poverty. Before the implementation of TANF in 1996, goals of the welfare system had been exclusively focused on the family, specifically the children's well being (Mink 1995). Since then, the welfare system has incorporated the concept of transitioning from welfare to work while reducing the welfare enrollment numbers.

Welfare reform in 1996 introduced and reinforced the notions of employment as a resolution to poverty and job preparation as a means of transitioning from welfare to work. This section will outline the changes that occurred with the introduction of TANF in 1996, including eligibility standards, demographics of welfare families, and work requirements. Following an analysis of the impact that TANF reform has had on welfare recipients, the concept of job clubs will be introduced. The opportunities for job club participation will be examined and discussed in the context of welfare reform. Concluding the literature review, welfare reform and the attendance of job clubs will be examined under the framework of the rational choice theory.

Eligibility Requirements

Adults who do not have a dependent child living with them are not eligible for TANF assistance (Fitzgerald and Ribar 2004). Some states allow for women who are pregnant to apply for TANF; however, various states base the eligibility requirement on different months of pregnancy. Living expenses such as rent,

utilities, and childcare are considered when establishing eligibility. The living situation of the welfare mother and the father of her children are also considered (Fitzgerald and Ribar 2004). To be eligible, an applicant family must pass both nonfinancial tests based on the demographic characteristics of the family and its members, and financial tests based on the income and asset holdings available to the family (Rowe et al. 2006). If the mother does not live with the father of her children, then she is more likely to receive welfare benefits than if she does live with him (Fitzgerald and Ribar 2004). This is because the poverty level of a single parent household is greater than that of a two-parent home. Also, as part of welfare reform, maintaining family formations is a critical goal for recipients. If a two-parent household is approved for assistance, both the mother and the father will be expected to participate in work-related programs (Olsen 2005). However, if the mother is living with a man that is not the father of her children, then that man is not required to participate in the TANF program, but his income is still considered and can be used to deny the family any assistance (Olsen 2005).

Once approved for TANF, all recipients are expected to participate in a work-related program with no less than 20 hours per week for single-parent families and 30 hours per week for two-parent families (Bitler et al. 2004; Rowe et al. 2006). PRWORA mandates that all recipients work for their cash benefits in a federally approved program (Corcoran et al. 2000). Allowable activities include a lifetime maximum of twelve months for vocational education, and six weeks a year for job searching, job readiness programs, and community service activities (Bitler et al. 2004; Kim 2009). The only academic training that is

allowed while receiving welfare benefits includes short-term certificate programs and preparation for the General Equivalency Diploma (GED) (Melendez, Falcon and Bivens 2003). Also, no more than 30 percent of TANF users are able to participate in activities that do not include work with an income (Kim 2009). TANF does not permit welfare recipients to enroll in two or four-year degree programs while receiving cash benefits. The 1996 reform policies established welfare systems as work-first programs that did not allow for long-term training. The main goal is to transition recipients from welfare to work and if recipients were in the middle of education programs, this would increase the duration of welfare.

Once deemed eligible for TANF, welfare recipients must adhere to the requirements or face sanctions. Recipients can face two different types of sanctions: initial and severe sanctions. Initial sanctions can reduce cash benefits by a small percentage and can last anywhere from a few weeks to four months, depending on the state's policies. Severe sanctions can reduce entire cash benefits and terminate TANF eligibility. In situations of severe sanctions, recipients may have to wait three or more months before obtaining cash benefits again or have to reapply from the beginning (Rowe et al. 2006). In order to keep from being sanctioned, welfare recipients must complete all the necessary work requirements and following the ongoing eligibility requirements.

Besides being tested on eligibility requirements, recipients must not give birth to another child, or exceed the allotted time limit. Recipients have been known to give birth, thinking that this would increase their cash benefits in order

to meet the needs of the new child. Because of this, many states have initiated family caps on the number of newborns. The majority of states have adapted this cap; however, those that have not will only increase cash benefits if recipients have been part of the program for at least eight to ten months (Rowe et al. 2006). Welfare used to be an entitlement program, which allowed for cash benefits to be distributed for an unlimited length of time. Now TANF has been reduced to a maximum of sixty continuous months. Some states have requested that their time limit be shorter (Connecticut has the shortest time limit with twenty months) (Rowe et al. 2006).

Welfare Demographics

Historically, the well being of children has been the priority in the U.S. From the maternalist movement in the 1940s through the many improvements of government programs, welfare soon began to consider the well being of mothers. As part of the New Deal, ADC was expanded to AFDC (Aid to Families with Dependent Children) to include the mothers' welfare (Mink 1995). The expansion to AFDC also reduced strict eligibility requirements, such as residency and employment rules. The easing of eligibility requirements increased welfare numbers, especially from women of color, as recipients who were once using ADC became eligible for Social Security because of the age requirement. With the establishment of Social Security and the elderly population switching from AFDC to Social Security, the welfare population's race demographics changed. Rather than having Whites make up the sole population, the proportion of other races started to increase. The number of welfare cases increasing lead to a stigma

of using welfare assistance due to having children outside of marriage, not earning wages, or for not choosing to depend on men (Mink 1995). Once PRWORA of 1996 was passed, Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) was created which restricted poor families' rights to income and social services. One of the goals was to promote self-sufficiency through work and marriage among low-income mothers, who made up about 90 percent of adult TANF recipients (Reese 2005).

Similarly to the recipients of welfare during the maternalist movement, the first criterion of current welfare usage is the presence of young children (Jennings 2004). Adults are only eligible for assistance if they have a dependent child in the household. The most common characteristic of welfare recipients now is that they are young, single mothers with children under the age of six. The usage of cash benefits for mothers is determined by a combination of her educational level, the number and ages of children in the home, and her state of residence (Jennings 2004). Welfare duration increases with lower levels of educational attainment. Previous research has shown that the educational level of a welfare recipient can be used, as a measurement of how long that person will be on welfare (Jennings 2004). For females with children present, daily rhythms may be erratic with respect to obligations such as schooling, childcare, or appointments (Roy, Tubbs and Burton 2004). Because of this, finding employment that suits the time pattern of a mother may be difficult to achieve without the help of resources. Recipients may spend the beginning of their time limit working towards obtaining a GED or a vocational license. As educational level increases, the duration of receiving

welfare starts to decrease (Jennings 2004). Because of this inverse relationship between educational attainment and length of welfare usage, many recipients have been described to have a lack of education (Rank 2001). Those who do not have a high school diploma or GED have a high likelihood of being on welfare (Porterfield 2001).

The number and ages of children in the home also influences the type of individuals who use welfare assistance. Women with young children who require full time childcare are more dependent on assistance when compared to women with children who do not need childcare or only care before and after school. Women with multiple children requiring full time care may struggle to pay for childcare with low-income wages. However, if there are older siblings who are present, they may be able to take on a sitter role and care for the younger siblings (Romich 2007). Infants or toddlers present require special supervision, which may increase the expense for childcare (Gennetian et al. 2004). Having children under the age of three increases the difficulty for low-income women to find and keep jobs, which extends the duration of welfare (Meyer and Cancian 1998). Also with each child requiring care, the cost rises and the chances of becoming financially independent of government assistance decreases (Lichter and Crowley 2004).

Where a person lives is another influence on the types of individuals who use welfare. Individuals living in low-income areas with fewer employment and educational opportunities are more likely to receive government assistance (McLaughlin and Lichter 1997). Geographic location can influence a family's

ability to sustain financial independence. Living in a metropolitan area may be advantageous financially with the presence of public transportation and access to surrounding cities. Having this accessibility increases the chances of obtaining a job and transitioning out of welfare. Those living in a rural area, on the other hand, may face greater limitations when striving for financial independence. Their stay on welfare may be longer as they make their way outside of their local area for jobs. Having to migrate to a more populated area or closer to one may be an option some have to take.

Job Clubs and Search Programs

Job clubs originated in the 1970s from a concept developed by Dr. Nathan Azrin. Dr. Azrin, a professor of psychological studies, focused his early works on interventions for the unemployed. Based on his research he came up with a list of principles for effective job clubs. These included having welfare recipients treat the job search as a full-time job, and small groups where recipients would be able to team up and work together, provide social support to each other, and learn how to properly dress for success (Brooks, Nackerud, and Risler 2001; Sterrett 1998). The primary purpose of job clubs is to place all or almost all of the recipients into a job (Kaplan 2002). In order to fulfill this goal, states have organized workshops to help facilitate the courses. The way that job clubs are structured creates similarities across state programs. Using data from the first three years of the Women's Employment Study (WES), Danziger and Seefeldt (2002) found that women were having a hard time being employed due to low skill levels and learning disabilities, lack of recent work experience, lack of work readiness, or

“soft” skills. Job clubs have been designed to alleviate some of these problems, allowing welfare recipients to become employable. One of the biggest factors that prevents recipients from being employable is not having a high school degree (31.4 percent) (Danziger and Seefeldt 2002). Although this is a barrier, job clubs are not used to solve the barriers, but to utilize other skills in place of the barriers.

Recipients are able to apply the hours spent in job clubs and searches as part of the required hours of work-based activities. Programs that offer job clubs are structured to not go beyond the six weeks of allowable substitution hours. Recipients may substitute these hours because they want to learn how to effectively search for employment, are facing sanctions, or are required to do so. Many recipients know that if they do not meet the minimum work requirements, cash benefits will start to diminish (Keiser et al. 2004) and enrolling in job clubs may prevent them from being sanctioned.

Job clubs have been receiving less attention as the years go by. States have been reducing the portion of budgets that affects low-income households and have been focusing their finances on childcare, child welfare, and employment and training (Ellwood and Boyd 2000). In 1999, about 42 percent of TANF cases were in activities that could be counted towards work-based activities (either employment, job search, or other employment preparation activities) (Danziger and Seefeldt 2002). In 2004, only 30 percent of TANF cases were allowed to use an activity that was not employment as part of the requirements (Kim 2009). There have been talks of decreasing the cap to a smaller range (Kim 2009). In nineteen states, attendance at job clubs and searches is mandatory as part of the

application process for receiving welfare assistance. If the applicant fails to comply with the requirements, they are not eligible for assistance (Rowe et al. 2006). Recipients residing within these states do not have the choice of whether to attend or not. If they do not attend, there is no reason for them to apply for assistance. The rest of the states do not require job clubs; however, they are still available to recipients if they choose that route at some point while receiving welfare assistance. These recipients are not being forced to attend job searches and can decide based on their own situation if this is something they want to do.

Similarities of Job Clubs and Searches across States

As the implementation of TANF provided states with the ability to structure their welfare programs, job clubs have remained similar with respect to the goals for attendees. Learning how to conduct themselves during interviews, workplace behavior, or searching for potential employment are goals for job clubs in every state. However, programs have used different approaches to achieve these goals. Some have maintained a classroom atmosphere, while others have combined classroom and field work for learning.

In Michigan, as part of their Work First program, job clubs provide a week of training followed by the beginning of job searches. The first week includes workshops on finding job leads, preparing resumes, and negotiating job offers. Mock interviews, which are taped, help participants improve on their weaknesses and develop strategies. After the first week, participants move on to job searching and meet with their instructor and classmates to discuss potential job leads and other difficulties that may arise (Anderson and Seefeldt 2000). These skills will

be helpful as they start the process of applying for work. Having the foundational skills will allow recipients to access jobs that require higher skill levels and provide financial independence from the welfare system. This program emphasizes the independence participants have when going out on their own and finding suitable jobs. Because of the participants' own ability, many retain the jobs they successfully find (Anderson and Seefeldt 2000).

Other programs such as Greater Avenues for Independence (GAINS) in California provide a four-week job readiness and career-planning program for welfare recipients. Each week consists of different activities that teach recipients skills for success. Goals include developing a career plan, targeting job searches with a living wage, focusing on occupations that have a potential for growth, and enrolling participants in education or training activities to be combined with part-time employment. Throughout the four weeks, participants learn skills such as work behaviors and attitudes, employer expectations, dress codes, budgeting finances, and setting career goals. Participants also learn how to adapt their resume to job applications and interview preparation (Greater Avenues for Independence 2008).

In Texas, the Choices Program enrolls recipients in job readiness activities. Recipients are responsible for making a designated number of employer contacts per week, while the staffers make job referrals and provide job development activities to facilitate the job search program. Activities that are provided include self-esteem building, labor market information, employment goal setting, resume writing, interviewing techniques, general workplace

expectations, and job retention skills (Texas Workforce 2011). Even though Texas is one of the states that mandate this program to all their applicants, the structure and goals of the program are no different than Michigan and California, two states that do not mandate the program.

Mixed Results from Previous Studies

Previous studies on job clubs and searches have attempted to determine whether or not these programs actually work. The goals of many studies have focused on learning the types of welfare recipients who participate, whether participants do eventually find a job, or the benefits of choosing to use job clubs and searches. Results from these studies have shown job clubs to have both positive and negative outcomes. Although this may seem a little discouraging, welfare policies differ between states, which may cause these mixed results. Studies have focused on specific states or combination of states that are rarely replicated in subsequent studies. We can take a look at some of the previous studies to see which states have been analyzed and how job clubs and searches have fared in their results.

Characteristics of successful job club programs have strongly encouraged participants to enroll, stressed the importance of finding jobs, and used job developers (Gueron and Hamilton 2002). These are all emphasized in programs with the exception of encouraging enrollment. When it came to accepting job offers, programs in Portland, Oregon told recipients to wait for jobs that paid more and had the opportunity for upward mobility. Those in Riverside, CA told recipients to accept the first job offer because of the uncertainty of another

potential offer (Gueron and Hamilton 2002). Typical unemployed job seekers would have a better chance of finding a desirable job by accepting the first offer received and continuing to search while employed (Blau and Robins 1990). For some recipients who have a number of barriers to work, job clubs cannot alleviate those barriers but can offer alternative solutions to employment. An evaluation of Washington state's Community Job program found that at least 72 percent of their participants (who may or may not have completed the program) were able to find employment and increased their income by 60 percent during the first two years of work (Baider and Frank 2006).

Successful results of job clubs include a study done by Azin et al. (1980) looking at five cities: Harlem, New Brunswick, Milwaukee, Wichita, and Tacoma. The study sample of 1000 Work Incentive Program (WIN) welfare recipients was split, with half required to attend job clubs and the other half used as a control group. In the end, 87 percent of those who were enrolled in job clubs found employment compared to the 59 percent who did not enroll. Job clubs were also effective for both high school graduates and dropouts. Those who enrolled had an overall satisfaction with the job club (Azin et al. 1980). Sterrett (1998) found that job club attendance was successful in increasing job search self-efficacy in two nonurban western Virginia cities. Job clubs boosted motivation and improved job-seeking skills. All of the recipients expressed a feeling of not wanting to be dependent. Before the end of one job club rotation, three out of eight participants were able to find employment (Sterrett 1998).

Looking at the long term effects of different types of welfare programs, those who use job search-focused programs increase their earnings by 12.3 percent over five years. Those who participated only in basic education had a 6.9 percent increase and those using a combination of the two increased by 24.7 percent (Martinson and Strawn 2003). When comparing the use of welfare programs on increasing educational levels, the use of job trainings increased earnings by 47.3 percent, compared to 13.4 percent when increasing reading skills and 30.5 percent when acquiring a GED (Martinson and Strawn 2003). Participating in job training is a pivotal experience for recipients as they transition out of the welfare system. As their cash benefits begin to decrease due to the increase in earnings, they will not need to rely on cash benefits anymore. Recipients are able to be self-sufficient with the experience they have gained through job training (Bos et al. 2002).

Previous studies have also suggested that job preparation courses provided have not been as effective as many would have gathered (Rangarajan and Gordon 1992; Grubb 1995). Using the 2004 SIPP data, Kim (2009) found that those who seemed to be job ready (had high education and never were unemployed more than six months) were the ones who were receiving training in finding jobs. Along with findings by Bell (2000) and O'Hara (2002), welfare recipients who dropped out of high school were the least likely to engage in job clubs or to further their skills. In West Virginia, attendance at job clubs did not increase employment and earnings. Much of this was due to the rural nature of the state and the existence of high unemployment rates (Gueron 1990). Studies in New

Jersey have found that job training increases work hours and reduces the number of welfare cases, but does not increase the recipient's income (Gueron and Hamilton 2002).

As these studies have stated, attending job clubs may guide participants to find desirable employment and increase earnings in the future. However, there have also been previous studies that show negative results from attending job clubs. The differences in results from these studies may be due to the mandatory job club attendance some states have implemented. In the Azin et al. (1980) study, states were not mandating participation, which could have affected the results. In Kim's (2009) study, her population came from a mixture of states where job clubs were both mandatory and voluntary.

Results from these studies have also focused on different aspects of job searches, which may affect the outcome of studies. The studies done by Martinson and Strawn (2003) and Sterrett (1998) looked at increases in earnings after the enrollment of job searches while Kim (2009) looked at the types of recipients who participate in job clubs. Because of the different study's focus on job clubs, this leads to different analysis of what is considered positive or negative. One type of factor may lead to successful participation in the program while another may not.

Similarly, the location within a state may differentiate the results. Two studies were conducted in nonurban locations with one deemed successful and the other not (Sterret 1998; Gureon 1990). Although they were both studying similar populations, the focus of the population was completely different. One focused

on the positive attitude that attendees showed which helped obtain employment while the other suggested that employment could not be found due to the rural area and high unemployment rates. If the end result is not employment, then the goal of the job club is not achieved.

As job clubs are structured to help the most disadvantaged, those who utilize them have made the choice to attend. Those who are job-ready participate because they understand the structure and may feel the importance of learning specific skills, whereas those who are disadvantaged or dropped out of school may not understand the importance. This makes the disadvantaged less likely to naturally put themselves in a situation to learn again. However if an individual lives in a state that mandates participation, then those who are job ready have no choice at all.

Educational Influences on Attendance of Job Clubs

Many studies have found welfare recipients to have low education levels. Having a high school education or less has been the characteristic of welfare recipients since the late 1970s (Rangarajan, Schochet and Chu 1998). In analyzing the welfare population on a national level, Zedlewski (1999), found that more than 4 out of 10 recipients have less than a high school education. Similarly, using the 1997 National Study of America's Families, Loprest and Zedlewski (1999) found that more welfare recipients report having an education less than high school (12 percent more than other education levels). Having less than a high school education also coincides with low work experience, knowledge of few workplace norms such as lateness and attendance, few job skills, and low

literacy (Danziger and Seefeldt 2002). Lacking a high school diploma also significantly increases the likelihood that a recipient will experience long welfare episodes (Peterson 1995; Sandefur and Cook 1997). The longer a recipient stays on as a welfare case, the closer she is to being sanctioned for using up the time allotment. This may lead welfare recipients who have low education levels to seek out job clubs and searches as a way to better their chances of finding employment and not be sanctioned.

As a brief comparison to the national population, 5 out of 100 drop out of high school before receiving a high school diploma. Living in a low-income family increases the chances of not receiving a high school degree or GED by four times compared to living in a family with high income (10.4 percent to 2.5 percent). About 74 percent of students who do graduate from high school have some college experience (Laird, DeBell, and Chapman 2006). According to the 2004 Current Population Survey, about 32 percent of the population age 18 and over have a high school diploma, while 19 percent of the total population has some college experience but no degree, and 17 percent have a bachelor's degree (U.S. Census Bureau 2005).

Although the majority of welfare recipients have low education levels (Bos et al. 2002), we cannot exclude recipients who have had higher education experience. The population within welfare recipients who have higher education may be small, however we cannot rule them out as those who do or do not enroll in job preparation courses. Bos et al. (2002) found that 39.4 percent of recipients in California's GAIN program enrolled in a job-training course had educational

experience after high school (42.8 percent graduated from high school or had a GED and 17.8 percent did not have a high school degree or GED). Those with higher education may perceive enrolling in job preparation courses differently from those who have low education. Wanberg, Kanfer and Rotundo (1999) found that as education level increases and the length of unemployment increases, recipients will start to use job searches to overcome the hardships of finding employment. Recipients may understand that they need external help and are willing to enroll in job clubs to do so. Since the skills that are taught in job search programs are geared towards the employers' expectations (Bos et al. 2002), recipients may see this as an advantage.

Other Factors Leading to the Attendance of Job Clubs

Other factors may play a role in influencing the choices a recipient makes. Some factors may be beyond the individual's ability to change or are a part of the individual. Such factors can be anything from the number of children one has, marital status, age, and even state employment rates. The easiest way of fulfilling work-based activities is to find work right away. For some, being impatient can be negatively correlated with search efforts and the employment exit rate (DellaVigna and Paserman 2005). Women relying on TANF in Mississippi were interviewed and described how when they found employment, it would automatically lead them out of welfare (Harris and Parisi 2008). Sometimes lowering their expectations and decreasing the value of jobs will increase their chances of finding employment faster (DellaVigna and Paserman 2005). This idea of immediate transition from welfare to work would be hindered if they spent

time in job clubs because it would mean that they would not be working. Because of the need to have a job, some may not spend the necessary time to attend a job club (DellaVigna and Paserman 2005). Similarly, for mothers in New York, those who participated in the Next Step program wanted to find employment as fast as possible because they did not want to deal with TANF and their work requirements (Smith 2002).

When interviewing participants of job clubs in Philadelphia, Black respondents expressed their attendance because they truly wanted to benefit from the program (Cleaveland 2008). They also described that participation should not be mandatory because individual situations should allow for the ability to want to participate in a program. Those who did not feel that the program would benefit them would not have been able to benefit as much compared to those who truly wanted it to. When studying women in San Francisco, CA. Kim (2009) found that those who received job training were young and often racial minorities.

Where welfare recipients live may also influence the decision to attend a job club or not. For example, in rural Kentucky, job-training opportunities are limited compared to the urban areas (Areneault 2006). As recipients traveled towards urban areas, there was an increase in the options for training and education, as well as specialized opportunities (Areneault 2006). If recipients in rural areas wanted to attend, they would need some sort of transportation to the urban areas for any chance. Because of the limitations, it may be more suitable to just find employment if job training were out of their boundaries. In Montgomery County, Maryland, low-income individuals who live in clusters often found jobs

through social networking with each other (Kleit 2002). However, individuals who were dispersed around the county utilized formal methods such as job searches as a means of finding jobs (Kleit 2002). Recipients who used networking in San Francisco often found jobs that were low quality and temporary, which inevitably required recipients to network and find new jobs (Chapple 2001). Job club participation rates are affected by place of residence.

The state environment in which a recipient lives in may affect the decision to attend a job club program. Welfare reform has given states the authority to control the requirements of welfare programs (Meyers, Glaser, and MacDonald 1998). Because of this, it may affect some of the states' economic characteristics. Although these economic characteristics may not be seen directly, it can manifest in ways that affect individual situations. Female labor participation rates, employment rates, and gross state production (per capita), single family rates, poverty rates, and minimum wage are incorporated in this study as control variables to tease out any potential influences in attending a job club.

Since welfare recipients are predominantly female, the female labor participation rate has been included to target this population. An increase in high female labor participation may show that states have opportunities of employment to facilitate the female population (Mandel and Semyonov 2006). If rates are low, accessibility may be hard to obtain and resources such as job clubs may be used as resources. Females may see other females unsuccessfully find jobs, which can influence their own decision of attending a job club or trying to continue to find jobs themselves.

Similarly with the female labor participation rate, employment rates also help to understand the availability of jobs in the market in a general perspective. Employment rates can help explain the likelihood a recipient would find employment. If employment rates are low, job openings may be scarce and recipients may need the help of job club programs to search for promising employment. In areas of Maryland, where low-income families are clustered, many have turned to social networking to find jobs. Because they are able to turn to neighbors who are having luck finding jobs for help.

Minimum wages for states have been included to control whether or not those living in lower minimum wage states may consider employment as opposed to job club programs. With the goal of minimum wage is to redistribute the earnings to low-paid workers (Freeman 1996), this may motivate recipients to search for employment that pays a higher wage. If the majority of the jobs provide low minimum wage, it may be beneficial for recipients to attend job club programs to find jobs with higher wages.

States with high gross state production (GSP) may have higher accessibility to employment than other states, which can influence recipients to proceed to employment rather than attending a job club program. High GSP can be a result of densely populated areas where employment is accessible (Ciccone and Hall 1996). Densely populated areas are usually found in cities, which is a common area for recipients to search for employment rather than to attend job club programs.

Controlling for the rate of single-parent families in a state will show how similar the state is to the respondents with respect to family structure. As the rate increases, the government takes into consideration the barriers that may arise in single-parent families. Services and programs become available through the government to help families function better. Previous studies have shown that if states provide sufficient access to childcare facilities or have family-oriented services, this may increase the probability of women searching for work (Mandel and Semyonov 2006). If rates are high, this may be an indicator that states are providing extra services to help. As lack of childcare has been shown to be a barrier to employment (Gennetian et al. 2004), the government may provide this service if they feel that enough families are able to utilize this service. Having these services provided by the government may influence choice of attending a job club. If the government is providing child care, individuals may take advantage and apply for employment as opposed to attending a job club to find work that can fit their schedules.

The last state-level variable used is the poverty rate, which can control the state population's ability to achieve a standard of living. If the poverty rate is high, then the state has a population that is not achieving the minimum standard of living. High state poverty rates also suggest that public employment is higher compared to government employment (Alesina, Baqir and Easterly 2000). Having high public employment will increase the chances of seasonal or temporary employment with no benefits. As these types of jobs are accessible, recipients may need help in searching for jobs that provide security for the future.

As much of the previous research has found a lack of job readiness programs to be a barrier in transitioning to work, this study will be able to shine some light on the types of recipients who are doing their best to minimize the barrier that is present. By using education level of recipients as an indicator, this will help researchers in understanding if there is a targeted group of recipients who utilize a program that the government offers. Because of these extra factors that may play a role, using logistic regression I can control these factors in determining the effect of education levels on attending job participation programs. Analyzing the characteristics of the recipients who attend these programs can help in changing the way those who do not attend perceive the benefits.

CHAPTER 3: RATIONAL CHOICE THEORY

Framework

This research will draw upon the rational choice perspective as a model to guide the relevant literature. Rational choice theory is derived from an economic perspective, which has been shaped to understand a sociological perspective.

Individuals must weigh out the costs in order to obtain the maximum benefit of a decision (Graham and Beller 1989; Masters and Garfinkel 1977). Usually monetary value is placed on both the costs and benefits (Robinson 1993) as a way to decide which to choose. As this cost and benefit framework understands economic behaviors, a rational choice framework understands the social behaviors. As the main requirement to continue receiving welfare subsidies is to work a minimum of twenty hours for single-parent families or thirty hours for two-parent families (Rowe et al. 2006), a number of various work-based activities qualify for those hours. Recipients are able to count hours used for educational purposes towards a degree or certificate, or hours spent in job clubs as a temporary alternative to working (Rowe et al. 2006). According to each individual's situation, social factors can play a role in influences the decisions to attend a specific type of work-based activity.

Work requirements need to be met before sanctions are applied. But recipients also understand that these policies are supposed to help them transition from welfare to work. By looking for work right away, this will benefit them sooner by having a job and receiving a flow of income that comes from a job and also having supplementation from welfare programs. On the other hand, given

the option of participating in job clubs, the benefits may be higher in the long run because of the added skills to find jobs that provide higher wages. But when recipients enroll in these courses, they are not getting paid as part of the process, which may not be helpful in some cases if recipients need income to pay bills. This is something that many recipients have to think about and figure out what course of action will provide the best benefit in their situation. As welfare reform's goal is to transition recipients into the workforce, these courses can provide the accommodation needed to do so, to the extent that recipients choose to use that route and the courses are effective.

Job clubs are structured so that participants are able to work in a classroom as well as in the field searching for employment. This type of structure may resemble the classroom experience throughout the early educational years. Each individual's previous education experience may be a factor in deciding whether or not to utilize job clubs. Depending on education levels, additional courses to help with skills or finding jobs may or may not be a benefit. If recipients have enough education to learn the necessary skills, enrolling in job clubs may cost them time away from earning an income, which would not be beneficial to them or reaching the goal of welfare reform.

The value of participating in a job club or search should help in maximizing the goal of transitioning from welfare to work. Individual actions are purposive and are intentional to the point that what they do will maximize the benefit. If there is no maximization to achieve the goal, then there is no point in taking that action (Hechter and Kanazawa 1997). Because this is an option as a

means of satisfying the work requirements and ultimately transitioning from welfare to work, there are enough individuals that place some value in this.

CHAPTER 4: HYPOTHESIS

Current educational levels and the idea of going back to learn more skills may be a factor that recipients will consider. The reasons they stopped their educational attainment in the first place can affect their choice in enrolling in job clubs. These job clubs can provide a starting point in allowing recipients to be self-sufficient (Reese 2005) by qualifying themselves for employment with the skills they have learned. This research will describe the educational level of recipients who do decide to enroll in job clubs. Results will show whether or not recipients with certain education levels have a higher chance in utilizing job clubs that are offered as part of work-based activities. Identifying which groups of educational levels are using job clubs more may give rise to targeting specific educational levels in the future and helping them achieve the transition from work to welfare.

Utilizing the rational choice theory, if recipients feel that there is a value in attending job club programs, they may likely attend. With work requirements being enforced, and the constant reminder of the process of transition from welfare to work, recipients may look to maximize what they can to reach their goal. Job club programs are a good resource to do so, especially with many successful results. Recipients with high educational levels may find this value appealing and may feel that this will help them find employment that will lead them out of welfare. Recipients with lower educational levels may miss seeing the value of job club programs, which will lead to not choosing to participate.

With the availability of job clubs for welfare recipients, TANF has been discouraging states from allowing recipients to participate in education and training programs (Martinson and Strawn 2003). A cap has been placed restricting the duration of education (twelve months) and training (six to twelve weeks) and having no more than 30 percent of recipients being enrolled (Kim 2009). The restriction TANF places, makes this research salient as a way to describe the types of recipients enrolling. Previous research has stated that learning new skill sets through job clubs have helped recipients obtain employment (Bos et al. 2002). Especially for those who have less education, being involved in these programs has shown promising results (Hershey and Pavetti 1997). Because of the cap on the number of recipients who can utilize this program and studies showing individuals who are job-ready utilizing job clubs, a hypothesis can be formulated as follows: having a higher education level will predict a higher likelihood of recipients attending job clubs or searches.

CHAPTER 5: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Data

The dataset used in this study is the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) sponsored by the U.S. Census Bureau. This survey collects data such as demographics, income, labor force information, and program participation to measure the effectiveness of federal, state, and local programs. The 2004 SIPP panel consists of 46,500 households, where respondents are interviewed a total of eight times. The interviews are conducted using a computer-assisted interview (utilizing both Computer-Assisted Personal Interview (CAPI) and Computer-Assisted Telephone Interview (CATI)) on laptops. Participants who moved during the course of the study were contacted to continue participation when possible. Each wave contains core and topical questionnaires. The core questionnaires are repeated interviews for each wave asking basic demographic questions, as well as questions pertaining to program participation and income. The topical questionnaires vary according to each wave and collect in-depth information on specific social and economic characteristics and personal history. Waves are conducted in four-month intervals detailing what had happened during the reference month (the month before the scheduled interviews) (Survey of Income and Program Participation 2009).

National-level data files were obtained from the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) website. The SIPP is a longitudinal study that has a total of eight waves lasting from 2004 – 2006. This study will use the core questionnaire from Wave 1. The 2004 study utilizes the

changes that have been made in survey instrumentation since 1992. The changes provided improvements to the questionnaires that allow for this study. Using the first wave in a longitudinal study will eliminate any type of prior knowledge of participating in a job club program. If another wave was used, then recipients would have answered this question before and have the knowledge that this program exists which may influence the decision to participate. By not having a variable that asked respondents if they previously knew about job clubs, the only way to tease out this possibility is to use the first wave. Also using the most recent dataset allows for analysis of the most recent sample population. A subset of the variables in the dataset is used for this research.

Since respondents live in different states, state-level data not found in the SIPP dataset are incorporated to control for a variety of economic characteristics. State-level data was gathered from sources such as the U.S. Census Bureau, University of Kentucky Center for Poverty, and the Welfare Rules Databook of 2004 assembled by the Urban Institute. The information gathered is made available for public use without any prior registration or affiliation.

As part of the U.S. Census Bureau, the SIPP defines families as groups of two or more people related by birth, marriage, or adoption who reside together. In order to distinguish the differences in families (nuclear or sub-family), the current study uses the respondent identifier variable RFID2 (Family ID but excludes family members that are related) to determine the reference person.

Sample

The final sample population consists of respondents in the SIPP dataset who meet four stipulations. The first stipulation requires respondents to reside in a state that does not mandate recipients of government assistance to participate in job clubs or searches. Looking at respondents who live in these states will give a better understanding of who is taking the opportunity to use job clubs and searches. The second stipulation is that respondents live in a female-headed household. Those who live in a male-headed or husband and wife household were not included in the sample population. Since the majority of welfare recipients are females, having children present would create a family environment where a female would be the head of the household. Mothers often obtain custody of their children, which allows the fathers to move in and out of the household. Since the second stipulation requires living in a female-headed household, the third stipulation requires that there be at least one child present in the family. Pregnant females are eligible to apply for welfare depending on the month of their pregnancy in some states, while other states do not allow pregnant females to apply. Because of the array of limitations according to each state and the absence of questions asked of respondents on their pregnancy status, only those who have at least one child will be part of the sample population. The final stipulation requires respondents to be 150 percent below the poverty threshold. The U.S. Census Bureau measures poverty threshold by the percentage of poverty the family is in during the reference month. The mean number of children and the

mean number of family members were calculated and using the U.S. Census' poverty threshold chart, the threshold was determined.

After narrowing down the sample population, a total of 3,642 respondents remained. The respondents live in thirty-one states: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

TABLE 1. LIST OF JOB CLUB PARTICIPATION BY STATE.

State	Job Club Requirement
Alabama	Yes
Alaska	No
Arizona	No
Arkansas	Yes
California	No
Colorado	No
Connecticut	No
Delaware	No
D.C.	Yes
Florida	No
Georgia	Yes
Hawaii	No
Idaho	Yes
Illinois	Yes
Indiana	No
Iowa	No
Kansas	No
Kentucky	No
Louisiana	Yes
Maine	No
Maryland	Yes
Massachusetts	No
Michigan	No

Minnesota	No
Mississippi	No
Missouri	Yes
Montana	No
Nebraska	No
Nevada	Yes
New Hampshire	No
New Jersey	Yes
New Mexico	No
New York	Yes
North Carolina	Yes
North Dakota	Yes
Ohio	Yes
Oklahoma	No
Oregon	No
Pennsylvania	No
Rhode Island	No
South Carolina	Yes
South Dakota	No
Tennessee	No
Texas	Yes
Utah	No
Vermont	Yes
Virginia	No
Washington	No
West Virginia	No
Wisconsin	Yes
Wyoming	No

Although this study focuses on recipients who live in states that do not mandate participation in job clubs, logistic regression was also run using a similar sample of respondents (must have met the four stipulations) living in states where participation is mandatory. The two groups are compared to determine whether the state requirements show different types of recipients participating in job clubs. The results are explained in the discussion section.

Variables

Dependent variable

The dependent variable measures the use of welfare programs that help in obtaining jobs. Programs that help in preparing to obtain jobs include attending job clubs or job searches. Respondents were asked the question:

At any time since (fill MONTH1) 1st, did (fill TEMPNAME) attend a job search program or job club, or use a job resource center to find out about jobs, to schedule interviews, or to fill out applications?

The “MONTH1” refers to the month prior to the interview month and the “TEMPNAME” refers to the head of household. Respondents were given the choice answer of yes (1) or no (2). The month filled represents the month prior to the interview date. Thus, this variable describes the use of job clubs in the past month.

Independent variables

Respondents were asked to indicate the highest degree received or grade completed. The list included the following categories: less than 1st grade; 1st, 2nd, 3rd, or 4th grade; 5th or 6th grade; 7th or 8th grade; 9th grade; 10th grade; 11th grade; 12th grade, no diploma; high school graduate (diploma or GED); some college, but no degree; diploma/certificate from vocational, technical or trade school; Associate degree; Bachelor’s degree; Master’s Degree; Professional degree (MD, DDS, or JD); and Doctorate degree (Ph.D. or Ed.D).

For this study, educational attainment was collapsed into four categories: less than a high school education, high school graduate/GED received, some

college but no degree/certificate, and received degree/certificate after high school. High school graduate/GED was used as the reference category.

Control variables

Individual-level variables. These variables include race (Hispanic/Latino/Spanish, Non-Hispanic White, Non-Hispanic Black, and Non-Hispanic Other with Non-Hispanic White being the reference category), marital status (married, divorced, widowed, separated, and never married with never married being the reference category), citizenship status (U.S. citizen or not with U.S. citizen as the reference category), age, and personal income (continuous). SIPP measures income according to three types of earnings: wages and salaries, self-employment, and farm self-employment. Income amounts recorded are before any types of deductions, such as payroll taxes, union dues, Part B Medicare premiums, etc. In this measurement of income, cash benefits from any welfare programs are not included.

Family-level variables. These variables include location of residence (living in a metropolitan area), number of children (one, two, and three or more children under 18 years old with one being the reference category), and total number of family members.

State-level variables. These variables include minimum wage (dollar amount), gross state production (per capita) (dollar amount), poverty rate (percentage), single-parent families (percentage), employment rate (percentage), and female labor participation (percentage) for each state.

Statistical Analysis

Descriptive statistics for each of the variables highlight the sample population's sociodemographic, and state-level economic characteristics. Percentages are provided for the following variables: race, origin, marital status, educational attainment, citizenship status, sex, location of residence, number of children, and the use of job clubs and searches. Means are provided for the following variables: age, total number of family members, minimum wage, poverty rate, rates of single families, employment rate, female labor force rate, and income.

TABLE 2. SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF LOW-INCOME MOTHERS (N=3,642).

Variables	Percentage
Attended job club or search program	7.25% (264)
Education Attainment	
Less Than High School Degree	30.48% (1,110)
High School Degree/GED	28.42% (1,035)
Some College but No Degree/Certificate	18.15% (661)
Degree/Certificate After High School	22.95% (836)
Race/Ethnicity	
Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish	16.78% (611)
Non-Hispanic White	47.64% (1,735)
Non-Hispanic Black	27.59%

Non-Hispanic Other	(1,005) 7.99% (291)
Marital Status	
Married	5% (182)
Divorced	23.04% (839)
Widowed	5.55% (190)
Separated	11.81% (430)
Never Married	54.94% (2,001)
U.S. Citizen	89.79% (3,270)
Living in a Metropolitan Area	77.38% (2,818)
Number of Children Under 18	
One	48.79% (1,777)
Two	30.48% (1,110)
Three or more	20.73% (755)
	Mean
Age	32.57
Number of Family Members	3.26
Monthly Income without welfare assistance	\$616.58
Monthly Income with welfare assistance¹	\$809.80
State Minimum Wage per Hour	\$5.53
State Employment Rate	62.14%

State Single Families	30.51%
Gross State Production (per capita)	\$32,023.14
State Poverty Rate	12.68%
State Female Labor Participation Rate	59.40%

¹Welfare assistance includes: general assistance, WIC, and Food Stamps
 Note: All mothers are living in states that do not mandate job club preparation attendance.

The relationship between the independent variable (educational level) and the dependent variable (use of job clubs and searches) will be assessed using logistic regression models. Other control variables will be introduced to the model to see if the relationship between the independent and dependent variables change. If there are statistically significant odds ratios for educational level, the results will support the hypothesis that educational levels predict the likelihood of using of job clubs and searches. If there are no statistically significant odds ratios for educational level, then the results do not support the hypothesis. Control variables will determine what the significant indicator(s) of job preparation courses is (are) on educational level.

Logistic Regression Equations

The logistic regression equation for Model 1 is:

$$\text{Logit}(\text{Job Club and Searches}) = a + \beta_1(\text{less than high school/GED}) + \beta_2(\text{some college no degree/certificate}) + \beta_3(\text{certificate/degree after high school}) + e$$

The logistic regression equation for Model 2 is:

$$\text{Logit}(\text{Job Club and Searches}) = a + \beta_1(\text{less than high school/GED}) + \beta_2(\text{some college no degree/certificate}) + \beta_3(\text{degree/certificate after high school}) +$$

$\beta_4(\text{Hispanic/Latino/Spanish}) + \beta_5(\text{non-Hispanic black}) + \beta_6(\text{non-Hispanic other})$
 $+ \beta_7(\text{married}) + \beta_8(\text{divorced}) + \beta_9(\text{widowed}) + \beta_{10}(\text{separated}) + \beta_{11}(\text{is a U.S.}$
 $\text{citizen}) + \beta_{12}(\text{age}) + \beta_{13}(\text{personal income by thousands}) + \beta_{14}(\text{lives in}$
 $\text{metropolitan area}) + \beta_{15}(\text{two children}) + \beta_{16}(\text{three or more children}) + \beta_{17}(\text{number}$
 $\text{of family members}) + \beta_{18}(\text{minimum wage}) + \beta_{19}(\text{gross state production per capita}$
 $\text{by thousands}) + \beta_{20}(\text{state poverty rate}) + \beta_{21}(\text{state percent of single families}) +$
 $\beta_{22}(\text{state percent of employment}) + \beta_{23}(\text{state percent of female labor participation})$
 $+ e$

CHAPTER 6: DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Results and Discussion

These results only take into consideration respondents who attended job clubs the previous month. Because the dependent variable was measured by asking respondents if they had attended a job club the previous month, this does not allow the results to be generalized to all job club attendees. Some respondents may have attended a job club before the designated time frame and because of that, were not considered to have attended.

Table 3 shows the results of logistic regression for the respondents who live in states that do not mandate job clubs and searches. Model 1 shows the odds ratios describing the association between the dependent and independent variables. Having less than a high school degree decreases the odds of attending a job club program by 30 percent compared to respondents who have a high school degree or GED. Having some college but no degree or certificate increases the odds of attending a job club program by 42 percent compared to respondents who have a high school degree or GED. Having a degree or certificate after high school increases the odds of attending a job club program by 59 percent compared to respondents who have a high school degree or GED. This probability is statistically significant at the $p < 0.01$ levels. These results are general and do not take into consideration that other variables may play a factor in recipients attending job clubs.

TABLE 3. ODDS RATIO ESTIMATES OF THE EFFECTS OF EDUCATIONAL LEVEL ON JOB CLUBS AND SEARCHES IN SINGLE MOTHER FAMILIES (N=3,642).

	Model 1	Model 2
Education Attainment (omitted=High School Degree/GED)		
Less Than High School Degree	0.7	0.8
Some College but No Degree/Certificate	1.4	1.4
Degree/Certificate After High School	1.6**	1.7**
Race (omitted=Non-Hispanic White)		
Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish	---	0.9
Non-Hispanic Black	---	1.3
Non-Hispanic Other	---	1.6
Marital Status (omitted=Never Married)		
Married	---	1.6
Divorced	---	1.0
Widowed	---	0.3*
Separated	---	1.0
U.S. Citizen	---	1.6
Living in a Metropolitan Area	---	0.7*
Number of Children Under 18 (omitted=One)		
Two	---	1.7**
Three or more	---	1.5
Age	---	1.0
Number of Family Members	---	0.8*
Monthly Income (by thousands)	---	1.0
State Minimum Wage	---	0.9
State Employment Rate	---	1.1
State Single-Parent Families	---	1.0

Gross State Production (per capita) (by thousands)	---	1.0
State Poverty Rate	---	0.9*
State Female Labor Participation Rate	---	1.0

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

Note: All mothers are living in states that do not mandate job club preparation attendance.

Model 2 shows the same logistic regression with the addition of control variables. These control variables help to understand whether or not other variables are influencing the decision to attend job clubs. Any change in the independent variable will be because of the added control variables. Looking at the independent variable, having less than a high school degree decreases the odds of attending a job club program by 23 percent compared to respondents who have a high school degree or GED, when controlling for other variables. Having some college but no degree or certificate increases the odds of attending a job club program by 43 percent compared to respondents who have a high school degree or GED, when controlling for other variables. Having a degree or certificate after high school increases the odds of attending a job club program by 70 percent compared to respondents who have a high school degree or GED, when controlling for other variables. Similarly to the first model, this is statistically significant, at the $p < 0.01$ level.

From analyzing the logistic regression results, the hypothesis stating that having a higher educational level will predict a higher likelihood of recipients attending job clubs or searches is supported. Having less than a high school

degree or GED decreases the odds of attending a job club program compared to respondents who have a high school degree or GED. As educational levels increase, the odds of attending a job club program increase compared to respondents who have a high school degree or GED. Although respondents in this population are not limited to only being welfare recipients, they do show results that indicate educational levels as a predictor for job club attendance. Studies done by Bell (2000) and O'Hara (2002), found that welfare recipients who did not finish high school were less likely to attend job club programs. As educational levels can also have a positive relationship on job skill levels, individuals with low educational levels lack the skills that many employers are seeking (Danziger and Seefeldt 2002) and also decrease their likelihood of attending a job club.

From the two models in Table 3, we can infer that job clubs have higher probabilities of being utilized by respondents who have a high educational level. For respondents who have a degree or certificate after high school, this is statistically significant. As stated by Kim (2009), although many individuals studied were already job ready, they still attended job clubs. Individuals who already have higher educational levels may feel that the education they have completed may not translate into employment because of the length of time in an academic setting. Spending the extra years in college or a vocational school rather than being employed may create a lack of work skills that individuals may find useful to learn in job clubs. Because job clubs are designed to teach participants the attitudes and behaviors of what it means to be successful (Sterrett

1998; Brooks et al. 2001; Bos et al. 2002; Kaplan 2002), attending will give the recipients the proper skills to succeed in finding employment.

With the cap limiting the number of attendance in job clubs (Kim 2009), individuals with higher educational levels increase the likelihood of attending job club programs because they are able to seek the resources necessary to succeed. They have spent more years in school and have learned the basic skills of finding help when needed. For welfare recipients, as educational levels increase, the amount of time as a welfare case decreases (Peterson 1995; Rank 2001; Sandefur and Cook 1997), which may lead individuals with higher education to find ways to transition into work faster than others. Because respondents were asked if they had attended a job club the previous month, individuals with high educational levels may be at the early stages of being a welfare case and thus are more likely to have attended a job club. Those who attend job club programs find work faster (Gureon and Hamilton 2002), individuals of with higher education may see the benefits of attendance. For individuals with low educational levels, they may have been a welfare case longer and have not had the opportunity to attend a job club yet.

Some of the control variables have found to be statistically significant. As rational choice theory has been chosen to understand the literature, it can also be used to understand reasons why variables may be significant. Each individual's situation may or may not include these variables in deciding the likelihood of attending a job club. Variations of situations according to each individual can determine the exact reasons why a variable may increase or decrease the

likelihood of attending a job club. Although this study does not test for these reasons, it offers possible scenarios as to why they may occur in increasing or decreasing the likelihood of attending a job club program.

Marital status, specifically being widowed, plays a factor in recipients' chances of attending a job club program. If a recipient is widowed, the odds of attending a job club program decreases by 72 percent compared to respondents who were never married when controlling for other variables ($p < 0.05$). This makes sense because the norm of an individual to become widowed usually occurs at later stages of life, which minimizes the benefit of attending a job club program. Being at a later stage of life, an individual may also be in the process of transitioning from welfare recipient to Social Security recipient. A possibility of testing this would be to limit the range of age in the population so that an individual would have experienced widowship at an earlier age rather than the norm.

As one of the indicators of how long welfare recipients stay on welfare is the location of where they live, respondents living in a metropolitan area decrease their odds of attending a job club program by 31 percent compared to those who do not live in a metropolitan area ($p < 0.05$). Due to the availability of jobs within a metropolitan area, individuals may find it easier to obtain jobs without the help from job club programs. Those living in a rural area may have limited chances of finding employment and must travel to urban or metropolitan areas (Areneault 2006). If recipients are not familiar with the job opportunities in those areas, attending a job club program may be beneficial for them to get their foot in the

door. However, individuals living in a rural area must have a reliable source of transportation in order to attend job clubs. Without one, attendance at a job clubs or employment may be difficult to achieve.

Families with children present have the added barrier of needing to provide childcare. The cost of childcare can be a reason for recipients to attend job clubs. Being able to find a job that allows for upward mobility and pays a higher rate can help alleviate the necessary childcare costs and plan for future expenses. For families with two children present, the odds of attending a job club program increases by 65 percent compared to families with one child present, when controlling for other variables ($p < 0.01$). The findings were similar for families that have three or more children present; however, it was not statistically significant. Having children increases the need for income that helps pay for the necessities for additional individuals. Recipients with more than one child may be thinking of the long-term effects and the responsibilities of having children. With the presence of more than one child, recipients may use the older sibling as a form of childcare to the younger siblings when attending job clubs (Romich 2007). This can be a temporary situation as the recipient learns the skills to find employment that will aid in transitioning from welfare to work. Having more than one child may also increase the mother's participation in the children's education. The mother may try to set an example showing the children that education and learning skills is an important factor in obtaining prospective employment.

In addition to the number of children present, the total number of family members also can influence the decision to attend job club programs. As the number of family members increases, the odds of attending a job club decreases by 22 percent when controlling for other variables ($p < 0.05$). With the increase in family members, the cost of taking care of everyone becomes more burdensome. Paying for utility bills cannot wait, which may influence the need to find employment as soon as possible rather than attending a job club. Individuals may understand the long-term benefits of these programs, however if their situation does not allow for a delay in income, recipients have no other option than to seek employment. Another possibility may show that with an increase in family members, there may be more members who are employed and helping with the cost of living. As extra help is being provided, attending a job club for a better job in the future may not be needed if current situations are acceptable. A possibility of testing this would be to incorporate a total family income to see if the number of family members will increase the total family income.

With states having their individual rules and regulations for welfare reform, the only state-level characteristic that affects the decision to attend a job club program is the poverty rate. As poverty rate increases, the odds of attending a job club program decreases by 9 percent when controlling for other variables ($p < 0.05$). If the poverty rate is high, individuals are unable to maintain a standard of living. By not being able to maintain a standard of living, there may be an increase in individuals applying for welfare. As the goal of welfare is to find employment, jobs may be unavailable for recipients, which may steer them to

having to enroll in job club programs for additional help. If individuals cannot find employment and are near being sanctioned, they may participate in job clubs in order to keep their cash benefits. In addition, individuals may want to attend job club programs as a way to be qualified for jobs that pay higher wages. Not being able to maintain a standard of living could be the result of high costs of living where low-wage jobs cannot improve the situation.

There is no statistical significance for race, U.S. citizenship, age, income, minimum wage, employment rate, number of single-parent families, gross state production, and number of female labor participation. Although odds ratios do show variables with decreases or increases in the likelihood of attending a job club in the sample population, however it cannot be seen in general population.

When comparing the odds ratios of the independent variable in model 1 and model 2, there is a change in the odds ratio for respondents who have a degree or certificate after high school compared to respondents who have a high school degree or GED. The odds ratio increases when sociodemographic and state-level characteristics are introduced. The control variables play an important part in influencing a respondent to attend a job club program. With the presence of a change in odds ratio from model 1 to model 2, we can determine that there are an intervening variables in effect. Marital status, living in a metropolitan area, number of family members, and poverty rate by state all have statistically significant variables with odds ratios that decrease from model 1 to model 2. However, the odds ratio increased for one control variable, the number of children under the age of 18. Because of the majority of the statistically significant

variables decreasing in odds ratio, model 1 shows a lower odds ratio because it did not take into consideration the control variables. The control variables that were statistically significant and decreased in odds ratio in model 2 influenced the odds ratio of the independent variable. Once the control variables were taken into consideration, the variables that showed decreases in odds ratios were held constant which allowed for the odds ratio to be higher for individuals with a degree or certificate after high school.

As the main reason for this study is to see which types of individuals are more likely to attend a job club when having the option, logistic regression was used to test a similar sample population that did not have the option. These respondents live in states that mandate the requirement to attend a job club during the application process or in the beginning of a welfare case's time limit.

States that mandate job club attendance show noticeable differences in state-level characteristics. Overall individual income before and after receiving welfare assistance is lower than states that do not mandate job club attendance. The average state minimum wage is lower by 36 cents which when can affect a population that is considered low-income. The average rate of single-parent families is almost doubled (56.46%) the rate of states that do not mandate job club (30.51%). Another notable difference is the rate of female labor participation with 59.40% compared to 33.31% in states that do not mandate job clubs.

TABLE 4. SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF LOW-INCOME MOTHERS IN MANDATING STATES (N=2,894).

Variables

	Percentage
Attended job club or search program	8.22% (238)
Education Attainment	
Less Than High School Degree	34.80% (1,007)
High School Degree/GED	28.13% (814)
Some College but No Degree/Certificate	19.25% (557)
Degree/Certificate After High School	17.83% (516)
Race/Ethnicity	
Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish	11.58% (335)
Non-Hispanic White	38.33% (1,106)
Non-Hispanic Black	44.44% (1,286)
Non-Hispanic Other	5.77% (167)
Marital Status	
Married	3.77% (109)
Divorced	20.27% (600)
Widowed	4.11% (119)
Separated	12.27% (355)
Never Married	59.12% (1711)
U.S. Citizen	94.06% (2,722)
Living in a Metropolitan Area	78.96% (2,285)
Number of Children Under 18	

One	44.51% (1,288)
Two	36.87% (1,067)
Three or more	18.62 (539)
	Mean
Age	32.09
Number of Family Members	3.32
Monthly Income without welfare assistance	\$522.73
Monthly Income with welfare assistance¹	\$682.18
State Minimum Wage per Hour	\$5.17
State Employment Rate	62.01%
State Single-Parent Families	56.46%
Gross State Production (per capita)	\$32,435.81
State Poverty Rate	13.66%
State Female Labor Participation Rate	33.31%

¹Welfare assistance includes: general assistance, WIC, and Food Stamps

Similar results were shown when looking at the relationship between educational levels and attendance in job clubs. Respondents who have educational levels beyond high school degree or GED increase their odds of attending a job club program and respondents who have educational levels below high school degree or GED decrease their odds of attending a job club program. When looking at respondents who have a degree or certificate after high school, the odds ratio is higher in states that mandate job club programs than states that

do not. This again is consistent with previous studies of individuals who are job ready and who participate in job club programs. Especially for states where this program is required, there is no choice but to attend.

TABLE 5. ODDS RATIO ESTIMATES OF THE EFFECTS OF EDUCATIONAL LEVEL ON JOB CLUBS AND SEARCHES IN SINGLE MOTHER FAMILIES IN MANDATING STATES (N=2,894).

	Model 1	Model 2
Education Attainment (omitted=High School Degree/GED)		
Less Than High School Degree	0.8	0.9
Some College but No Degree/Certificate	1.2	1.2
Degree/Certificate After High School	2.0***	1.8**
Race (omitted=Non-Hispanic White)		
Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish	---	0.5*
Non-Hispanic Black	---	2.1***
Non-Hispanic Other	---	2.5***
Marital Status (omitted=Never Married)		
Married	---	0.5
Divorced	---	1.7
Widowed	---	0.6
Separated	---	1.8
U.S. Citizen	---	1.6***
Living in a Metropolitan Area	---	1.4***
Number of Children Under 18 (omitted=One)		
Two	---	1.5*
Three or more	---	1.7
Age	---	1.0

Number of Family Members	---	0.7**
Monthly Income (by thousands)	---	1.3***
State Minimum Wage	---	1.0
State Employment Rate	---	1.2***
State Single-Parent Families	---	1.0
Gross State Production (per capita) (by thousands)	---	1.1***
State Poverty Rate	---	1.2***
State Female Labor Participation Rate	---	1.0

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

An interesting difference between recipients living in states that mandate and states that do not mandate this program is that, once incorporating the control variables, the odds ratio shows an inverse result. The odds ratio for the independent variable in states that mandate attendance decreases when adding the exact same control variables compared to states that do not mandate attendance. Control variables that are statistically significant show increases in the odds of attendance compared to their respective reference category. Once the control variables were taken into consideration, the variables that showed increases in odds ratios were held constant which allowed for the odds ratio to be lower for individuals with a degree or certificate after high school. The inverse result may be influenced in part by the types of respondents being represented in these states. As control variables are added when looking at respondents living in states that do mandate, the odds ratio decrease because of the increase in the number of

respondents who have the characteristic of a variable that is statistically significant. The difference in odds ratio for the two types of states can tell us that the composition of each population reflects different characteristics of each state.

As mentioned before, there are some differences between the two types of states, which may play a part in an individual's likelihood of attending a job club. Between the two states, overall monthly income before and after welfare assistance is lower in states that mandate job club participation. The difference in income may contribute to differences in the results in that having a low monthly income may motivate individuals to use resources that can assist in finding higher paying jobs in the future. This difference may determine why statistical significance is found in states that mandate job clubs. Citizenship is also found to be different between the two types of states. In states that mandate job clubs, the percentage of those with a U.S. citizenship is higher by 5 percent. This difference may determine why statistical significance is found in states that mandate job clubs. As the majority of the U.S. population has citizenship, it might take a higher percentage in a population to show any means of significance. Although there are statistical differences in the results for metropolitan area, employment rates, and poverty rates, there are no differences between the two types of states.

CHAPTER 7: RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Implications

Understanding the reasons why certain individuals make the decision to attend job clubs on a micro-level will help in understanding how these decisions affect and could affect welfare reform on a macro-level. Reasons for individual's choices may be due to the structure of welfare. The results from this study may offer some implications as to how choices may have been decided that influence future reformation.

As the primary purpose of job clubs is to place all or almost off of the recipients into a job (Kaplan 2002), in order to do so involves teaching the types of skills employers are seeking when making the final hiring decision. These skills that employers have identified as necessary to be successful are skills that recipients with low educational levels lack. In this sample population and at this time point in each individual's length of welfare, we see similar notions of respondents with higher education levels to have higher chances of attending job clubs. Job clubs have been designed to target individuals who do not have the skill sets and ability to successfully be placed in a job. However, the individuals who do utilize the program have been considered to already have these job skills in this time point and do not necessary need the program to be effective in job placement. As we continue to identify the types of individuals who are more likely to attend job clubs and benefit from this program, potential changes need to be made if targeted individuals are not utilizing this to their advantage. Teaching

skills to individuals who may already have the skill set does not advance the potential of job placement nor does it make any sense.

As the goal of TANF is to transition welfare recipients into workers, welfare reform has limited the number of hours individuals are allowed for educational purposes. Educational programs may take longer than expected; there is the possibility that recipients may require welfare assistance longer than sixty months. Because of this possibility, a limit has been placed so individuals only are able to obtain a GED or earn a vocational license or certificate. A cap has also been placed on the percentage of welfare recipients in a state that can attend a job club (Kim 2009). These limitations may drive the welfare recipients to decide not to attend and lose on the benefits especially for targeted individuals who are lacking the basic skills employers are looking for. Individuals may not even know about the possibilities of job clubs because of TANF's focus on transitioning recipients from welfare to work. Looking at the sample population only 15.45 percent (7.25 percent for states that do not mandate and 8.2 percent for states that do mandate) have attended during the reference period. Although this percentage is less than the capped amount, individuals can still attend job clubs if they have not yet done so. Because of the measurement of the attendance of job clubs and the understanding of education levels on length of welfare, this can be used to target future job club attendees. Understanding the types of individuals that have attended at a given time point can help in concentrating on the individuals that are less likely to attend.

Due to the structure of welfare reform and the importance of job placement, increasing educational attainment or training does not provide to be salient as a means of ending poverty. Welfare reformers are more concerned with the idea of moving recipients out of being a welfare case and into becoming employed. Recipients who do not have enough of a skill set to find work by themselves have the opportunity to attend job club programs however there is a limit. It seems as if welfare reform provides the opportunity for recipients to learn the skills to succeed, but they also are limiting the chances of having that opportunity. Allowing job club participation to count towards required work-base activities is a benefit for recipients to take the next step towards employment, however the limited six weeks of training may not be enough for some to learn enough skills. The negative outcomes of job clubs may be due in part of the short amount of time dedicated to job skills. Those who lack these skills in general may find job clubs unappealing if they know they will not benefit the attendance. Past attendees could also have influenced the number of individuals that have attended job club. If someone did not have a positive experience with a job club such as not being able to find employment afterwards, they may feel the need to tell a potential job club attendee to not waste their time. As many low-income families cluster together, there is an increase in social networking in helping each other out.

Limitations

As with all research using secondary data, limitations may be present in designing a study on a particular topic. While working through this study, some

limitations have appeared which were taken into consideration. These limitations arose due to the structure of the dataset as well as the specific population of the sample being studied.

A flaw to using secondary data is the inability to create variables specific to the topic of choice. Having variables operationalized in a specific way may not be able to isolate certain aspects of a concept. In this SIPP dataset, the independent variable educational level was coded in such a way that the difference between having a high school diploma and a GED could not be isolated. For the purposes of SIPP, this difference was not a factor in the goals of their analysis. However, being able to differentiate between a high school diploma and a GED may have changed the results of this study. When studying a population such as welfare recipients, educational attainment can vary and having a GED may show a recipient's motivation to return to school. Even though having a high school diploma and a GED requires the same amount of education, the process to earn them differs.

Even though this dataset has a focus on program participation, it does not capture the history of a respondent during the time of their participation in a program. Questions according to each wave ask respondents similar questions time after time. The dataset is not structured enough to have general questions like marital status or age be answered according to the time of program placement. Recipients may have enrolled in a job club program during the beginning of their welfare duration and have participated in SIPP towards the tail end. Because the questions being asked specify answers to reflect current

situations, some variables have changed over time. This change over time does not link the characteristics of a recipient at the time of job participation if enrolled.

Because the question specified a reference time, respondents may be in different stages of their welfare time line. As previous research have stated individuals with higher education tend to have shorter welfare episodes while individuals with lower education have longer welfare episodes. During the interview, individuals with higher education may have been in the earlier stages and thus have attended a job club. Individuals with lower education may have been on welfare for a longer period of time and could have attended a job club before the designated reference period. Because of the difference in time period in welfare that may have lapsed, an individual may or may not have gotten the chance to attend a job club.

Narrowing down the sample population was a difficult task. Because of the many requirements to apply for TANF, finding the cutoff point to include respondents was problematic. When it comes to determining if an individual is considered low-income or in poverty, many of these definitions did not give a specific cap. Although there were thresholds provided, these were not always up to date with each year. Because of this limitation, there were difficulties in capturing as many individuals as possible. As many previous studies have used the poverty threshold as their indicator, this was taken into consideration. Although there are some recipients who make slightly more than the poverty threshold, the study increased the cap point to include 150 percent of the poverty

threshold. This allowed recipients who are above the poverty threshold to be included in the study; however, there could have been recipients earning more than that who could have been included.

Conclusion

Promoting self-sufficiency and transitioning from the reliance on welfare to work has been the purpose of the federally funded welfare system. The Personal Responsibility and Work Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) replaced the historical welfare program known as Aids to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) (Daguerre 2008; Gennetian and Miller 2004). Under PRWORA, all government cash assistance programs were replaced with Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF). The key reformation, as indicated by the new, name was that welfare benefits were no longer available as an entitlement; instead all services were now temporary (Gennetian and Miller 2004). Once Bill Clinton signed into legislation PRWORA in 1996, this program established four new goals. Of the four established goals, only one focused on job training and job placement as a means of reducing poverty (Blum and Francis, 2001; Christopher, 2004). Recipients are now being pushed to fulfill work-based activities in order to continue receiving welfare benefits from the government. Because one of the goals of the new reform focused on job training and job placement, recipients are able to use this as part of their required work base activities. This option is available, nevertheless to only 30 percent of the welfare population in each state (Kim 2009). Since a limited number of welfare recipients are allowed to enroll in a given time period, this study has found that respondents who have an education

beyond a high school diploma or GED are more likely to attend a job club than those who have lower education levels. Although there is an increase for recipients with higher education, those who have a degree or certificate beyond a high school diploma or GED have the most significant chance of attending job club programs.

REFERENCES

- Alesina, Alberto, Reza Baqir, and William Easterly. 2000. "Redistributive Public Employment." *Journal of Urban and Economics*. 48: 219-241.
- Anderson, N. and K. Seefeldt. 2000. "Inside Michigan Work First Programs." Michigan Program on Poverty and Social Welfare Policy.
- Arsneault, Shelly. 2006. "Implementing Welfare Reform in Rural and Urban Communities: Why Place Matters." *The American Review of Public Administration*. 36: 173-188.
- Azrin, N. H., R. A. Philip, P. Thienes-Hontos, and V. A. Besalel. 1980. "Comparative Evaluation of the Job Club Program with Welfare Recipients." *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 16:133-145.
- Baider, Allegra and Abbey Frank. 2006. "Transitional Jobs: Helping TANF Recipients with Barriers to Employment Succeed in the Labor Market." Center for Law and Social Policy: Washington DC.
- Bell, S. 2000. "The Prevalence of Education and Training Activities Among Welfare and Food Stamp Recipients." Series B. The Urban Institute: Washington DC.
- Blau, David M. and Philip K. Robins. 1990. "Job Search Outcomes for the Employed and Unemployed." *The Journal of Political Economy*. 98: 637-655.
- Bos, Johannes, Susan Scrivener, Jason Snipes, and Gayle Hamilton. 2002. "Improving Basic Skills: The Effects of Adult Education in Welfare-to-Work Programs." *National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services: Washington DC.
- Bitler, Marianne P., Jonah B. Gelbach, Hilary Williamson Hoynes, and Madeline Zavodny. 2004 "The Impact of Welfare Reform on Marriage and Divorce." *Demography*. 41: 213-236.
- Blum, Barbara B. and Jennifer Fransworth Francis. 2001. "Welfare Research Perspectives Past, Present, and Future 2001 Edition." *National Center for Children in Poverty*. 1-24.
- Brooks, Fred, Larry Nackerud, and Ed Risler. 2001. "Evaluation of a Job-Finding Club for TANF Recipients: Psychosocial Impacts." *Research on Social Work Practice*. 11: 79-92.

- Chapple, Karen. 2001. "Time to Work: Job Search Strategies and Commute Time for Women on Welfare in San Francisco." *Journal of Urban Affairs*. 23: 155-173.
- Christopher, Karen. 2004. "Welfare as We [Don't] Know it: A Review and Feminist Critique of Welfare Reform Research in the United States." *Feminist Economics*. 10: 143-171.
- Ciccone, Antonio and Robert E. Hall. 1996. "Productivity and the Density of Economic Activity." *The American Economic Review*. 86: 54-70.
- Cleaveland, Carol. 2008. "A Black Benefit": Racial Prejudice Among White Welfare Recipients in a Low-Income Neighborhood." *Journal of Progressive Human Services*. 19: 71-91.
- Corcoran, Mary, Sandra K. Danziger, Ariel Kalil, and Kristin S. Sceefeldt. 2000. "How Welfare Reform is Affecting Women's Work." *Annual Review of Sociology*. 26: 241-269.
- Daguerre, Anne. 2008. "The Second Phase of US Welfare Reform, 2000-2006: Blaming the Poor Again?" *Social Policy and Administration*. 44: 362-378.
- Danziger, Sandra K. and Kristen S. Sceefeldt. 2002. "Barriers to Employment and the 'hard to serve': Implication for Services, Sanctions, and Time Limits." *Focus*. 22: 76-81.
- DellaVigna, Stefano and M. Daniele Paserman. 2005. "Job Search and Impatience." *Journal of Labor Economics*. 23: 527-588.
- Ellwood, D. and D. Boyd. 2000. "Changes in State Spending on Social Services since the Implementation of Welfare Reform: A Preliminary Report." *Rockefeller Institute of Government*. Albany, NY.
- Fitzgerald, John M. and David C. Ribar. 2004. "Welfare Reform and Female Headship." *Demography*. 41: 189-212.
- Freeman, Richard B. 1996. "The Minimum Wage as a Redistributive Tool." *The Economic Journal*. 106: 639-649.
- Gennetian, L. A., Crosby, D. A., Huston, A. C., and Lowe, E. D. 2004. "Can Child Care Assistance in Welfare and Employment Programs Support the Employment of Low-Income Families?" *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*. 23: 723-743.

- Gennetian, Lisa A. and Cynthia Miller. 2001 "How Welfare Reform can affect Marriage: Evidence from an Experimental Study in Minnesota." *Review of Economics of the Household*. 2: 275-301.
- Gilens, Martin. 1999. *Why Americans Hate Welfare: Race, Media, and the Politics of Antipoverty Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Graham, John, W. and Andrea H. Beller. 1989. "The Effect of Child Support Payments on the Labor Supply of Female Family Heads: An Econometric Analysis." *Journal of Human Resources*. 24: 665-688.
- Greater Avenues for Independence. 2008. "Overview." *Department of Public Social Services*: Los Angeles, CA.
- Grubb, N. 1995. "Evaluating job training programs in the United States: Evidence and explanations." *National Center for Research in Vocational Education*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University.
- Gueron, Judith M. 1990. "Work and Welfare: Lessons on Employment Programs." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*. 4: 79-98.
- Gueron, Judith M. and Gayle Hamilton. 2002. "The Role of Education and Training in Welfare Reform." *Welfare Reform and Beyond*. The Brookings Institution: Washington DC.
- Harris, Devorah A. and Domenico Parisi. 2008. "Forward-Looking Behavior and Time Limits: How Do Rural TANF Clients Manage Their Welfare Eligibility?" *Journal of Poverty*. 12: 265-283.
- Hechter, Michael and Satoshi Kanazawa. 1997. "Sociological Rational Choice Theory." *Annual Review of Sociology*. 23: 191-214.
- Hershey, Alan M. and LaDonna A. Pavetti. 1997. "Turning Job Finders into Job Keepers." *The Future of Children*. 7: 74-86.
- Jennings, Patrick K. 2004 "What Mothers Want: Welfare Reform and Maternal Desire." *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*. 31: 113-130.
- Kaplan, Thomas. 2002. "Whatever we have been doing:" Policy Control over TANF." *Focus*. 22: 35-38.
- Keiser, Lael R., Peter Mueser, and Seung-Whan Choi. 2004. "Race, Bureaucratic Discretion, and the Implementation of Welfare Reform." *American Journal of Political Science*. 48: 314-327.

- Kim, Jeounghee. 2009. "Does Job Training Yield Positive Outcomes for Women on Public Assistance?" *Journal of Policy Practice*. 8: 204-223.
- Kleit, Rachel Garshick. 2002. "Job Search Networks and Strategies in Scattered-site Public Housing." *Housing Studies*. 17: 83-100.
- Laird, J., M. DeBell, and C. Chapman. 2006. "Dropout Rates in the United States: 2004 (NCES 2007-024). U.S. Department of Education." *National Center for Education Statistics*. Washington, DC.
- Lens, Vicki. 2002. "TANF: What Went Wrong and What to Do Next." *Social Work*. 47: 3.
- Lichter, Daniel T. and Martha L. Crowley. 2004. "Welfare Reform and Child Poverty: Effects of Maternal Employment, Marriage and Cohabitation." *Social Science Research*. 33: 34-45.
- Loprest, Pamela J. and Sheila R. Zedlewski. 1999. "Current and Former Welfare Recipients: How do they differ?" *The Urban Institute*. Washington, DC.
- McLaughlin, Diane K. and Daniel T. Lichter. 1997. "Poverty and the Marital Behavior of Young Women." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 59: 582-594.
- Mandel, Hadas and Moshe Semyonov. 2006. "A Welfare State Paradox: State Interventions and Women's Employment Opportunities in 22 Countries." *The American Journal of Sociology*. 111: 1910-1949.
- Martinson, Karin and Julie Strawn. 2003. "Built to Last: Why Skills Matter for Long-Run Success in Welfare Reform." *Workforce Development Series*. Center for Law and Social Policy. Washington DC.
- Masters, Stanley and Irwin Garfinkel. 1977. *Estimating the Labor Supply Effects of Income Maintenance Alternatives*. New York: Academic Press.
- Melendez, Edwin, Luis Falcon, and Josh Bivens. 2003. "Community College Participation in Welfare Programs: Do State Policies Matter?" *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*. 27: 203-223
- Meyers, Marcia K., Bonnie Glaser, and Karin Mac Donald. 1998. "On the Front Lines of Welfare Delivery: Are Workers Implementing Policy Reforms?" *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*. 17: 1-22.

- Meyer, R., and M. Cancian. 1998. "Economic well-being following an exit from aid to families with dependent children." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 60: 479-492.
- Mink, G. 1996. *The Wages of Motherhood: Inequality in the Welfare State, 1917-1942*. Cornell: Cornell University Press.
- Monroe, P. A., and V. V. Tiller. 2001. "Commitment to Work Among Welfare-Reliant Women." *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 63: 816-828.
- O'Hara, B. 2002. "Work and Work-Related Activities of Mothers Receiving Temporary Assistance to Needy Families: 1996, 1998, and 2000." *Current Population Report Pp. 70-85*. U.S. Bureau of Census: Washington DC.
- Olson, Sarah. 2005. "Marriage Promotion, Reproductive Injustice, and the War Against Poor Women of Color," *Dollars and Sense*. 257: 5.
- Peterson, C. D. 1995. "Female-Headed Families on AFDC: Who Leaves Quickly and Who Doesn't." *Journal of Economic Issues*. 29: 619-628.
- Porterfield, S. 2001. "Economic vulnerability among rural single-mother families." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*. 5: 1302-1311.
- Rangarajan, Anu, Peter Schochet, and Dexter Chu. 1998. "Employment Experiences of Welfare Recipients Who Find Jobs: Is Targeting Possible?" *Mathematica Policy Research*. Princeton, NJ.
- Rangarajan, Burghardt and Anne Gordon. 1992. "Evaluation of the Minority Female Single Parent Demonstration: Fifth-year impacts at CET." *Mathematica Policy Research*. Princeton, NJ.
- Rank, M. R. 2001. "The effect of poverty on America's families." *Journal of Family Issues*. 22: 882-903.
- Reese, Ellen. 2005. *Backlash against Welfare Mothers: Past and Present*. (1st Ed.) California: University of California Press.
- Robinson, Ray. 1993. "Economic Evaluation and Health Care: Cost-Benefit Analysis." *British Medical Journal*. 307: 924-926.
- Romich, J. L. 2007. "Sharing the Work: Mother-Child Relationships and Household Management." *Journal of Early Adolescence*. 27: 192-222.

- Rowe, Gretchen, Mary Murphy, and Meghan Williamson. 2006. "Welfare Rules Databook: State TANF Policies as of July 2004." *The Urban Institute*. Washington, DC.
- Roy, Kevin M., Carolyn Y. Tubbs, and Linda M. Burton. 2004. "Don't Have No Time: Daily Rhythms and the Organization of Time for Low-Income Families." *National Counsel on Family Relations*. 53: 168-178.
- Sandefur, G. D. and S. T. Cook. 1997. "Duration of Public Assistance Receipt: Is Welfare a Trap?" *Institute for Research on Poverty*: Madison, WI.
- Seccombe, Karen. 1998. "So You Think I Drive a Cadillac?" Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Smith, Judith R. 2002. "Commitment to mothering and preference for employment: The voices of women on public assistance with young children." *Journal of Children & Poverty*. 8: 51-66.
- Sterrett, Emily A. 1998. "Use of Job Club to Increase Self-Efficacy: A Case Study of Return to Work." *Journal of Employment Counseling*. 35: 69-78.
- Texas Workforce. 2011. "Temporary Assistance For Needy Families Employment and Training." *Texas Workforce Commission*: Texas.
- United States Census Bureau. 2005. "Educational Attainment in the United States." *Current Population Studies*. Washington DC.
- Wanberg, Connie R., Ruth Kanfer, and Maria Rotundo. 1999. "Unemployed Individuals: Motives, Job-Search Competencies, and Job-Search Constraints as Predictors of Job Seeking and Reemployment." *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 84: 897-910.
- Zedlewski, Sheila R. 1999. "Work Activity and Obstacles to Work Among TANF Recipients." *The Urban Institute*. Washington, DC.

APPENDIX A
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPLICATION.

Arizona State University
Office of Research Integrity and
Assurance
P.O. Box 871103
Tempe, AZ 85287-1103
Phone: 480-965-6788
Fax: (480) 965-7772



For Office Use Only:
Date Received:
HS Number:

**ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY
APPLICATION FOR EXEMPT RESEARCH**

PROTOCOL TITLE: Association between Education and Job Training Program Enrollment		DATE OF REQUEST: April 13, 2011
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sarah Hayford Ph.D.	DEPARTMENT/CENTER: School of Social and Family Dynamics	UNIVERSITY AFFILIATION: <input type="checkbox"/> Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assistant Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Instructor <input type="checkbox"/> Other: Please specify. ("Other" categories may require prior approval. Students can not serve as the Principal Investigator)
CAMPUS ADDRESS: (include campus mail code) School of Social and Family Dynamics Arizona State University Box 873701 Tempe, AZ. 85287-3701	PHONE: 480.965.6211 E-MAIL: sarah.hayford@asu.edu	
List all co-investigators. (Attach an extra sheet, if necessary.) A co-investigator is anyone who has responsibility for the project's design, implementation, data collection, data analysis, or who has contact with study participants.		
CO-INVESTIGATOR: Gloria Yim	DEPARTMENT/CENTER: School of Social and Family Dynamics	UNIVERSITY AFFILIATION: <input type="checkbox"/> Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Instructor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: Please specify. Graduate Student
CAMPUS ADDRESS: (include campus mail code) School of Social and Family Dynamics Arizona State University Box 873701 Tempe, AZ. 85287-3701	PHONE: 415.646.5275 EMAIL: gyim1@asu.edu	
CO-INVESTIGATOR:	DEPARTMENT/CENTER:	UNIVERSITY AFFILIATION: <input type="checkbox"/> Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Instructor <input type="checkbox"/> Other: Please specify.
CAMPUS ADDRESS: (include campus mail code)	PHONE: EMAIL:	

Revision 5/10

STUDY OVERVIEW

1. Provide a **brief** description of the **background, purpose, and design** of your research. Avoid using technical terms and jargon. Be sure to list all of the **means you will use to collect data** (e.g. tests, surveys, interviews, observations, existing data). Provide a short description of the tests, instruments, or measures and **attach copies of all instruments and cover letters for review**. *If you need more than a few paragraphs, please attach additional sheets.* **FOR ALL OF THE QUESTIONS, WRITE YOUR ANSWERS ON THE APPLICATION RATHER THAN JUST SAYING SEE ATTACHED.**

This research uses previously existing non-identifiable data to analyze the association between educational attainment and enrollment in job training programs among welfare-eligible families in the United States. Job clubs first originated in the 1970's by Dr. Nathan Azrin. Dr. Azrin, a professor of psychological studies focused his early works on intervention for the unemployed. Through his previous research he came up with a list of principles that all job clubs should be based off of. These included having welfare recipients treat the job search as a full-time job, have small groups where recipients would be able to team up and work together, provide social support to each other, and learn how to properly dress for success (Brooks, Nackerud, and Risler 2001). The primary purpose of job clubs is to place all or almost all of the recipients into a job (Kaplan 2002). In order to fulfill this goal, states have organized workshops to help facilitate the courses.

Since job clubs and searches can act as part of the hours set in work base activities, welfare recipients can apply these hours if they choose to do so. Reasons for using these courses may include wanting to learn how to effectively search for potential employment, or are simply being required to do so. Knowing that if they do not meet the minimum work requirements, subsidies will start to diminish (Keiser, Mueser, and Choi 2004) may also be a reason for enrolling. In 19 states, job clubs and searches are mandatory to attend as part of the application process of receiving welfare assistance. If the applicant fails to comply with the requirements, they are not eligible for assistance (Rowe, Murphy, and Williamson 2006). Recipients residing within these states do not have the choice of whether to attend or not. If they do not attend, there is no reason for them to apply for assistance. The rest of the states do not require job searches be part of the requirement, however it is still available to recipients if they choose that route at some point while receiving welfare assistance. These recipients are not being forced to attend job searches and can decide based on their own situation if this is something they want to do.

Because certain states require the participation in job club or searches, this study will focus on recipients who live in states where participation is not required. By studying these recipients, we can tease out the reason recipients enroll because of the requirement. Without the requirement, recipients are able to choose if they want to utilize the course or not. Recipients can take into consideration their current situations and decide for themselves if that is what they want to do. This will give us a population to study that is not limited to what they have to do. This also allows for other possibilities such as the economic state or individual characteristics that as a researcher can control.

Not only will the sample population be from states where job club and searches are voluntary, but also must be described as a female-headed household. Since the majority of welfare recipients are females, having children present would create a family environment where a female would be the head of the household. Mothers often obtain custody of their children, which allow the fathers to move in and out of the household. Limiting the sample population with this stipulation will create a population similar to that in society.

Another require for receiving welfare assistance is that there must be children present. However there are some states, which allow pregnant females to be eligible to apply for welfare depending on the month of their pregnancy. Because of the array of limitations according to each state and the absence of questions asked to respondents on their pregnancy status only those who have at least one child will be part of the sample population.

Focusing on the welfare population, income has to be taken into consideration. This study will only use respondents that are below the poverty threshold. Many welfare recipients are considered low-income, but there

really is no way of identifying the exact cut off of a low-income family. Using the poverty threshold is the best way to do so especially when this information is available to use and many have used this as the point of reference.

Using data from the first wave of the 2004 panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) (obtained from ICPSR) this study will investigate the association of education level and the usage of job clubs and searches. This study does not look at the effectiveness of job clubs and searches, but describes the type of recipients that do use it with education. The study will utilize Logistic Regression to see how the educational level would affect the usage of job clubs and search. This type of analysis is most appropriate to address the prediction of probability on the dependent variable. Also when a dependent variable has dichotomous categories Logistic Regression is more appropriate. Two models will be used to test the hypothesis, with the first including just the independent and dependent variables and the second with the addition of control variables.

The dependent variable measures the usages of welfare programs that help in obtaining jobs. Programs that help in preparing to obtain jobs include attending job clubs or searches. Respondents responded by saying yes they did attend or no they did not attend.

The independent variable measures the educational level of the respondents. Respondents were asked what their highest degree received or grade completed. The list included the following categories: less than 1st grade; 1st, 2nd, 3rd, or 4th grade; 5th or 6th grade; 7th or 8th grade; 9th grade; 10th grade; 11th grade; 12th grade, no diploma; high school graduate (diploma or GED); some college, but no degree; diploma/certificate from vocational, technical or trade school; Associate degree; Bachelor's degree; Master's Degree; Professional degree (MD, DDS, or JD); and Doctorate degree (Ph.D. or Ed.D).

The control variables gathered from the SIPP data includes race (if the respondent is White, Black, Asian, or Other), origin (Hispanic/Latino/Spanish or not), marital status (married living with spouse, married living without spouse, divorced, widowed, separated, or never married), citizenship status, age, person income (which includes wages and salaries, self-employment, and farm self-employment before deductions have been made), if respondent lives in a metropolitan area, the number of children in the family, and the number of family members.

Additional control variables were gathered from the U.S. Census Bureau and the University of Kentucky's Center for Poverty Research. These state level variables include minimum wage (in dollars), gross state production (per capita), poverty rate (by percentage), number of single families (by percentage), employment rate (by percentage), and female labor participation (by percentage).

After creating the appropriate dummy variables, descriptive statistics for each of the variables will highlight the sample population's sociodemographic, and the state-level characteristics. Means will be provided for the following variables: age, total number of family members, minimum wage, poverty rate, rates of single families, employment rate, female labor force rate, and income. Percentages will be provided for the following variables: race, origin, marital status, educational attainment, citizenship status, sex, location of residence, number of children, and the use of job clubs and searches. My logistic regression equation will be as follows:

$$\text{Logit}(\text{Job Club and Searches}) = a + B2(\text{less than high school/GED}) + B3(\text{some college no degree/certificate}) + B4(\text{certificate/degree after high school}) + B5(\text{Black}) + B6(\text{Asian}) + B7(\text{other}) + B8(\text{Spanish/Hispanic/Latino/a}) + B9(\text{Married}) + B10(\text{Divorced}) + B11(\text{Widowed}) + B12(\text{Separated}) + B11(\text{is a citizen}) + B12(\text{age}) + B13(\text{personal income}) + B14(\text{lives in metro area}) + B15(\text{two children}) + B17(\text{number of family members}) + B18(\text{min wage}) + B19(\text{GSP per capita}) + B20(\text{state poverty rate}) + B21(\text{state \% of single families}) + B22(\text{state \% of Employment}) + B23(\text{state \% of female labor participation}) + e$$

RECRUITMENT

2. Describe how you will recruit participants (attach a copy of recruitment materials).

Data files were obtained from the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) website. Files were made available according to each wave as well as whether or not it was a core or topical wave. This study will use data from the 2004 Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) panel Wave I specifically the core file. In order to distinguish the differences in families (nuclear or sub family) the dataset will be sorted using RFID2 (Family ID but excludes family members that are related). That way when using the reference person of the family, he or she will be the head of the family. Respondents were asked what kind of family they are in with the option of headed by husband/wife, male headed, or female headed. Those who live in a family that is headed by a female are kept. Poverty threshold was measured by the percentage of poverty the family is in during the reference month. Those who are below the U.S. poverty threshold of 2004 were used in the study. To find the cut off for this sample, the mean number of children and the mean number of family members were found and using the U.S. Census information, the threshold as determined. The last criterion for this sample population is that respondents must reside in a state that does not require having to use any of the job club/search courses.

PROJECT FUNDING

3. How is the research project funded? (A copy of the grant application(s) must be provided prior to IRB approval. For funded projects, researchers also need to submit a copy of their human subjects training certification: <http://researchintegrity.asu.edu/irb/training/>)

- Research is **not funded** (Go to question 4)
- Funding decision is pending
- Research is **funded**

- a) What is the source of funding or potential funding? (Check all that apply)
- Federal
 - Private Foundation
 - Department Funds
 - Subcontract
 - Fellowship
 - Other

b) Please list the name(s) of the sponsor(s):

c) What is the Project grant number and title (for example NIH grant number)?

d) What is the ASU account number/project number?

e) Identify the institution(s) administering the grant(s):

STUDY POPULATION- If you are doing data analysis only, please write DA.

4. Indicate the total number of participants that you plan to include or enroll in your study. 2,334		Indicate the age range of the participants that you plan to enroll in your study	17 to 64
---	--	---	----------

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

5. Attach a copy of the following items as applicable to your study (Please check the ones that are attached):
- Research Methods (Research design, Data Source, Sampling strategy, etc)
 - Any Letters (cover letters or information letters), Recruitment Materials, Questionnaires, etc. which will be distributed to participants
 - If the research is conducted off-site, provide a permission letter where applicable
 - If the research is part of a proposal submitted for external funding, submit a copy of the FULL proposal

Note: The information should be in sufficient detail so IRB can determine if the study can be classified as EXEMPT under Federal Regulations 45CFR46.101(b).

DATA USE

6. How will the data be used? (Check all that apply)
- Dissertation
 - Thesis
 - Results released to participants/parents
 - Results released to agency or organization
 - Other (please describe):
 - Publication/journal article
 - Undergraduate honors project
 - Results released to employer or school
 - Conferences/presentations

EXEMPT STATUS
<p>7. Identify which of the 6 federal exemption categories below applies to your research proposal and explain why the proposed research meets the category. Federal law 45 CFR 46.101(b) identifies the following EXEMPT categories. Check all that apply to your research and provide comments as to how your research falls into the category.</p> <p>SPECIAL NOTE: The exemptions at 45 CFR 46.101(b) do not apply to research involving prisoners. The exemption at 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2), for research involving survey or interview procedures or observation of public behavior, does not apply to research with children, except for research involving observations of public behavior when the investigator(s) do not participate in the activities being observed.</p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> (7.1) Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices, such as (i) research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or (ii) research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods. Please provide an explanation as to how your research falls into this category:</p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> (7.2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless: (i) Information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; AND (ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation. Please provide an explanation as to how your research falls into this category:</p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> (7.3) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior that is not exempt under paragraph (b)(2) of this section, if: (i) The human subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office; or (ii) federal statute(s) require(s) without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter. Please provide an explanation as to how your research falls into this category:</p>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (7.4) Research, involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects. Note-Please review the OHRP Guidance on Research Involving Coded Private Information or Biological Specimens: http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/humansubjects/guidance/cdebiol.pdf Please provide an explanation as to how your research falls into this category:</p> <p>My research uses data that has been collected by the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) sponsored by the United States Census Bureau. No identifying information is present in the data and all federal requirements regarding data confidentiality are fulfilled in the public use files to be used for this analysis. The 2004 SIPP Wave 1 Core files will be used as the dataset. Data files were obtained from the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) website. ICPSR makes their data publicly available with some documentation available to those affiliated with an academic institution. This study examines existing data, which falls into the exempt category.</p>

(7.5) Research and demonstration projects which are conducted by or subject to the approval of department or agency heads, and which are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine: (i) Public benefit or service programs; (ii) procedures for obtaining benefits or services under those programs; (iii) possible changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures; or (iv) possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those programs. **(Generally does not apply to the university setting)**

(7.6) Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies, (i) if wholesome foods without additives are consumed or (ii) if a food is consumed that contains a food ingredient at or below the level and for a use found to be safe, or agricultural chemical or environmental contaminant at or below the level found to be safe, by the Food and Drug Administration or approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.
Please provide an explanation as to how your research falls into this category:

TRAINING

8. The research team must document completion of human subjects training within the last 3 years. (Attach a copy of the human subjects training for the PI and all Co-Investigators: <http://researchintegrity.asu.edu/humans>.)

Please provide the date that the PI and co-investigators completed the training.
PI training completed on July 29, 2011.
Co-investigator completed on June 4, 2010.

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

In making this application, I certify that I have read and understand the ASU Procedures for the Review of Human Subjects Research and that I intend to comply with the letter and spirit of the University Policy. I may begin research when the Institutional Review Board gives notice of its approval. I must inform the IRB of ANY changes in method or procedure that may conceivably alter the exempt status of the project. **I also agree and understand that records of the participants will be kept for at least three (3) years after the completion of the research**
Name (first, middle initial, last):

Signature:  Date: 5/10/11

FOR OFFICE USE:	This application has been reviewed by the Arizona State University IRB: <input type="checkbox"/> Exempt Category/Categories: <input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Deferred to other review <input type="checkbox"/> Recommended that investigator submit for expedited or Full Board review.
	Authorizing Signature: _____ Date: April 13, 2011 X

CITI Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI)

Responsible Conduct of Research Curriculum Completion Report Printed on 2/7/2011

Learner: Sarah Hayford (username: shayford)

Institution: Arizona State University

Contact Information NIH

Department: School of Social and Family Dynamics
Email: sarah.hayford@asu.edu

Social and Behavioral Responsible Conduct of Research:

Stage 1. Basic Course Passed on 07/29/10 (Ref # 4710695)

Required Modules	Date Completed	Score
Introduction to the Responsible Conduct of Research	07/29/10	no quiz
Introduction to Research Misconduct	07/29/10	no quiz
Research Misconduct 2-1495	07/29/10	4/5 (80%)
Data Acquisition, Management, Sharing and Ownership 2-1523	07/29/10	4/5 (80%)
Publication Practices and Responsible Authorship 2-1518	07/29/10	5/5 (100%)
Peer Review 2-1521	07/29/10	3/5 (60%)
Responsible Mentoring 01-1625	07/29/10	6/6 (100%)
Conflicts of Interest and Commitment 2-1462	07/29/10	3/6 (50%)
Collaborative Research 2-1484	07/29/10	6/6 (100%)
The CITI RCR Course Completion Page.	07/29/10	no quiz
Arizona State University	07/29/10	no quiz

For this Completion Report to be valid, the learner listed above must be affiliated with a CITI participating institution. Falsified information and unauthorized use of the CITI course site is unethical, and may be considered scientific misconduct by your institution.

Paul Braunschweiger Ph.D.
Professor, University of Miami
Director Office of Research Education
CITI Course Coordinator

[Return](#)

CITI Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative

Human Research Curriculum Completion Report Printed on 2/7/2011

Learner: Sarah Hayford (username: shayford)

Institution: Arizona State University

Contact Information NIH

Department: School of Social and Family Dynamics
Email: sarah.hayford@asu.edu

Group 2 Social & Behavioral Research Investigators and key personnel:

Stage 1. Basic Course Passed on 07/29/10 (Ref # 4710694)

Required Modules	Date Completed	Score
Introduction	07/29/10	no quiz
History and Ethical Principles - SBR	07/29/10	4/4 (100%)
Defining Research with Human Subjects - SBR	07/29/10	5/5 (100%)
The Regulations and The Social and Behavioral Sciences - SBR	07/29/10	3/5 (60%)
Assessing Risk in Social and Behavioral Sciences - SBR	07/29/10	4/5 (80%)
Informed Consent - SBR	07/29/10	5/5 (100%)
Privacy and Confidentiality - SBR	07/29/10	2/3 (67%)
Research with Prisoners - SBR	07/29/10	2/4 (50%)
Research with Children - SBR	07/29/10	2/4 (50%)
Research in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools - SBR	07/29/10	3/4 (75%)
International Research - SBR	07/29/10	3/3 (100%)
Internet Research - SBR	07/29/10	4/4 (100%)
Research and HIPAA Privacy Protections	07/29/10	2/2 (100%)
Workers as Research Subjects-A Vulnerable Population	07/29/10	4/4 (100%)
Conflicts of Interest in Research Involving Human Subjects	07/29/10	1/2 (50%)
Arizona State University	07/29/10	no quiz

For this Completion Report to be valid, the learner listed above must be affiliated with a CITI participating institution. Falsified information and unauthorized use of the CITI course site is unethical, and may be considered scientific misconduct by your institution.

Paul Braunschweiger Ph.D.
Professor, University of Miami
Director Office of Research Education
CITI Course Coordinator

[Return](#)

CITI Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative

**Human Research Curriculum Completion Report
Printed on 6/4/2010**

Learner: gloria yim (username: gybighead)

Institution: Arizona State University

Contact Information alesha durfee
Department: sociology
Email: gloria.yim@asu.edu

Group 3 IRB Members:

Stage 1. Basic Course Passed on 06/04/10 (Ref # 4496972)

Required Modules	Date Completed	Score
Introduction	06/04/10	no quiz
History and Ethical Principles - SBR	06/04/10	3/4 (75%)
History and Ethical Principles	06/04/10	6/7 (86%)
Defining Research with Human Subjects - SBR	06/04/10	4/5 (80%)
The Regulations and The Social and Behavioral Sciences - SBR	06/04/10	4/5 (80%)
Basic Institutional Review Board (IRB) Regulations and Review Process	06/04/10	5/5 (100%)
Assessing Risk in Social and Behavioral Sciences - SBR	06/04/10	5/5 (100%)
Informed Consent - SBR	06/04/10	5/5 (100%)
Informed Consent	06/04/10	4/4 (100%)
Privacy and Confidentiality - SBR	06/04/10	2/3 (67%)
Social and Behavioral Research for Biomedical Researchers	06/04/10	4/4 (100%)
Records-Based Research	06/04/10	2/2 (100%)
Genetic Research in Human Populations	06/04/10	2/2 (100%)

Research With Protected Populations - Vulnerable Subjects: An Overview	06/04/10	3/4 (75%)
Research with Prisoners - SBR	06/04/10	4/4 (100%)
Vulnerable Subjects - Research with Prisoners	06/04/10	4/4 (100%)
Research with Children - SBR	06/04/10	4/4 (100%)
Vulnerable Subjects - Research Involving Minors	06/04/10	3/3 (100%)
Research in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools - SBR	06/04/10	4/4 (100%)
Vulnerable Subjects - Research Involving Pregnant Women and Fetuses in Utero	06/04/10	3/3 (100%)
International Research - SBR	06/04/10	3/3 (100%)
International Research	06/04/10	1/1 (100%)
Internet Research - SBR	06/04/10	3/4 (75%)
Group Harms: Research With Culturally or Medically Vulnerable Groups	06/04/10	3/3 (100%)
FDA-Regulated Research	06/04/10	4/5 (80%)
Human Subjects Research at the VA	06/04/10	3/3 (100%)
HIPAA and Human Subjects Research	06/04/10	2/2 (100%)
Workers as Research Subjects-A Vulnerable Population	06/04/10	3/4 (75%)
Hot Topics	06/04/10	no quiz
Conflicts of Interest in Research Involving Human Subjects	06/04/10	2/2 (100%)
The IRB Member Module - "What Every New IRB Member Needs to Know"	06/04/10	6/6 (100%)
Arizona State University	06/04/10	no quiz

For this Completion Report to be valid, the learner listed above must be affiliated with a CITI participating institution. Falsified information and unauthorized use of the CITI course site is unethical, and may be considered scientific misconduct by your institution.

Paul Braunschweiger Ph.D.
Professor, University of Miami

Director Office of Research Education
CITI Course Coordinator

[Return](#)

CITI Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI)

**Responsible Conduct of Research Curriculum Completion Report
Printed on 6/4/2010**

Learner: gloria yim (username: gybighead)

Institution: Arizona State University

Contact Information alesha durfee
 Department: sociology
 Email: gloria.yim@asu.edu

Humanities Responsible Conduct of Research:

Stage 1. Basic Course Passed on 06/04/10 (Ref # 4496973)

Professor, University of Miami
Director Office of Research Education
CITI Course Coordinator

[Return](#)