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ABSTRACT

The Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN) program was designed to assist recipients of Aid To Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) to become employed and to become self-sufficient, and thereby reduce the number of people receiving AFDC. Participants in the program are placed in various components to enhance their employability.

This positivist research project with a two group quasi-experimental design aimed to determine the potential impact of Goals, a self-esteem and goal-setting component of GAIN. Quantitative data was gathered from GAIN computer records and case files to determine if the Goals component had a significant effect on participants' performance while in GAIN or their ability to obtain employment.

Results of this study indicate that Goals does not have a significant impact on GAIN participants. More of the participants who received Goals training took personal deferrals, had longer periods of deferral, and were sanctioned for non-compliance with GAIN regulations than those who did not receive Goals. However, Goals did have some positive impact, as significantly more of the participants in the study who are currently employed completed Goals.
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INTRODUCTION

The federal Family Support Act (FSA) of 1988 mandated that welfare recipients make efforts to become employed and that local welfare agencies provide social and educational services to facilitate their (re)entry into the work force. The centerpiece of FSA is the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) Program. All states must adhere to the JOBS identified targeting, participation and performance goals, but they have a choice of service methods for achieving those goals (Gueron and Pauly, 1991). In San Bernardino County, the Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN) Program (the name for California's JOBS program) emphasizes a combination of basic education, vocational training, assessment, job search programs, unpaid work experience, and such supportive services as transportation and child care cost reimbursement.

Two previous federally funded welfare-to-work programs, the public service employment program authorized by the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA), and the Work Incentive (WIN) program, an employment and training program targeted to AFDC recipients, were criticized as being "make work" programs that had no long-term impact on employment, earnings or the welfare rolls (Bailis & Ball, 1987; Gueron & Auspos, 1987; Gueron, 1989; Gueron & Pauly, 1991). Rein (1982)
found that employment obtained through the WIN program's extensive job search were the same kind of low-paying, low-level jobs that would have been procured without such intervention. And the Jobs Training Partnership Act (JTPA) program, which replaced CETA, has been criticized for only accepting as participants those who they feel have potential to quickly find employment, such as those who have previous work experience or job skills and who have at least a high school education. This "creaming" of participants discriminates against young mothers who did not complete their high school education due to their pregnancy or those who stayed home to raise their families out of choice or necessity.

Barriers to employment faced by those entering the earlier programs continue to face participants in GAIN: lack of education, occupational training and job skills, lack of adequate child care and lack of transportation. However, GAIN is helping to eliminate those barriers. GAIN places more of an emphasis on adult basic education, classes to obtain a GED, and occupational training than previous programs (Hagen, 1992; Hagen & Davis, 1992). Further, GAIN pays for program related scald and transportation costs for participants. Although adequate child care is still a problem in San Bernardino County, the availability of public transportation has increased. Further, rather than "creaming" participants, GAIN targets those who are more in need of their services.
Everyone whose children are all over six years of age is a mandatory participant. GAIN's target groups consists of: 1) those under 20 years of age without a high school diploma or its equivalent, no matter what the age of their child; 2) those whose youngest child is 16 years of age or older; 3) those who have received AFDC three out of the last five years; 4) and if there are two parents living in the household, one parent must participate.

The Goals component of the GAIN program in San Bernardino County is a motivational program utilized to induce participants to actively participate in the program and to reach for their potential. In addition, case managers are to provide positive reinforcement and encouragement to the participants as they proceed through the GAIN program. This combination is considered effective and efficient in raising self-esteem and motivation in clients and in empowering them to find gainful employment and become self-sufficient.

Understanding the potential impact of JOBS programs such as GAIN and their components, such as Goals, is now more important than ever, as limited funding necessitates that these programs provide the most appropriate services to AFDC recipients to effect high impact on their earnings and on welfare savings per dollar invested (Friedlander and Long, 1987; Gueron and Pauley, 1991). The programs must assure that recipients are able to get and keep jobs with wages high enough for them to live independent of the welfare system.
Social service agencies can ill afford to spend scarce tax dollars on ineffective programs.
LITERATURE REVIEW

Prior research on JOBS programs, such as GAIN, have provided interesting insights. Friedlander and Long (1987) estimated programs' relative impacts on the employment and welfare receipt of differing groups of welfare recipients in three JOBS programs. Marital status, number of children and race were not determined to have impact on a participant's becoming employed. A high level of education was positively related to impacts in San Diego but not in Baltimore. In all three studies, prior employment and length of welfare receipt were the most important determinants of gaining employment.

An initial assessment of a participant's education, work experience, employment skills, family circumstances, and supportive service needs such as child care is provided by San Bernardino County Gain. Hagen (1992) points out the necessity for a comprehensive assessment in order to develop a meaningful employability plan. Local economic conditions such as the availability of jobs and the structure of the labor market will also affect employability of a participant. Approximately one-third of the full-time jobs open to women do not pay enough to support a mother and two children above the poverty line (Hagen, 1992; Hagen and Davis, 1992).

Many employers offer relatively low-wage jobs with little job security and few fringe benefits, and many employers hire
their employees as "independent contractors" which offers no job security, no fringe benefits such as sick leave, and no unemployment compensation. A woman's responsibility for children and other dependents results in economic and emotional burdens, and requires income sufficient to pay for child care and health insurance (Pearce, 1990).

In 1989, the U. S. Bureau of the Census indicated that women and their families were a clear majority of American poor. Further Goldberg and Kremem (1990) cited research by Leaky and Sivard (1989) which found that women worldwide do not have equality with men regarding opportunity, political position, economic position or social status. Currently, single motherhood has become prevalent in the United States due to divorce, separation and single motherhood. And, as women generally receive custody of their children, single mothers, many of whom receive little or no financial support from the fathers of their children, are forced to take low wage jobs due to inequities in the labor market or to go on AFDC (Goldberg and Kremen, 1990).

As our society continues to blame the victim, poverty is generally thought to be caused by sloth, moral corruption or personal shortsightedness (Rodgers, 1990). He points out that families are further stigmatized when poverty forces them to move into substandard housing in areas of high crime and drug use. Many families applying for AFDC are treated with disdain by eligibility workers, even if those workers had previously
received A.F.D.C. themselves. And most of these families will find their grocery purchases scrutinized by other shoppers when they pay for their items with food stamps, as many people believe their tax dollars are being spent to buy tobacco and alcohol rather than food.

The public's stereotypical attitudes towards welfare recipients are internalized by the recipients themselves; their self-image becomes more negative and their sense of self-worth is diminished. Ozawa (1982) states, "Psychological warfare between taxpayers and welfare recipients is part of the process by which a deep sense of degradation is instilled in those on welfare" (p. 120). Zopf (1989) and Ozawa (1982) found that many AFDC mothers perceive themselves as second-class citizens due to the devastating affect of stigmatization. A survey by Handler and Hollingsworth found that 49% of the mothers receiving welfare felt embarrassed in their dealings with those not on welfare, and 38% felt indifference or hostility from their community, which resulted in their isolation and alienation from the community.

Divorce, quitting school, and lack of work experience may further lead to feelings of failure and inadequacy in the AFDC mother. Further, a negative self-identity on the part of a mother adversely affects their children. Minimizing the stigma effect of AFDC is an important concern, as children internalize their mothers feelings and may perpetuate the AFDC cycle or join a gang in order to get recognition, a sense of
power, and a sense of belonging. Gain is counting on their Goals component to help their participants identify their strengths and abilities in order to raise their self-esteem and motivate them to find gainful employment so they will no longer need to rely on AFCD.

Rein (1982) points out that some female heads-of-households are only able to find full time employment which offers income less than or equivalent to an income completely derived from welfare. The trade-off between the benefits of work and the benefits of welfare produces a rational decision that precludes work. It is difficult to see how poor working situations and low salaries can provide motivation for participants to seek employment, according to Rein. Pearce (1990) further found that welfare destroys not only the recipients' incentives but also the prospects of ever working their way out of poverty. Becoming employed can mean that a person will lose their rent subsidy, thereby adding to their burden.

Currently, those leaving the welfare rolls are able to keep more of their earnings due to AFDC "disregards". At one time, one dollar was deducted from the welfare grant for every dollar the welfare recipient earned from employment. Realizing this was a disincentive to finding employment and acknowledging that it costs money to work in the form of transportation, clothing and child care, the Department of Health and Welfare initiated a change in the manner in which
earnings were deducted. Currently, a specific formula is used to determine the amount of income which shall be disregarded, and which shall not count as earnings. To calculate disregards, $30 is deducted from net earnings and 1/3 of the remaining earnings are then deducted; finally, an additional $90 is deducted. The resultant total is then deducted from the welfare grant as earnings, and the client receives the difference. In addition, any out-of-pocket child care costs will be deducted from income for up to one year. This should make working a more economical choice.

Jobs, GAIN and Goals

Previously conducted studies of JOBS programs were of "broad coverage" programs and all elements of a complete delivery system or package of activities (Friedman, 1991; Riccio, et al, 1989; Quint and Guy, 1989; Hamilton and Friedlander, 1989; U.S. Congressional Budget Office; and U.S. General Accounting Office). Gueron and Pauly (1991) found that many studies were completed which measured the overall success of a JOBS program, or made comparisons between programs that stressed either education or job services. Few studied the impact of a particular component of a program and none studies whether a motivational component would impact the participants and the success of a program. But dwindling fiscal resources dictate that each aspect of the GAIN program must now be evaluated for effectiveness.
According to Gueron and Pauly (1991) it is difficult to determine the most effective combination of services due to differing strategies used by counties and states to implement the requirements of JOBS and to measure program success. In addition, Friedlander and Long (1987) point out that there is a normal job-finding and welfare departure within the welfare population, and Rein (1982) states that one-fourth to one-third of participants are relatively employable and may not need to be provided with costly training and child care.

However, inequities in the job market, including inadequate employment prospects, lesser work experience and seniority, gender-typing in jobs and wage discrimination (Zopf, 1989), effect the ability of many people to find employment that will lead to self-sufficiency. GAIN is attempting to decrease inequities and to increase the employment prospects of AFDC recipients by working with employers and the Chambers of Commerce in their communities. GAIN asks employers to give their participants first chance at job openings and will conduct the qualifying interview for the employer. While taking into consideration such job requirements as education and previous experience, participants are referred to jobs based on their skills, abilities and area of interest rather than gender. How successful they have been in securing full time well-paying jobs for their participants will be discussed later in this paper.
The single component chosen for this study is called Goals, a patented motivational program. Goals was added to the GAIN program in San Bernardino County at an initial cost of $150,000, with ongoing costs for supplies. In the Goals component, a motivational video is shown to GAIN participants. The audience seen in the video are all welfare recipients and most of the presenters and facilitators had also been on welfare at some time in their lives. Two audio tapes of the video presentation plus a workbook are given to each participant to use during the training and to keep. GAIN employment specialists use a facilitator's workbook to teach participants to look at the successes in their lives, identify their strengths and skills, and to set goals.

Two different geographical areas of San Bernardino County's GAIN program were studied, and information resulting from the research provided some insight into the impact of this component on GAIN participants from those areas. These area offices are presenting Goals at differing times in the GAIN program. One area provides Goals training along with the initial orientation component, as it is their view that participants' overall performance in the program will be enhanced by the Goals component, thereby reducing non-compliance and facilitating finding employment. The other area office presents Goals as part of the job services component, which is farther along in the program than orientation. It is their contention that participants are more
motivated to find and accept jobs quickly when Goals and other job services are given together. This study looks at the overall effectiveness of Goals, and whether Goals provides motivation for participants to find employment and leave AFDC more quickly than those participants who have not had Goals.

**Problem Focus**

This is a positivist explanatory study which aimed to determine if Goals is meeting its own stated goals of motivating participants and raising their self-esteem, and thereby increasing participation rates and number of jobs found, and lowering non-cooperation and drop-out rates.

As researchers have pointed out, there are other factors which may affect GAIN participants ability to find gainful employment including level of education, previous job experience and length of time on AFDC. Therefore, these areas were addressed in this study.

The federal government has recently placed more emphasis on workfare programs for families receiving AFDC, and has allowed states more flexibility in the manner in which they manage such programs. Some states have initiated a "two years and you're off" policy, while California continues in their attempt to lower welfare rates as a way to encourage people to find employment and leave the welfare roles. However, with high rates of unemployment, many jobs on the market offer part time work for minimum wages and no benefits. Therefore, it is critical that the workfare programs set realistic goals and
policies to reach those goals. They must provide education and training that is adequate and appropriate for the types of jobs that are available in the immediate area. And they must do so economically and efficiently.
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

Purpose of the Study

The intent of the Goals component of the GAIN program is to raise the self-esteem of participants, to motivate them to actively participate in the program, and to find employment. The purpose of this study was to determine if GAIN participants attending Goals had lower drop-out and non-cooperation rates, and higher employment rates than those who did not have Goals training.

Research Question

The ultimate goal for GAIN is for participants to find employment and leave the AFDC rolls. Therefore, success for Goals can be measured by the usefulness of this component in aiding participants in their quest for employment.

The positivist orientation was chosen for this study as it best fits the explanatory elements to be researched. The population studied were GAIN participants from two area offices of the GAIN program in San Bernardino County. This is a summative program evaluation which will provide an indication of the potential impact of the Goals component.

The research questions focused on outcomes which were both internal to the program and external to the program for GAIN participants in the two area offices. Internal outcome questions included: Do those who have completed the Goals
component show more active participation, more timely completion of components, and less episodes of non-compliance, sanctions and dropping-out than those who have not received Goals? External outcome questions included: do more of those who have completed the Goals component find gainful employment than those who have not attended Goals; does this employment provide full time jobs at higher wages than found by those not attending goals?

It was hypothesized that Goals would prove to be effective and that those who completed Goals would be successful as measured by the following:

**Internal Outcomes**
1) fewer deferrals and less time on deferrals
2) fewer sanctions
3) fewer drop-outs

**External Outcomes**
1) finding full time employment
2) receiving higher wages
3) disenrolling in A.F.D.C.

**Sampling**

The population studied were participants of the GAIN program in San Bernardino County. 72 participants were selected as a convenience sample from GAIN case records via the program data base. The criterion for selection into the sample was attendance in GAIN in one of the two area offices in San Bernardino County chosen for this study. The first
A group of participants chosen from Area 1 participated in GAIN before Goals was a part of their program and therefore did not participate in the Goals program. The second group chosen from Area 1 all completed the Goals component. The participants chosen from Area 2 all participated in GAIN while Goals was part of the program; this group were equally divided between those who did and those who did not have the Goals component. See Table 1.

**Table 1: Number of Participants in the Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Area 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Area 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Participate</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(24)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* This researcher was unable to access an equal number of participants' records from Area 1 and Area 2 because of differing record keeping methods based on a systems change in the program.
Table 2: Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable (n=72)</th>
<th>Area 1 (n=48)</th>
<th>Area 2 (n=24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (Mean)</td>
<td>33.375</td>
<td>33.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Children (Mean)</td>
<td>2.1042</td>
<td>2.0417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>87.5% (42)</td>
<td>79.17% (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12.5 (6)</td>
<td>20.83 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>27.08% (13)</td>
<td>25% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>41.66 (20)</td>
<td>50 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>31.25 (15)</td>
<td>25 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Parent</td>
<td>81.25% (39)</td>
<td>79.17% (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
<td>18.75 (9)</td>
<td>20.83 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>45.83% (22)</td>
<td>87.5% (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-member</td>
<td>54.17 (26)</td>
<td>12.5 (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ages of the 72 participants in the study group ranged from 18 to 53 years. All 11 of the males belonged to two-parent households, as did 4 females; the remaining 57 belonged to single-parent households. Most participants had two children but one single mother had 6 children. GAIN's target group consists of parents who are under 20 years of age and do not have a high school diploma or its equivalent, parents whose youngest child is 16 years of age or older, parents who have received AFDC three of the last five years, and at least one parent in a two parent household.

Design

This positivist research project with a two group quasi-experimental design, which aimed to determine the potential impact of the Goals component of GAIN, contains certain threats to internal validity. These threats include the participant's personal history, the passage of time, and the difference in comparison groups.

As stated in the introduction, a personal history which includes previous employment experience, a high school diploma and less than two years of AFDC dependency would increase a person's ability to find current employment. Therefore, to measure the affects of history, past employment, highest grade completed, and length of time on AFDC were utilized as independent variables in this study. Additional independent variables include current employment, past and current wages, and number of hours currently working. All data were analyzed
using those who had participated in Goals and those who had not participated in Goals as dependent variables.

Passage of time is a threat to the validity of this study due to the transient nature of welfare recipients. Many leave GAIN because they have moved from the area, they no longer need AFDC, they have found employment through their own efforts, or they have a previously undisclosed source of income and do not want to participate in the GAIN program. Still others stop complying with GAIN regulations or stop attending the GAIN program. This threat was addressed under deregistration reasons and are listed in Table 5.

The third threat to internal validity related to the composition of groups is that the sample selection could not be randomly assigned. It was necessary to choose the sample by selecting those from the specific areas under study, and to choose an equal number from the specific area who did and did not attend the Goals program. There may also be differences in employment opportunities and availability of public transportation, child care, and education and training programs in the two areas studied. However, the two groups appear similar in demographics, history, time in GAIN and in GAIN participation. Although there are some differences in population and areas, the findings of this study will still give useful information to program administrators.

A further threat to internal validity concerned the input of information to the data base which was the major source of
data for this study. Input is made by GAIN employment specialists assigned to the individual case and the two offices use differing methods to input data. For example, in Area 1, if a participant becomes employed 40 hours per week they would be deregistered from GAIN and would be discontinued from AFDC after approximately two months of employment. However, in Area 2, employment specialists may receive a notice of AFDC discontinuance and deregister the participant from GAIN due to AFDC discontinuance, rather than employment and AFDC discontinuance. As a result, employment data may be inaccurate.

Data Collection

Data was collected unintrusively from the GAIN data base and from case records. Independent variables were whether or not the participant completed Goals training. Data pertaining to the dependant variables included information relating to the participant before, during and after their participation in GAIN. Data included whether they had been employed in the two years preceding their GAIN participation and their last wage earned, plus their highest level of education reached and the length of time they had received AFDC upon entering GAIN. Information concerning their GAIN participation included whether or not they had taken any deferrals from the program, and the number of non-cooperation sanctions which were issued. Further data concerned reasons for leaving the GAIN program such as employment or AFDC discontinuance. If the participant
left the program due to employment, the hours worked per week and hourly wage were noted. Statistical data regarding demographics were also gathered.

Procedure

For this explanatory study, questions and assessment information necessary to provide data regarding the potential effectiveness of the Goals motivational component on GAIN participants was decided upon (See Appendix A). Quantitative data were gathered unobtrusively, as all information was taken from the GAIN data base or from GAIN case records. This information was then coded and transferred to a form which was completed for each participant (See Appendix B). Identification of sampling elements were confidential and anonymous, and were recorded using GAIN case numbers only. This record will remain in the GAIN office and will be used only for purposes of validation of this study.
RESULTS

The quantitative data in this report were analyzed using various methods, including one-way chi-square tests, two-way chi-square tests, one-way ANOVAS and t-tests. The following describes the data collected and the analysis of that data.

Internal Outcomes

Internal outcomes that relate to successful completion of GAIN were measured by personal deferrals rates, sanction rates, and drop-out rates. The following are the result of those internal measures.

Deferral Rates. Deferrals from the GAIN program are given for part-time employment (15 to 30 hours per week), for funding purposes when GAIN funding is low, and for personal reasons. Personal deferrals are given when a client has problems with arranging child care or transportation, when they or their child is ill, or for other personal business such as legal problems.

The GAIN program was designed to prepare participants for employment and, in a way, is job training. Therefore, participants are expected to make arrangements for personal problems in order that such problems do not interfere with program participation and the successful and timely completion of the program. When a participant has a debilitating illness or other problems that can be documented, they can be given
an exemption from program participation. However, many months of participation are lost when numerous personal deferrals are taken; therefore, personal deferrals are seen as delaying the successful completion of the program and are listed in Table 3. Employment deferrals are regarded to be in the best interest of the client and funding deferrals are through no fault of the client, therefore they were not considered to be a detriment to successful completion of the Gain program and are not listed in Table 3.
Table 3: Number of Personal Deferrals and Length of Time on Deferral

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Area 1 (n=48)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Area 2 (n=24)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferrals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those deferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23(11)</td>
<td>19(9)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those not deferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27(13)</td>
<td>31(15)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total*</td>
<td>50(24)</td>
<td>50(24)</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>50(12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Months on deferral

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>22.33</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>13.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>18.045</td>
<td>6.271</td>
<td>11.258</td>
<td>8.343</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no significant difference in the number of personal deferrals between those who had Goals and those who did not have Goals. In both areas over 4% more participants who had Goals took personal deferrals than did those who did not have Goals. However, the average number months of deferral for those who had Goals in Area 1 was significantly higher than for those who did not have Goals in that area (One Way Anova: F= 6.8107; p=<.0004).
It should be noted, however, that more of the participants who did not have the Goals component were deferred due to employment rather than for personal reasons, while almost 50% of those who had Goals had at least 1 personal deferral.

Sanction Rates. Sanctions are imposed when a participant does not meet Gain program participation standards. These standards include compliance with rules and regulations involving active participation and regular attendance for the various segments of the program. Upon receiving the first sanction, the participant is deregistered from AFDC for up to 6 months and loses their portion of their monthly grant; they will be reinstated to AFDC when they again begin to actively participate. A second sanction calls for the participant to lose their portion of their AFDC grant for 12 months; after 6 months, they can become active in GAIN and their portion of the grant will be restored. A third sanction calls for an 18 month lose of their grant, with restoration after 12 months if they begin to participate. The participant's portion of their grant is not restored after the time limit of the sanction is reached unless they reregister for GAIN.
Table 4: Number of Participants Who Received Sanctions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanctions</th>
<th>Area 1</th>
<th>Area 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>No Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Sanctioned</td>
<td>10.42(5)</td>
<td>6.25(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Not Sanctioned</td>
<td>39.58(19)</td>
<td>43.75(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50(24)</td>
<td>50(24)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Area 1, more participants were sanctioned who had Goals than who did not have Goals. In Area 2, there was no difference in the number of sanctions between those who did and those who did not have Goals. Most of the participants listed only had one sanction. One participant who did not have Goals was sanctioned twice, while two of those who had Goals were sanctioned twice.

Drop-Out Rates. Drop-out rates were based on the reason for deregistration from GAIN. Reasons for deregistration include employed, employed and AFDC discontinued, AFDC discontinued for an unknown reason, sanctioned, exempt, and other/unknown.

When participants become employed over thirty hours per week and were earning at least minimum wage, they were deregistered from Gain using the reason "employed" or "employed and AFDC discontinued" if AFDC is discontinued.
immediately. Some employed participants may remain on AFDC if
their earnings are not high enough for discontinuance of AFDC.
When their AFDC is discontinued, they should be reentered into
the GAIN computer under "employed and AFDC discontinued". This
is not always the case (see threats to internal validity), and
they may remain under the "employed" category. Both the
"employed" and "employed and AFDC discontinued" reasons for
deregistration are considered as successful completion of the
GAIN program. Exemptions from GAIN are given when a
participant has documented proof that they cannot participate
in the program; reasons would include an incapacitating
physical or mental illness or injury, lengthy jail term, etc.
Exemptions are not included in drop-out rates.

Reasons for deregistration that are considered as
"drop-outs" include AFDC discontinuance - reason unknown,
sanction, and other -unknown. A participant is deregistered
if they have not reregistered from Gain after a sanction.
Unknown reasons for " AFDC discontinuance" and " other"
categories are usually due to the affects of time and the
transient nature of the population. Many participants move
out of the area, others may no longer be eligible for, or do
not want or need AFDC, and still others may have become
employed due to their own efforts and have not notified GAIN
of their employment. These two categories are considered as
"drop-outs" due to the participant not notifying GAIN of the
reason for lack of participation in GAIN. Those in the study
group who are still on GAIN are included here because they did not successfully complete GAIN in a timely manner.

Table 5: Rates of Deregistration for Reasons Considered "Drop-out"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Area 1 Goals</th>
<th>Area 1 No Goals</th>
<th>Area 1 Total</th>
<th>Area 2 Goals</th>
<th>Area 2 No Goals</th>
<th>Area 2 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFDC Dis.</td>
<td>8 (4)</td>
<td>23(11)</td>
<td>31(15)</td>
<td>12(3)</td>
<td>4(1)</td>
<td>17(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanction</td>
<td>4 (2)</td>
<td>6 (3)</td>
<td>10(5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8(2)</td>
<td>8(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>4 (2)</td>
<td>12(3)</td>
<td>8(2)</td>
<td>21(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still on</td>
<td>10(5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10(5)</td>
<td>12(3)</td>
<td>8(2)</td>
<td>21(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>25(12)</td>
<td>19(9)</td>
<td>44(21)</td>
<td>12(3)</td>
<td>21(5)</td>
<td>33(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50(24)</td>
<td>50(24)</td>
<td>100(48)</td>
<td>50(12)</td>
<td>50(12)</td>
<td>100(24)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Area 1, 56.25% (27) of the participants were "drop-outs", while in Area 2, 66.66% (16) were "drop-outs". Also, in Area 1, 6.2% fewer "drop-outs" had Goals, while in Area 2, 8.34% more "drop-outs" had Goals.

External Outcomes

External outcomes that relate to successful completion of GAIN are full time employment, discontinuance from AFDC, and higher wages.

Employment. The total number of participants in the study who were employed either full- or part-time by the end of their program are listed in Table 6.
Table 6: Number of Participants Employed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Area 1 (n=48)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Area 2 (n=24)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>27(13)</td>
<td>17(8)</td>
<td>44(21)</td>
<td>21(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>23(11)</td>
<td>33(16)</td>
<td>56(27)</td>
<td>29(7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Area 1 more of the participants who had Goals are employed, while in Area 2, more of the participants who had Goals are unemployed. However, the largest category in both areas are those participants who did not have Goals and are unemployed. Of the 30 participants who are employed, 18 (60%) attended Goals.

Discontinuance from GAIN and AFDC. Participants who are employed over 30 hours per week and earn at least the minimum wage are considered to be employed full time, and are deregistered from GAIN. Many will continued on AFDC due to low wages, but will be discontinued as soon as their wages increase; most will be discontinued within two months, while others are discontinued upon employment. Some of those employed and discontinued from AFDC may be listed under both "employed" and "employed and AFDC discontinued". All of those listed are considered to have successfully completed GAIN.
Table 7: Discontinuance Rates For Those Who Are Employed Full Time Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disc. Reason</th>
<th>Area 1 (n=48)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Area 2 (n=24)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Goals</td>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>No Goals</td>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>13(6)</td>
<td>10(5)</td>
<td>23(11)</td>
<td>4(1)</td>
<td>17(4)</td>
<td>21(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp. and AFDC Disc.</td>
<td>4(2)</td>
<td>4(2)</td>
<td>8(4)</td>
<td>4(1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>33(16)</td>
<td>35(17)</td>
<td>69(33)</td>
<td>42(10)</td>
<td>33(8)</td>
<td>75(18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Area 1, 31.25% (15) and in Area 2, 25% (6) of the studied participants have been deregistered due to full time employment. The employment figures listed include 15 participants who are employed 40 hours per week, and 1 person who is employed 32 hours per week. Of those employed full time, 47.6% had attended the Goals component. In Area 2, twice as many participants who did not have Goals have been deregistered due to employment, while those in Area 1 are evenly divided between those who have and those who have not had Goals.

Wages. Goals is a motivational program. Participants are taught to assess their past work experience, life skills and abilities, and education in terms of their potential impact on employment. They are taught how to write a resume, which
is then professionally completed for them. They are taught to look at the positive experiences in their lives and are given assertiveness training. It is thought that such preparation will enhance the participant's ability to find and maintain gainful employment at an equal to or higher wage than they had received before.

Table 8: Hourly Wages Before Enrollment In GAIN and Current Hourly Wages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Area 1 (n=48)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Area 2 (n=24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over</td>
<td>With</td>
<td>Over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Wage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Reporting</td>
<td>60(29)</td>
<td>29(14)</td>
<td>89(43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Wage</td>
<td>$5.76</td>
<td>$5.71</td>
<td>$7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Wage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Reporting</td>
<td>40(19)</td>
<td>23(11)</td>
<td>63(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Wage</td>
<td>$6.32</td>
<td>$6.09</td>
<td>$5.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some participants reported that they were employed during the two years before they enrolled in GAIN but did not report their earnings. One participant is currently employed 20 hours per week, but their wages are unknown.
From Area 1, one person who had Goals is currently working 20 hours per week, but their wages are unknown. In Area 1, the mean past wage was lower than that in Area 2. However, current wages in Area 1 are higher than in Area 2. Participants in Area 1 who are currently employed earn more than those who were previously employed in that area. Participants in Area 2 who are currently employed earn less than those previously employed in that area, and less than those currently employed in Area 1.

The last hourly wage for males was significantly greater than for females, two-tailed t-test: $t(10.86) = p < .001$, and the last hourly wage for those who were member of two parent families was significantly higher than for those who were members of single parent families, two-tailed t-test: $t(16.06) = p < .0341$.

All components of the Gain program were tested to assess their impact on participants' current employment. It was thought that Goals would be the component to have the most impact in this area; however, it was the Job Club component rather than Goals that had significant impact. The participants who completed the Job Services component had a significantly higher current wage than those who did not have Job Services, two-tailed t-test: $t(57.95) = p < .022$, worked significantly more hours per week than those who did not have Job Services, two-tailed T-test: $t(70) = p < .037$, and relatively more participants who had Job Club were employed.
Goals, as the last component a participant attended, did prove to have more of an effect on employment than Job Club. The analysis of variance indicated significantly higher number of hours worked per week for those whose last component in GAIN was Goals than those whose last component was Job Services, one-way ANOVA: $F(4, 72) = 2.7506$, $p<.0174$.

Additional Findings Associated With Program Outcomes

Areas external to GAIN which could have an influence on a participant's employment, and are therefore threats to internal validity, include the participant's previous employment, education, and length of time on AFDC. Previous research found that these three factors had significant influence on employment in some areas of the County. It was felt that all three areas would effect employment in San Bernardino County. However, as seen in a previous section, more people reported previous employment than are currently employed; therefore previous employment did not prove to influence current employment.

Table 9: Mean Number of Years of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Area 1 (N=48)</th>
<th>Area 2 (N=24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>With Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>10.563</td>
<td>10.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.934</td>
<td>1.970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The number of years of education completed, which ranged from 2 years to 14 years, did not prove to have an influence on current employment. There was no significant difference in the number of years of schooling for those who did and those who did not have goals. The mean number of years of education for all participants studied from Area 1 was higher than in Area 2. However, the mean number of years for those with Goals was higher in Area 2.

The mean number of years of schooling for those who were employed during the two years before enrollment in GAIN was significantly higher than for those who were not employed during that time, two-tailed t-test $t(69.40) = p<.035$.

Many more people in GAIN were on AFDC for over five years than were on AFDC less than five years.

Table 10: Relationship of Employment to Years on AFDC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area 1 (n=48)</th>
<th>Area 2 (n=24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2yrs 2-5yrs 5+yrs</td>
<td>0-2yrs 2-5yrs 5+yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Employment 8 (4) 8 (4) 23 (11) 8 (2) 8 (2) 21 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Employment 4 (2) 15 (7) 25 (12) 0 13 (3) 25 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Overall 21 (10) 27 (13) 52 (25) 13 (3) 21 (5) 66 (16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Area 1, those on AFDC 2-5 years showed a higher gain in finding current employment than those in the other two categories. Areas 1 and 2 were similar in the rate of employment for those listed in the above table. The number of participants on AFDC over 5 years was significantly larger than for 0-2 years or 2-5 years, chi-square: (2, N = 72) = 18.583, p<.000; this group also had the highest rate of employment in both areas. The lowest rate of employment was for those on AFDC 0-2 years.

It was further found that there were relatively more males on AFDC for 0-2 years, chi-square: (1, N = 72) = 4.583, p<.0329, relatively more two parent families on AFDC for 0-2 years, chi-square: (1, N = 72) = 8.1826, p<.00423, and relatively more Whites were on AFDC for 0-5 years than for 5+ years, chi-square: (2, N = 72) = 6.6116, p<.03667). The average number of months of deferral for those who had 5+ years on AFDC was significantly higher than those who had 0-2 years and 2-5 years on AFDC, one-way ANOVA: F(3, 72) = 6.8107, p<.0083.
DISCUSSION

This study sought to determine whether the Goals component of the GAIN program had a positive effect on participants. It was thought that those who completed the Goals component would have fewer deferrals, less sanctions, and fewer drop-outs (internal measurements) than those who did not have the Goals component. It was also thought that more of the participants who completed Goals would find full time employment, receive higher wages and have higher rates of leaving AFDC (external measurements) than those who did not have Goals. Further, the effects of history, time, and differences in comparison groups were thought to possibly have an effect on the results of this study.

Internal Outcomes

The results of this study did not show evidence of significant differences between those who received the Goals component and those who did not receive the Goals component. However, the findings regarding internal outcomes showed more negative outcomes for those who received Goals than for those who did not receive Goals. For example, those who received Goals had more personal deferrals, fewer deferrals for employment, and were deferred for longer periods of time than those who did not receive Goals.
More of the participants who received Goals were sanctioned, and two were sanctioned twice for non-compliance with GAIN regulations and/or compliance standards. However, all of these participants eventually returned to GAIN and successfully completed the program. None of those participants who were sanctioned and did not receive goals returned to GAIN and all remain discontinued from AFDC.

Drop-out rates, which were based on the reason for deregistration from GAIN, did not show any conclusive findings.

Contrary to the hypothesis, Goals does not have an impact on a participant's performance while in the GAIN program. The instructors of the Goals component may need to stress the importance of participants' making adequate arrangements for child care, transportation, etc., while in the GAIN program. This could lessen the need for personal deferrals, thereby enhancing their performance in GAIN, and better prepare them for entry into the employment arena.

External Outcomes

There was only one significant difference between those who received Goals and those who did not receive goals. Most of the participants in this study remain unemployed; however, significantly more of those who are employed completed Goals.

The number of participants discontinued from GAIN due to either employment or employment and discontinuance from AFDC is almost equally divided between those who attended Goals and
those who did not. However, significantly more of those who
attended Goals in Area 1 are employed full time than those who
attended Goals in Area 2. Past wages in Area 2 were almost
$2.00 per hour higher than in Area 1, but current wages are
higher in Area 1, with the highest wages received by those
who did not receive Goals. The differences between the areas
are due to the economy and the types of jobs available in the
specific areas. Previously, more full time jobs which paid
higher wages were available in Area 2. The drop in wages in
that area could be accounted for by a current availability of
mainly part-time jobs with lower pay. Conversely, more full
time jobs are now available in Area 1, but current wages there
are still lower than those previously paid for full time
employment in Area 2.

It is apparent that the economy, rather than Goals, is
having a significant affect on GAIN participants. Many of the
participants in the study were previously employed, and they
may be reluctant to take jobs that pay less than they were
previously earning. And they, like other participants, may be
reluctant to take part-time jobs with no benefits and few
prospects for the future. Goals training will have to stress
that participants are starting over in the job market, and
even part-time employment offers opportunities for work
experience and an inside track to full time jobs that become
available.
External Influences

The economy, as well as the number and types of jobs available have affected all GAIN participants. Many of those in the group studied who were previously employed are not currently employed.

Unlike previous research, this study found that the number of years of education did not prove to be significant between those who found employment and those who did not find employment, nor was it significant between those who attended Goals and those who did not attend Goals. The research findings in this report does agree with previous research that length of time on AFDC affects the participants ability to find employment. However, previous researchers found that the longer one stayed on AFDC, the more difficult it was to find a job. The results for this study group were the exact opposite for both Areas 1 and 2. Those on AFDC 0 to 2 years had 0% to 9% rates of employment, those on AFDC 2 to 5 years had a 33% rate, and for those on AFDC over 5 years the employment rate was 57% to 66%. More of the participants in Area 2 who were on AFDC over 5 years found employment than in Area 1.

A person who successfully completed GAIN would be described as one who is employed, working full time, and earning wages high enough to have been discontinued from AFDC. From the research, it was found that the person who best fits that description is a male from a two-parent family who has
completed the Job Club component of GAIN, and who received AFDC for over five years.

The Goals component did not have a significant impact on the success of the group studied during their participation in the GAIN program or in finding full time employment with high wages and being discontinued from AFDC. While the Goals component may need to be enhanced, there will not be any significant strides in the employability of GAIN participants until there is a change in the economy in this area.

San Bernardino County has had a high rate of unemployment for a number of years. In the last year, many new businesses have opened in San Bernardino, bringing with them new opportunities for employment. However, the rate of growth for new jobs is much lower than the rate of population increase in the county, and the rate of unemployment remains high. Until this changes, we will continue to see many low-wage part-time jobs or full time positions for employes designated as independent contractors, which offer no benefits such as sick leave, vacation time or medical insurance. One change that has occurred since this study was undertaken is in the political climate of the country. This author believes that this change will affect the economy and will prove to be positive for some San Bernardino County residents, but not for those who are AFDC recipients. The need for GAIN to be effective in assisting those on AFDC in finding employment is now more important than ever.
APPENDIX A

ASSESSMENT INFORMATION

1. ID#  --  --  --  --
2. Age  --  --  --
3. Sex  --  --  --
4. Children  --  --
5. Ethnicity  01)White  02)Latino  03)Black  04)Asian  05)other
6. Family Status  01)Single parent  02)2 parent H.H.
7. Regist.Status  01)Mandatory  02)Voluntary
8. Target group  01)Yes  02)No
9. Time on AFDC  01)-2yrs  02)2-5yrs  03)5+yrs
10. Emp.last 24 mos.  01)Yes  02)No
11. Last hourly wage  Dollar amount, adjusted upward
12. School  Years completed
13. Training Status  01)Voc.trng  02)other trng  03)not in trng

GAIN PARTICIPATION

15. ABE/GED/ESL  01)Yes  02)No
16. JC/JS/UJS  01)Yes  02)No
17. Other  01)Assessmt  02)VocTrng  03)WkExp  04)All (1,2&3)  05)1&2only
18. # of Sanctions  --  --
19. Last component  01)Orient.  02)ABE/GED/ESL  03)JC/JS/UJS  04)other  05)Goals
20. Deferral Reason  01)Employed  02)Personal  03)Funding
22. Employed  01)Yes  02)No
23. Hrs. per Week  full hours only
24. Wage per Hour  Dollar Amount, Rounded Upward
25. Years on GAIN  01)-1  02)1-2  03)2-3  04)3+
26. #Mos. Defer/Dereg
27. #Mos. before Goals  After enrollment
28. #Mos. after Goals  Before deregistration; or if still on, until
                      data retrieved from file
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## APPENDIX B

### INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPATION FORM

1. **ID#** :: 
2. **Age** :: 
3. **Sex** :: 
4. **Children** :: 
5. **Ethnicity** :: 01)White 02)Latino 03)Black 04)Asian 05)other
6. **Family Status** :: 01)Single parent 02)2pr. H.H.
7. **Regis. Status** :: 01)Mandatory 02)Voluntary
8. **Target Group** :: 01)Yes 02)No
9. **Time on AFDC** :: 01)-2 yrs 02)2-5yrs 03)5+yrs
10. **Emp. last 24 mos.** :: 01)yes 02)No
11. **Last hourly wage** :: Dollar amount, rounded upward
12. **Yrs. of school** :: Years completed
13. **Trng. Status** :: 01)in voc.trng. 02)in oth.trng 03)not in trng.
14. **Rcvd. Goals** :: 01)in Onta. 02)In Colton 03)No
15. **Rcvd. ABE/GED** :: 01)yes 02)No
16. **Rcvd. JC/JS** :: 01)yes 02)No
17. **Rcvd. more** :: 01)Assessment 02)Voc.trng. 03)Wk.exp. 04)Rcvd.all(1,2&3) 05)Rcvd.1&2
18. **No. of Sanctions** :: 
19. **Last component** :: 01)orientation 02)ABE/GED 03)JC/JS 04)other 05)Goals
20. **Deferral Reason** :: 01)employed 02)personal 03)funding
21. **Dereg. Reason** :: 01)Employment 02)AFDC disc 03)Employed & AFDC disc 04)Sanction 05)Exempt 06)other 07)Unknown 08)still in GAIN
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>01)Yes 02)No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Hrs. Per Week Empl.</td>
<td>full hours only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Wage per Hour</td>
<td>Dollar amount, rounded upward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Yrs. on GAIN</td>
<td>01)-1 02)1-2 03)2-3 04)3+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>#Mos. Def/Dereg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>#Mos.before goals</td>
<td>After enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>#Mos.after goals</td>
<td>Before deregistration or if still on, until info. taken</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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