

**2010 National Beneficiary  
Survey: Methodology and  
Descriptive Statistics**

Final Report

April 2, 2012

Debra Wright  
Gina Livermore  
Denise Hoffman  
Eric Grau  
Maura Bardos



**MATHEMATICA**  
Policy Research

**This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.**

Contract Number:  
0600-03-60130

Mathematica Reference Number:  
08977.964

Submitted to:  
Social Security Administration  
Office of Retirement and Disability Policy  
500 E Street, SW, 9th Floor  
Washington, DC 20024  
Project Officer: Paul K. O'Leary

Submitted by:  
Mathematica Policy Research  
1100 1st Street, NE, 12th Floor  
Washington, DC 20002  
Telephone: (202) 484-9220  
Facsimile: (202) 863-1763  
Project Director: Gina A. Livermore

**2010 National Beneficiary  
Survey: Methodology and  
Descriptive Statistics**

Final Report

April 2, 2012

Debra Wright  
Gina Livermore  
Denise Hoffman  
Eric Grau  
Maura Bardos

---

**MATHEMATICA**  
Policy Research

---

**This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.**

## CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	vii
ACRONYMS .....	ix
I        INTRODUCTION .....	1
II       DESCRIPTION OF THE 2010 NATIONAL BENEFICIARY SURVEY.....	3
A. Purpose of the Survey.....	3
B. Data Collection Overview.....	3
C. Sampling Design .....	4
1. Target Population.....	6
2. Strata Definitions and Sample Sizes.....	6
D. Questionnaire.....	7
E. Data Collection.....	11
1. Advance Contacts.....	11
2. Locating.....	11
3. CATI and CAPI Interviews	
4. Assisted and Proxy Interviews .....	12
5. Characteristics of CATI, CAPI, and Proxy Respondents.....	13
6. Case-Disposition Summary and Response Rates .....	13
III      DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS BASED ON THE NATIONALLY REPRESENTATIVE BENEFICIARY SAMPLE .....	17
A. Characteristics of Employed Beneficiaries .....	17
B. Employment Expectations.....	18
C. Employment-Related Activities and Work Capacity .....	18
D. Job Characteristics of Beneficiaries Employed at Interview.....	18
1. Hours, Wages, and Monthly Earnings.....	18
2. Job Tenure .....	19
3. Supported Employment .....	19
E. Awareness of Social Security Work Supports .....	19
REFERENCES.....	45

**This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.**

## TABLES

II.1	Round 4 Sample Sizes and Number of Target Completed Interviews per Sampling Strata.....	6
II.2	Overview of the National Beneficiary Survey Questionnaire.....	10
II.3	Characteristics of CATI, CAPI, and Proxy Respondents .....	14
II.4	Summary Case Disposition by Sample Type and Sampling Strata.....	15
II.5	Weighted Response Rates by Sample Type and Sampling Strata for the Representative Beneficiary and TTW Participant Samples .....	16
III.1	Subgroup Sample Sizes.....	17
III.2	Sociodemographic Characteristics .....	21
III.3	Living Arrangements.....	22
III.4	Health Status .....	23
III.5	Difficulties with Specific Activities.....	24
III.6	Program Participation .....	25
III.7	Sources of Health Insurance.....	26
III.8	Service Use .....	27
III.9	Services Needed but Not Received in 2009.....	28
III.10	Employment Expectations.....	29
III.11	Employment .....	30
III.12	Employment Rates for Specific Beneficiary Subgroups .....	31
III.13	Reasons for Not Working .....	32
III.14	Hourly Reservation Wages Among Nonworking Beneficiaries Seeking Employment or Reporting Reasons Other Than Their Health for Not Working.....	32
III.15	Summary of Employment-Related Activities and Expectations .....	33
III.16	Work Activity Relative to Work Capacity and Supports That Would Improve Work Capacity Among Recently Employed Beneficiaries .....	34
III.17	Job Characteristics of Employed Beneficiaries.....	35
III.18	Job-Related Benefits.....	37

III.19	Job Satisfaction.....	38
III.20	Job Accommodations and Supports.....	40
III.21	SSA Notification of Work Activity Following Job Start Among Beneficiaries Employed at Interview .....	41
III.22	Social Security Benefit Adjustment in Response to Work Activity Among Recently Employed Beneficiaries .....	41
III.23	Benefits Reduced or Ended Due to Work Activity Among Recently Employed Beneficiaries .....	42
III.24	Percentage of Respondents Aware of Social Security Work Supports (among those eligible for each item) .....	42
III.25	Awareness of the Ticket to Work Program by Time Since Ticket Mailing at Interview .....	43

## **ABSTRACT**

This report presents the sampling design and data collection activities for Round 4 (2010) of the Social Security Administration's National Beneficiary Survey (NBS). It also provides descriptive statistics on working-age individuals receiving Supplemental Security Income and Social Security Disability Insurance benefits, based on the nationally representative sample from the 2010 NBS.

This is the fourth in a series of reports that make up the seventh Ticket to Work evaluation report.

**This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.**

## ACRONYMS

AAPOR	American Association of Public Opinion Research
ADL	Activities of Daily Living
CAPI	Computer-Assisted Personal Interview
CATI	Computer-Assisted Telephone Interview
DI	Social Security Disability Insurance (under Title II of the Social Security Act)
EN	Employment Network
IADL	Instrumental Activities of Daily Living
NBS	National Beneficiary Survey
PSU	Primary Sampling Unit
SSA	Social Security Administration
SSI	Supplemental Security Income (Title XVI of the Social Security Act)
SVRA	State Vocational Rehabilitation Agency
TRS	Telecommunication Relay Service
TTW	Ticket to Work
TTY	Text Typewriter

**This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.**

## I. INTRODUCTION

This report presents the sampling design and data collection activities for Round 4 (2010) of the Social Security Administration's (SSA's) National Beneficiary Survey (NBS). It also provides descriptive statistics on working-age individuals receiving Social Security Disability Insurance (DI) and Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits, based on the national sample of the 2010 NBS.

The NBS was designed to collect information to evaluate SSA's Ticket to Work (TTW) program, a voluntary employment program for working-age Social Security disability beneficiaries. Established by the Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act of 1999, TTW was designed to increase the quality of and access to employment services for disability beneficiaries. The program was implemented in three phases over 2002–2004, with a subset of U.S. states and territories being included in each phase of the rollout.

Under TTW, SSA provides beneficiaries with a Ticket they may use to obtain vocational rehabilitation, employment, or other support services from participating providers called employment networks (ENs). These providers receive payments from SSA if the beneficiaries they serve achieve successful employment outcomes. Three payment systems are used under the program to reimburse ENs. The traditional payment system is available only to state vocational rehabilitation agencies (SVRAs) and, until recently, operated in the same manner as it did before the implementation of TTW.<sup>1</sup> Two new payment systems—milestone-outcome and outcome-only—were implemented under TTW and are available to all ENs.<sup>2</sup> These providers receive payments from SSA if the beneficiaries they serve achieve successful employment outcomes.

The NBS collects data from a national sample of working-age (age 18 to full retirement age) DI and SSI beneficiaries and a sample of TTW participants. Four rounds of the NBS have been conducted. The survey is a key component of a congressionally mandated evaluation designed to assess the impact of TTW on the service use and employment outcomes of working-age SSI and DI beneficiaries. The evaluation includes process, participation, and impact analyses that rely on data collected from SSA administrative records, interviews with program stakeholders, and the NBS.

Mathematica Policy Research conducted three of the four rounds planned for the NBS in 2004, 2005, and 2006. The fourth and final NBS round was postponed until 2010 to capture beneficiary experiences after SSA implemented significant changes to the regulations governing TTW on July 21, 2008. These changes were designed to strengthen the program and encourage more participation by providers and beneficiaries. The revised regulations made ENs eligible for payments for clients working at lower levels of earnings than before and increased the total value of potential

---

<sup>1</sup> Under the traditional SVRA reimbursement system, SVRAs are paid for the allowable costs incurred (up to a ceiling determined by SSA) for serving an SSA beneficiary if the beneficiary works above the SSA-defined level of substantial gainful activity for 9 or more months during a 12-month period.

<sup>2</sup> ENs select one of the two TTW payment systems to operate under. The selected system applies to all clients served by the EN under TTW. Only SVRAs are permitted to choose, on a case-by-case basis, whether to serve a TTW client under the traditional payment system or under its selected alternative TTW payment system (milestone-outcome or outcome-only). For more information about the TTW 2011 EN payment rates see [<https://yourtickettowork.com/documents/10404/26708/Payments+at+a+Glance+2011.pdf>].

payments. Additionally, the new regulations removed the requirement that SVRAs accept Tickets to receive cost-reimbursement payments and required only that SVRAs document that a Ticket was in use (in other words, that the beneficiary was receiving employment services from the SVRA).

The remainder of this report is organized into two chapters. In Chapter II, we describe the 2010 NBS methodology, including:

- The purpose of the survey
- The sample design (including the formation and selection of primary sampling units, the selection of beneficiaries and TTW participants in the clustered and unclustered components, the definition of the target population, and the sampling strata and sample sizes)
- A summary of the content and design of the survey questionnaire
- The data collection process and procedures
- A summary of the final case dispositions and response rates

In Chapter III, we provide a set of data tables, based on the national sample, that show:

- The weighted and unweighted sample sizes for the subgroups for which descriptive statistics are presented
- Descriptive statistics pertaining to the characteristics, sources of support, and employment-related activities of working-age SSI and DI beneficiaries (including their sociodemographic characteristics, living arrangements, health status, income sources, health insurance coverage, employment, service use, and awareness and use of SSA work supports)

## **II. DESCRIPTION OF THE 2010 NATIONAL BENEFICIARY SURVEY**

### **A. Purpose of the Survey**

Mathematica conducted Round 4 of the NBS in 2010. This survey, sponsored by SSA's Office of Retirement and Disability Policy, collected data from a national sample of Social Security disability beneficiaries (hereafter referred to as the Representative Beneficiary Sample) and a sample of TTW participants (hereafter referred to as the TTW Participant Sample). The two sampling frames make it possible to assess point-in-time service use and employment outcomes of all beneficiaries and of TTW participants.

The survey has the following five key objectives:

1. To obtain data on the work-related activities of SSI and DI beneficiaries, particularly as associated with participation in TTW
2. To describe the characteristics and program experiences of beneficiaries who use their Tickets
3. To gather information about beneficiaries who do not use their Tickets and the reasons they do not
4. To assess the employment outcomes of TTW participants and other SSI and DI beneficiaries
5. To collect data on service use, barriers to work, and perceptions about TTW and other SSA programs designed to help beneficiaries with disabilities find and keep jobs

Besides meeting these original study objectives, the Round 4 survey was also designed to assess changes in the TTW program since the new regulations took effect in July 2008.

The survey data have been combined with selected SSA administrative data to provide critical information on access to services and employment outcomes for disability beneficiaries, including TTW participants and nonparticipants. The survey data may also be used by SSA for other policymaking and program-planning efforts, and by external researchers interested in disability and employment issues.

### **B. Data Collection Overview**

The NBS is a computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) survey with computer-assisted personal interviewing (CAPI) followup for beneficiaries who did not respond to the CATI survey or who requested an in-person interview. The survey instrument was identical in each data collection mode and for both the Representative Beneficiary Sample and the TTW Participant Sample. Whenever possible, the interview was attempted with the sample person. If this person was unable to respond due to their disability, a proxy respondent was sought.

The sample size for Round 4 was 3,683 for the Representative Beneficiary Sample and 4,334 for the TTW Participant Sample (8,017 total). Mathematica completed interviews with 2,298 individuals in the Representative Beneficiary Sample and 2,780 individuals in the TTW Participant Sample for a total of 5,078 completed interviews.<sup>3</sup> An additional 222 beneficiaries and 98 TTW participants were determined to be ineligible for the survey.<sup>4</sup> Across both samples, 3,936 interviews were completed by telephone, and 1,142 were completed in person. Interviews with proxy respondents were completed for 998 sample members.

The weighted response rates are 72.8 percent for the Representative Beneficiary Sample and 71.4 percent for the TTW Participant Sample.<sup>5</sup>

### C. Sampling Design

SSA implemented the TTW program in three phases over three years, with each phase corresponding to about one-third of the states. The initial NBS design called for four national cross-sectional surveys (called “rounds”) of Ticket-eligible SSA disability beneficiaries—one each in 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006—and cross-sectional surveys of TTW participants in each of three groups of states (Phase 1, Phase 2, and Phase 3 states)—defined by the year in which the program was introduced (Bethel and Stapleton 2002).<sup>6</sup> In addition, the design called for the first TTW participant

---

<sup>3</sup> Because the clustered and unclustered samples of the TTW Participant Sample were independent, it was possible for individuals to be chosen for both samples. It was also possible for a sample member to be chosen for both the Representative Beneficiary Sample and the TTW Participant Sample. Interviews for duplicate cases were conducted only once but were recorded twice (once for each sample). The counts reported enumerate the duplicates as separate cases.

<sup>4</sup> Ineligible sample members include those who were deceased, no longer living in the continental U.S., incarcerated, or in active military service or who were denied benefits subsequent to sample selection or had never received benefits.

<sup>5</sup> This response rate is the weighted count of sample members who completed an interview or were determined to be ineligible divided by the weighted count of all sample members (number of completed interviews + number of partially completed interviews + number of ineligibles / number of cases in the sample). The rate can be determined by taking the product of the weighted location rate and the weighted cooperation rate, also known as the weighted completion rate among located sample members. This response rate is equivalent to the American Association of Public Opinion Research’s (AAPOR’s) standard response-rate calculation:  $RR_{AAPOR} = \text{number of completed interviews} / \text{number of cases in the sample} - \text{estimated number of ineligible cases}$ . Ineligible cases are included in the numerator for two reasons, the first being that these cases are part of the original sampling frame (and hence the study population). We obtained complete information to fully classify these cases (i.e., their responses to the eligibility questions in the questionnaire are complete) and therefore classify them as respondents. The second reason is that incorporating ineligibles in the numerator and denominator of the response rate is essentially equivalent to the definition of a response rate with these cases excluded if the people with an additional estimation of the number of eligible cases among those with eligibility unknown. By including the ineligible cases in the numerator and denominator, we avoid using this estimation stage, and the method of computing the response rate is more transparent.

<sup>6</sup> The Ticket to Work program, implemented in 2002, was phased in nationwide over three years. In 2002, the first year of the program, SSA distributed Tickets in the following 13 states, known as the Phase 1 states: Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Iowa, Massachusetts, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Vermont, and Wisconsin. Phase 2 ran from November 2002 through September 2003, during which time SSA distributed Tickets in the following 20 Phase 2 states and the District of Columbia: Alaska, Arkansas, Connecticut, Georgia, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Tennessee, and Virginia. Phase 3 ran from November 2003 through September 2004, during which time SSA distributed Tickets in 17 Phase 3 states: Alabama, California, Hawaii, Idaho, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming as well as in American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

cohort in each group of TTW phase-in states to be followed longitudinally until 2006. The design was later revised so that Phase 1 data collection started in 2004 rather than in 2003. Round 4 (the final round) was also postponed until 2010.

In the original design, Round 4 focused on following participants interviewed in earlier rounds and interviewing new TTW participants in Phase 3 states. The cross-sectional Representative Beneficiary Sample in this round was originally much smaller than the cross-sections of earlier rounds. However, changes in federal regulations that substantially altered the TTW program in 2008 made it less meaningful to track the long-term experiences of beneficiaries who participated in the program under the former regulations. As a result, TTW participants from earlier rounds were not re-interviewed in Round 4 as part of the longitudinal sample,<sup>7</sup> and the sample design was revised to include a larger cross-sectional sample of beneficiaries and a representative cross-sectional TTW Participant Sample. First-stage sampling units in Round 4 were the same as those in the previous three rounds.

The NBS used a multistage sampling design in all survey rounds, with a supplemental single-stage sample for some TTW participants. Primary sampling units (PSUs) were formed in every state based on the number of beneficiaries in each county, as reported by SSA. Mathematica used a three-stage sample design to select the Representative Beneficiary Sample:

- In the first stage, we identified the number of PSUs to be selected from each of the Phase 1, 2, and 3 states. PSUs were chosen with probability proportional to the size of the beneficiary population in the PSUs. The total number of PSUs to be selected was 80, but because one PSU was selected twice due to the numerous beneficiaries in that area, the final number was 79.
- In the second stage, we formed sampling units in the two largest PSUs (which were selected with certainty) based on zip code. Two secondary units were selected in one PSU, and four secondary units were selected in the other.
- In the third stage, we selected the beneficiary sample in four age-specific strata. The final size of the Representative Beneficiary Sample was 3,683.

The clustered TTW Participant Sample was selected in the same manner as the Representative Beneficiary Sample, using the same PSUs. However, due to the small number of TTW participants, the secondary sampling units were not used, and the sample was instead drawn from all participants in the PSUs. The original sampling design for the TTW Participant Sample called for using the same PSUs developed for the Representative Beneficiary Sample. But the number of TTW participants with Tickets assigned to SVRA ENs and non-SVRA ENs was too small to support the desired data analysis. We therefore supplemented each clustered sample in the two groups with an independent unclustered sample of TTW participants.<sup>8</sup> Participants were stratified based on the payment system available to TTW service providers (traditional, milestone-outcome, and outcome-only). In Round 4,

---

<sup>7</sup> A sample member selected in Round 4 could have also been selected in earlier rounds. Given that the same primary sampling units were used as in earlier rounds, the likelihood of selection in more than one round was not negligible.

<sup>8</sup> The survey sample design report by Bethel and Stapleton (2002) includes more detailed information regarding the original NBS sample design.

the final sample size for the TTW Participant Sample was 4,331. The sample sizes and number of targeted and completed interviews for each stratum are shown in Table II.1.

**Table II.1. Round 4 Sample Sizes and Number of Target Completed Interviews per Sampling Strata**

Sample/Strata	Sample Size	Target Completed Interviews	Actual Completed Interviews
<b>Representative Beneficiary Sample</b>	<b>3,683</b>	<b>2,400</b>	<b>2,298</b>
Age 18 to 29	1,029	666	634
Age 30 to 39	1,032	666	625
Age 40 to 49	1,019	666	643
Age 50+	603	402	396
<b>TTW Participant Sample</b>	<b>4,334</b>	<b>3,000</b>	<b>2,780</b>
Ticket assigned under EN payment system	3,251	2,250	2,030
Non-SVRA ENs	2,157	1,500	1,352
SVRA ENs	1,094	750	678
Ticket assigned under traditional SVRA payment system	1,083	750	750
<b>Total Sample Size</b>	<b>8,017</b>	<b>5,400</b>	<b>5,078</b>

Source: 2010 National Beneficiary Survey.

## 1. Target Population

The target population for both the Representative Beneficiary Sample and TTW Participant Sample consisted of SSI and DI beneficiaries age 18 to the full retirement age. For the Representative Beneficiary Sample, the target population included beneficiaries in all 50 states and the District of Columbia who were in current pay status as of June 2009.<sup>9</sup> In this sample, one subpopulation of beneficiaries was not eligible for TTW but was included in the survey samples to ensure complete coverage of the national beneficiary population: young SSI recipients who were receiving benefits because of their eligibility as a child and were completing the re-determination process under the adult eligibility criteria. The target population for the Representative Beneficiary Sample included approximately 12.1 million people; approximately 2.4 million beneficiaries were in the sampled PSUs.

For the TTW Participant Sample, the target population only included beneficiaries who had used their Ticket at least once between January 1, 2009, and October 2, 2009 (the extract date of the sampling frame). At the time of Round 4 sampling, this target population had 85,038 TTW participants, including 68,592 who signed up with SVRAs using the traditional payment system (“traditional SVRAs”); 12,728 signed up with ENs that were not SVRAs (“non-SVRA ENs”); and 3,718 signed up with SVRAs using an EN payment system (“SVRA ENs”).

## 2. Strata Definitions and Sample Sizes

The sample was designed to be statistically and operationally efficient and to provide adequate sample sizes for the planned analyses. To ensure a sufficient number of beneficiaries interested in

<sup>9</sup> Beneficiaries in the trust territories and Puerto Rico were excluded from the target population.

work, the Representative Beneficiary Sample was classified into sampling strata based on age, with people in the youngest categories selected at higher rates than people in the oldest. The strata included the following age groups—18 to 29 years, 30 to 39 years, 40 to 49 years, and 50 years and older. The target number of completed interviews for Round 4 was 667 in each of the three youngest groups and 400 for the oldest group.

The sampling strata for the TTW Participant Sample were defined by TTW provider type (SVRA and EN) and payment system (traditional, milestone-outcome, and outcome-only). In Rounds 1 through 3, Mathematica stratified TTW participants based on the implementation phase of their state of residence and, within each phase, according to the payment system selected by each participant's TTW provider. In Round 4, it was no longer necessary to stratify participants by implementation phase because the TTW program was operating in all states. Participants in Round 4 were instead stratified based on whether their Tickets were assigned to (1) traditional SVRAs, (2) SVRA ENs, and (3) non-SVRA ENs. Participants who assigned their Ticket to an EN were oversampled. The target number of completed interviews for the Round 4 TTW Participant Sample was 3,000, including approximately 750 interviews each for traditional SVRAs and SVRA ENs and 1,500 interviews for non-SVRA ENs.

For beneficiaries in all samples, clustered or unclustered, we used the same locating process to identify a telephone number so that a phone interview could be attempted. However, if an in-person interview was required, the level of effort differed between the clustered and unclustered samples. Clustered sample members were eligible for a field followup and were assigned to field locators or interviewers. Unclustered sample members who could not be located or who required an in-person interview were “closed out” and, operationally, were treated as if they had not been sampled.

The samples included two and a half to three times as many cases as were needed to achieve the target number of completed interviews.<sup>10</sup> These samples were randomly partitioned into subsamples to be released sequentially as cases were needed. During data collection, we monitored the sample results and determined whether additional cases were needed, and in which strata and PSUs.

## D. Questionnaire

The NBS collects data on a wide range of topics, including employment, disability, experience with a variety of SSA programs, employment services used in the past year, health and functional status, health insurance, income and other assistance, and sociodemographic information. The Lewin Group and Westat selected and pre-tested the survey items as part of a separate contract. Mathematica then revised and prepared the instrument for CATI/CAPI programming and pre-tested the programmed instrument before fielding. To encourage response from Spanish-speaking populations, the questionnaire was translated into Spanish. Interpreters were also used to conduct interviews in languages other than Spanish.

In Round 4, we made additional modifications to the survey instrument to update it for administration in 2010, including (1) changing the reference periods to 2009, (2) revising the text to accommodate the change in sample design, (3) revising items about awareness of work-incentive

---

<sup>10</sup> We used this expanded sample size to accommodate differential response and eligibility rates across the PSUs and sample strata and to allow for a distribution of the sample that would be statistically efficient.

programs to address recent changes in selected programs, (4) adding items to gather in-depth data from respondents who reported that they did not receive services in 2009 or were dissatisfied with the services they received, and (5) adding pre-defined response categories to some open-ended items. In addition, we deleted items that were no longer relevant. The survey is divided into 18 sections, labeled A through M, which serve the following purposes:

**Section A: Screener.** This section allows the interviewer to verify that the correct sample members have been contacted and that they are eligible for the survey. Respondents are also given a cognitive assessment to ensure they are capable of completing the interview. If they do not pass the assessment, they are asked whether someone else can answer questions about their health, daily activities, and any jobs they might have (such as a friend, parent, caseworker, or payee). An interview is then pursued with the proxy respondent. To minimize bias in reporting, proxies were not asked all questions that the sample person was eligible to receive. For example, proxies were not asked to provide subjective assessments regarding the sample person's satisfaction with jobs or programs.

**Section B: Disability and Current Work Status.** This section collects information on beneficiaries' physical or mental disabilities and current employment status. Unemployed beneficiaries are asked about their reasons for not working. This section also includes questions about the job characteristics that are important to beneficiaries and collects information about work-related goals and expectations.

**Section C: Current Employment.** This section collects detailed information about each beneficiary's current job(s). Respondents are asked about the type of work performed, type of employer, hours worked, benefits offered, and wages earned. They are also asked about work-related accommodations, those received as well as those needed but not received. Other questions solicit information about job satisfaction.

**Section D: Jobs/Other Jobs During 2009.** This section collects information about employment during the 2009 calendar year, including types of employers, hours worked, wages earned, and reasons for leaving employment, if applicable. Beneficiaries are also asked whether they worked or earned less than they could have (and if so, the reasons why) and about any adjustments in their Social Security benefits due to work.

**Section E: Awareness of SSA Work Incentive Programs and TTW.** In this section, the interviewer determines whether the beneficiary is aware of or participating in specific SSA work-incentive programs and services. For TTW, beneficiaries are asked how they learned about the program, the names of providers they signed up with, and the dates they signed up with their service providers.

**Section F: TTW Nonparticipants in 2009.** This section, administered only to beneficiaries not participating in TTW, addresses their reasons for nonparticipation. It asks whether the beneficiary has attempted to learn about employment opportunities (including TTW), problems the beneficiary may have had with ENs or other employment agencies, and how those problems were handled or resolved.

**Section G: Employment-Related Services and Supports Used in 2009.** This section collects information about beneficiaries' use of employment-related services in 2009, including the types of services received, the types of providers used, how long they received services, how the services were paid for, and reasons for and satisfaction with service use. Other questions ask about

sources of information about services and the nature of any services that were needed but not received.

**Section H: TTW Participants in 2009.** This section, administered only to respondents who report participating in TTW in 2009, collects information about their experiences with TTW, including how they decided to participate in TTW, the kinds of information they used to select their current service providers, development of the individual work plan, and any problems with services provided by an EN. The section also includes a series of questions about the resolution of problems with ENs and overall satisfaction with the TTW program.

**Section I: Health and Functional Status.** This section collects information about the beneficiary's health status and daily functioning, including the need for special equipment or assistive devices. Questions address general health status (via the SF-8<sup>TM</sup>),<sup>11</sup> difficulties with activities of daily living (ADLs) and instrumental activities of daily living (IADLs), a variety of functional limitations, substance abuse/dependence, and treatment for mental health conditions.

**Section J: Health Insurance.** This section collects information about sources of health insurance coverage, both at interview and during 2009.

**Section K: Income and Other Assistance.** This section collects information about sources of income such as earnings, Social Security, workers' compensation, and other government programs and sources.

**Section L: Sociodemographic Information.** This section collects basic demographic information about the beneficiary, such as race, ethnicity, education, parental education, marital status, living arrangements, and household income.

**Section M: Closing Information and Observations.** This section collects address information for the sample person. The interviewer also records reasons that a proxy or other assistance was required, if appropriate, and documents any special circumstances.

See Table II.2 for a summary description of the flow of the main questionnaire. The complete survey instrument is available from Mathematica upon request.

Because the NBS population represents a wide range of disabilities with varying degrees of severity, we incorporated several features into the instrument design to overcome possible cognitive or stamina challenges. Structured probes were included in the survey instrument, allowing questions to be rephrased and concepts defined in a standard manner if respondents required clarification or additional information. To minimize item nonresponse, the survey instrument included follow-up questions for continuous variables. For example, if a respondent could not provide an exact figure, for example, for wages or income amounts, the "don't know" response was followed with a modified version of the question that offered response categories (the upper and lower bounds of each category were based on ranges specified by analysts). In general, we attempted to word survey questions simply, clearly, briefly, and in an unbiased manner so that respondents could readily understand key terms and concepts. Given the intent of the questions, response categories were appropriate, mutually exclusive, and reasonably exhaustive.

---

<sup>11</sup> SF-8<sup>TM</sup> is a trademark of QualityMetric, Inc.

Table II.2. Overview of the National Beneficiary Survey Questionnaire

Section	Title of Section	Respondents Receiving the Section
A	Screenener	All respondents
B	Disability/Current Work Status	All respondents
C	Current Employment	Respondents who answer (B24 = YES) Question B24: Are you currently working at a job or business for pay or profit?
D	Jobs/Other Jobs During 2009	Respondents who answer (B30 = YES) Question B30: Did you work at a job or business for pay or profit anytime in 2009?
E	Awareness of SSA Work Incentive Programs and TTW	All respondents
F	TTW Nonparticipants in 2009	Respondents who have heard of the Ticket to Work program (answer E21, E24, or E25 =YES) AND Respondents who answer (E35 = NO, DON'T KNOW, OR REFUSED) Question E35: Did you ever try to get a Ticket from Social Security or anywhere else? OR Respondents who answer (E36 = NO, DON'T KNOW, OR REFUSED) Question E36: Have you ever used your Ticket to sign up with an Employment Network? OR Respondents who answer (E37/E37b = NO, DON'T KNOW, OR REFUSED) Question E37/E37b: Were you signed up with any Employment Network/State Vocational Rehabilitation Agency at any time in 2009?
G	Employment-Related Services and Supports Used in 2009	All respondents
H	TTW Participants in 2009	Respondents who have heard of the Ticket to Work program (answer E21, E24, or E25 =YES) AND Respondents who answer (E37/E37b = YES) Question E37/E37b: Were you signed up with any Employment Network/State Vocational Rehabilitation Agency at any time in 2009?
I	Health and Functional Status	All respondents
J	Health Insurance	All respondents
K	Income and Other Assistance	All respondents
L	Sociodemographic Information	All respondents
M	Closing Information/Observations	All respondents

Interviewers used neutral, nondirected probing methods (repeating the question, repeating the response categories, asking for more information, stressing generality, stressing subjectivity, and zeroing in) when necessary and employed active listening skills and patience. They provided neutral feedback and encouragement throughout the survey and were trained to help keep the respondent free of distractions, to say the respondent's name often, and to avoid using an exaggerated inflection or tone of voice. To overcome stamina challenges, interviewers were trained to recognize signs of

fatigue in respondents. If a respondent seemed tired, agitated, or distracted, for example, interviewers were encouraged to ask whether the respondent needed to take a break and to schedule another time to continue. Interviewers were also urged to set appointments for times when the respondent would be most alert.

## E. Data Collection

CATI data collection began in April 2010.<sup>12</sup> In-person locating and interviewing of CATI nonrespondents and beneficiaries who requested or required an in-person interview began in August 2010 and continued, concurrent with CATI interviewing, through December 2010. In total, 5,078 cases were completed (including 38 partially completed interviews)—2,298 from the Representative Beneficiary Sample and 2,780 from the TTW Participant Sample.<sup>13</sup>

### 1. Advance Contacts

To increase respondent trust and rapport, all sample members for whom we had a valid address were sent an advance letter and a list of frequently asked questions and answers before the start of data collection. The advance letter, printed on SSA letterhead and signed by an SSA official, identified SSA as the sponsor of the survey and Mathematica as the survey contractor. It explained the purpose of the survey; offered assurances of confidentiality; described the voluntary nature of participation; and included a toll-free number, a text typewriter (TTY) number, and an email address for respondents to use to contact Mathematica with questions or to complete the interview at their convenience. To encourage participation and to thank them for their time, an incentive payment of \$10 was offered to respondents who completed the survey.<sup>14</sup> The advance letters also indicated that the interview could be conducted in-person if the respondent was unable to respond by telephone because of a disability.

To promote the survey's legitimacy, SSA posted information about the survey on the agency website and circulated a description of the survey to SSA field offices. Field offices were also sent the names of telephone and in-person interviewers involved in the NBS so that these individuals could be identified as legitimate contacts.

### 2. Locating

Contact information for sample members was obtained from SSA's administrative records. Before mailing the advance materials, we verified or updated all addresses using a commercially available database. During the Round 4 data collection, 63 percent of the telephone numbers provided were identified as invalid and were sent to central office locating. We used a variety of techniques to locate updated information, including database searches, calling relatives and friends, obtaining updated contact information from SSA, and making in-person visits for field locating. We

---

<sup>12</sup> Note that interviewing began approximately eight months after the sample was selected.

<sup>13</sup> Partial interviews were considered to be complete if responses were provided through Section H of the interview (or through Section G if the respondent was not eligible for Section H).

<sup>14</sup> To increase response rates towards the end of the field period, advance incentive payments were mailed to some sample members.

eventually located about 70 percent of the cases with invalid contact information; 59 percent of them completed the interview.

### 3. CATI and CAPI Interviews

In total, 3,936 sample members completed their interviews by telephone. This includes 62 percent of the Representative Beneficiary Sample (n=1,537) and 86 percent of the TTW Participant Sample (n=2,399). On average, the CATI interviews took 54 minutes to administer. The interviews ranged from 19 to 180 minutes (excluding TTY, relay, and instant-messaging interviews).

To overcome communication hurdles, interviews with people with severe hearing or speech impairments were conducted via TTY, telecommunications relay service (TRS), or instant messaging. To minimize respondent burden, standard shortcuts were used for TTY and instant-messaging interviews (such as eliminating capitalization, some punctuation, and programming instructions and using common abbreviations such as “ga” [go ahead], “nu” [number], “oic” [oh, I see]), while maintaining question wording. In addition, in-person interviewers used sign language translators and a range of other accommodations when conducting in-person interviews with people with hearing impairments.

In all, 2,553 cases (or about 32 percent of the total sample) were sent to field interviewers for in-person interviewing. Of these, 188 (7 percent) completed their interviews via CATI, while 1,142 (45 percent) completed their interviews via CAPI. To save on data collection costs, field interviewers encouraged sample members to call in and complete the survey by telephone once they were located. Thirty-three percent of the Representative Beneficiary Sample completes (n=761) and 14 percent of the TTW Participant Sample completes (n=381) were obtained via CAPI.

More than half (59 percent) of the cases sent to the field could not be located or lacked a telephone number, whereas 24 percent of the cases were sent to the field because the sample member refused a CATI interview. An additional 15 percent were sent to the field because they were difficult to contact by telephone or had evaded contact efforts. The remaining two percent of cases sent to the field were sample members who requested an in-person interview to accommodate their disability.

### 4. Assisted and Proxy Interviews

To encourage self-response, we permitted “assisted” interviews. These interviews were different from proxy interviews because beneficiaries answered most questions themselves. The assistant, typically a family member, provided encouragement, interpretation, and verification of answers. We allowed assisted interviews to minimize item nonresponse, improve the accuracy of responses, and overcome certain limiting conditions such as difficulty hearing and language barriers. In all, 234 assisted interviews were conducted (five percent of all completed interviews) during Round 4.

As a last resort, we used proxy respondents to complete the survey on behalf of sample members who were unable to, even with assistance. These members included those with severe communication impairments, severe physical disabilities that precluded participation, or mental impairments that might have compromised data quality. Interviewing the sample member, rather than a proxy, was strongly favored because sample members generally provide more complete and accurate information than do proxies. However, allowing the use of proxies when necessary minimized the risk of nonresponse bias due to the exclusion of people with severe disabilities.

We used an innovative “mini-cognitive test,” designed expressly for the survey, to identify when proxy respondents were needed.<sup>15</sup> The test allowed interviewers to objectively evaluate when to seek a proxy and minimized the need to rely on their own discretion or on gatekeeper advice. The test assessed respondents’ ability to understand the survey topics and also included elements of informed consent.

In some situations, a knowledgeable informant told us that a proxy would be necessary. We used several guidelines to determine whether a proxy would indeed be appropriate in these cases. Our guidelines included using proxies only when the sample member’s physical or mental condition precluded self-response, selecting the most knowledgeable proxy, and ensuring that the proxy answered on behalf of the sampled respondent rather than offering his or her own opinions. Interviewers were trained to overcome gatekeepers’ objections and to allow sample members to speak for themselves whenever possible.

In Round 4, proxy interviews were completed for 998 sample persons (20 percent of all completed interviews). In most cases (83 percent), a proxy was necessary because the sample person failed the cognitive assessment or was otherwise deemed unable to respond due to a cognitive or mental impairment. Interviews were completed by proxy for 611 people in the Representative Beneficiary Sample (27 percent of completed interviews) and for 387 people in the TTW Participant Sample (14 percent of completed interviews).

## 5. Characteristics of CATI, CAPI, and Proxy Respondents

Our analysis of selected respondent characteristics indicates a few differences between CATI and CAPI respondents, and between all respondents and sample members who required a proxy (Table II.3). Compared to CATI respondents, CAPI respondents were more likely to be SSI-only recipients, to be younger, to have lower levels of education, and to have experienced childhood onset of disability. CAPI respondents were also less likely to be employed at interview. Compared to all respondents, those requiring a proxy interview were more likely to be male, younger, and SSI-only recipients. They were also more likely to have less than a high school education, to have an intellectual disability, and to have experienced childhood onset of disability.

## 6. Case-Disposition Summary and Response Rates

Table II.4 provides a summary of final case dispositions for all released cases in the sample. Table II.5 provides breakdowns of response rates by sample type and sampling strata.

---

<sup>15</sup> Westat created the test as part of the design of the TTW evaluation; Mathematica modified it after pretesting.

Table II.3. Characteristics of CATI, CAPI, and Proxy Respondents

	All Interviews	CATI	CAPI	Proxy
Number (unweighted)	5,078	3,936	1,142	999
Percentage of All Interviews (unweighted)	100.0	77.5	22.5	19.7
<b>Social Security Program</b>		<b>Percentages (unweighted)</b>		
DI-only	44.6	47.6	34.3	24.6
Concurrent	23.9	24.4	22.2	26.2
SSI-only	31.5	28.0	43.5	49.1
<b>Sex</b>				
Male	51.2	51.1	51.8	63.9
Female	48.8	48.9	48.2	36.1
<b>Age in Years</b>				
18-24	13.2	12.5	15.7	31.0
25-39	30.7	29.1	36.3	36.2
40-54	38.0	38.9	34.9	24.3
55 and over	18.0	19.4	13.1	8.4
<b>Race</b>				
White only	64.5	65.3	61.8	69.6
Black or African American only	28.1	27.5	30.0	23.7
Other	7.4	7.2	8.1	6.7
<b>Ethnicity</b>				
Hispanic or Latino	11.9	11.2	14.5	14.3
Not Hispanic or Latino	88.1	88.8	85.5	85.7
<b>Education</b>				
Did not complete high school or GED	24.5	22.3	32.0	35.9
High school diploma or GED	44.3	43.8	46.3	56.5
More than high school	31.2	33.9	21.7	7.6
<b>Conditions Causing Limitation</b>				
Psychiatric condition	41.7	41.3	43.3	43.1
Intellectual disability	6.2	5.6	8.3	25.6
Musculoskeletal	28.1	29.5	23.0	11.4
Sensory disorder	7.7	7.3	8.8	12.2
Other nervous system diseases	15.4	15.2	15.8	17.3
Other	52.4	52.6	51.9	51.5
No limiting conditions	10.6	11.2	8.6	6.5
<b>Age at Onset of Limiting Condition(s)</b>				
Childhood onset (<age 18)	35.3	32.7	44.2	75.5
Adult onset (age 18+)	64.7	67.3	55.8	24.5
<b>Employment Status at Interview</b>				
Employed at interview	20.1	21.5	15.4	23.5
Not employed at interview	79.9	78.5	84.6	76.5

Source: 2010 National Beneficiary Survey.

Table II.4. Summary Case Disposition by Sample Type and Sampling Strata

	Total Sample	Complete			Ineligible			Refused			Unlocated			Other Nonrespondents		
		Count	Un-weighted Percent	Weighted Percent	Count	Un-weighted Percent	Weighted Percent	Count	Un-weighted Percent	Weighted Percent	Count	Un-weighted Percent	Weighted Percent	Count	Un-weighted Percent	Weighted Percent
<b>National Representative Beneficiary Sample</b>																
Age 18-29	1,029	634	61.6	63.6	71	6.9	6.6	109	10.6	9.8	108	10.5	10.0	107	10.4	10.0
Age 30-39	1,032	625	60.6	62.3	54	5.2	5.0	115	11.1	10.6	120	11.6	11.5	118	11.4	10.7
Age 40-49	1,019	643	63.1	65.3	56	5.5	5.2	122	12.0	11.2	78	7.7	7.3	120	11.8	11.0
Age 50+	603	396	65.7	68.7	41	6.8	6.5	79	13.1	11.9	32	5.3	5.0	55	9.1	7.9
<b>Total Beneficiary Sample</b>	<b>3,683</b>	<b>2,298</b>	<b>62.4</b>	<b>66.8</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>425</b>	<b>11.5</b>	<b>11.4</b>	<b>338</b>	<b>9.2</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>9.1</b>
<b>Cross-Sectional TTW Participant Sample</b>																
SVRA EN	1,094	678	62.0	68.2	15	1.4	1.3	118	10.9	11.3	49	4.5	9.6	234	21.3	9.6
Non-SVRA EN	2,157	1,352	62.7	69.4	47	2.2	2.1	237	11.0	11.3	115	5.3	6.7	406	18.8	10.5
Traditional	1,083	750	69.3	70.14	15	1.4	1.3	140	12.9	12.6	74	6.8	6.7	104	9.6	9.2
<b>Total Participant Sample</b>	<b>4,334</b>	<b>2,780</b>	<b>64.1</b>	<b>69.9</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>495</b>	<b>11.4</b>	<b>12.4</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>6.9</b>	<b>744</b>	<b>17.2</b>	<b>9.4</b>
<b>Combined Sample</b>																
<b>Total Sample*</b>	<b>8,017</b>	<b>5,078</b>	<b>63.3</b>	<b>66.8</b>	<b>299</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>920</b>	<b>11.5</b>	<b>11.4</b>	<b>576</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>1,144</b>	<b>14.3</b>	<b>9.1</b>

Source: 2010 National Beneficiary Survey.

Notes: The number of completed cases includes 38 partially completed interviews: 20 in the TTW Participant Sample and 18 in the Representative Beneficiary Sample. The refused disposition includes non-completed cases for which the sample person or an informant refused to participate in the survey at any point during the field period. The unlocated disposition includes non-completed cases for which a valid telephone number or address could not be determined by the end of the field period. The other nonrespondents disposition includes all other non-completed cases (such as language or other participation barriers and evasive cases).

\* The weighted percentages can be calculated as a weighted average of the Representative Beneficiary and TTW Participant Samples.

**Table II.5. Weighted Response Rates by Sample Type and Sampling Strata for the Representative Beneficiary and TTW Participant Samples**

Sample/Strata	Weighted Count of Responded (Completed + Ineligibles)	Weighted Response Rate	Weighted Count of Completed Interviews
<b>Representative Beneficiary Sample</b>	<b>8,825,358</b>	<b>72.8</b>	<b>8,089,618</b>
Age 18 to 29	909,693	70.2	824,579
Age 30 to 39	884,155	67.3	818,577
Age 40 to 49	1,779,664	70.5	1,649,587
Age 50 and over	5,251,847	75.2	4,796,876
<b>TTW Participant Sample</b>	<b>60,702</b>	<b>71.4</b>	<b>59,476</b>
SVRA ENs	2,584	69.5	2,536
Non-SVRA ENs	9,102	71.5	8,832
Traditional	49,016	71.5	48,108
<b>Total Sample</b>	<b>8,886,060</b>		<b>8,149,094</b>

Source: 2010 National Beneficiary Survey.

Note: The weighted counts are based on the original design weights, which were subsequently adjusted for nonresponse and post-stratified to sample frame totals to develop the final survey weights.

### III. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS BASED ON THE NATIONALLY REPRESENTATIVE BENEFICIARY SAMPLE

This chapter includes a set of data tables based on the national cross-sectional sample of the 2010 NBS. These tables provide a ready source of information about the characteristics and employment-related experiences of working-age SSI and DI beneficiaries in 2010, comparable to the statistics from the 2004–2006 NBS rounds. Statistics based on previous rounds of the NBS and similar to those presented here have been reported in Thornton et al. (2004, 2006, and 2007), Livermore (2008), Stapleton et al. (2008), and Livermore et al. (2007, 2009a, and 2009b).

The tables that follow contain a variety of descriptive statistics pertaining to beneficiaries’:

- Characteristics and health status (Tables III.2 through III.5)
- Sources of support (Tables III.6 and III.7)
- Service use (Tables III.8 and III.9)
- Employment-related characteristics, activities, and expectations (Tables III.10 through III.23)
- Awareness of Social Security work supports (Tables III.24 and III.25)

The statistics are shown for all beneficiaries, for beneficiaries by program participation status (DI-only, concurrent, and SSI-only), and for all employed beneficiaries. The weighted and unweighted sample sizes for these subgroups are shown in Table III.1. We used the imputed values for missing data, when available, and the appropriate survey weights. Statistics are not reported whenever the unweighted number of observations for a specific subgroup is 30 or fewer.

**Table III.1. Subgroup Sample Sizes**

	All Beneficiaries	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only	All Employed Beneficiaries
Number (unweighted)	2,298	883	510	905	253
Number (weighted)	11,102,096	6,003,764	1,927,585	3,170,748	796,158
Percent of sample (weighted)	100.0	54.1	17.4	28.6	7.2

Source: 2010 National Beneficiary Survey.

Note: The weighted counts are based on the final survey weights, which were adjusted for nonresponse and post-stratified to the survey sample. Thus, the weighted counts differ from those presented in Table II.5.

Highlighted below are selected survey findings related to beneficiary employment and awareness of Social Security work supports, followed by tables containing detailed statistics.

#### A. Characteristics of Employed Beneficiaries

Compared to all beneficiaries, beneficiaries who were working at the time of the NBS interview were generally younger (mean age of 43 versus 50), less likely to be SSI-only recipients (20 percent versus 29 percent), less likely to have not completed high school (27 percent versus 34 percent), less likely to be married (19 percent versus 31 percent), more likely to have experienced

disability onset during childhood (50 percent versus 22 percent), and more likely to report their health as very good or excellent (33 percent versus 10 percent) (Tables III.2, III.3, and III.4). Employed beneficiaries received lower average monthly benefits from Social Security (\$809 versus \$942) and from non-Social Security sources (\$69 versus \$182) (Table III.6), but they were slightly less likely to be living in households with incomes below the federal poverty level (43 percent versus 48 percent) (Table III.2). In addition, employed beneficiaries were more likely to report having private health insurance coverage relative to all beneficiaries (27 percent versus 19 percent) (Table III.7).

## B. Employment Expectations

Overall, 31 percent of beneficiaries indicated that their goals include work or career advancement. Concurrent beneficiaries were most likely to report having work goals (40 percent), while DI-only beneficiaries were least likely to do so (26 percent). In comparison, only 27 percent of all beneficiaries saw themselves working for pay in the next five years, and even fewer saw themselves working and earning enough to leave Social Security benefits in the next five years (16 percent). SSI-only and concurrent beneficiaries were more likely to see themselves leaving benefits in the next five years (20 percent and 19 percent, respectively) relative to DI-only beneficiaries (13 percent) (Table III.10). Overall, 41 percent of beneficiaries indicated having work goals or saw themselves working for pay within the next five years.

## C. Employment-Related Activities and Work Capacity

About 12 percent of all beneficiaries had used services specifically intended to enhance their employment opportunities during the previous calendar year or were using them at the time they were interviewed. Overall, 7 percent of beneficiaries were working during the month they were interviewed, and another 5 percent were actively seeking employment. About 10 percent had worked during the previous calendar year. Taken together, about 15 percent of all beneficiaries were employed, were actively seeking employment, or had worked during the previous calendar year; concurrent beneficiaries were more likely to report recent employment or job-seeking activities (21 percent) than were SSI-only and DI-only beneficiaries (13 percent) (Table III.15).

Among those who were working at interview or who had worked during the previous calendar year, 23 percent indicated that they worked fewer hours or earned less than they were capable of earning. Among these beneficiaries, the primary reasons given for working or earning less than they were capable of include wanting to keep their cash benefits (41 percent) and wanting to retain their Medicare or Medicaid coverage (40 percent) (Table III.16).

## D. Job Characteristics of Beneficiaries Employed at Interview

Below, we highlight our findings on the job characteristics of working beneficiaries; see Table III.17 for more details.

### 1. Hours, Wages, and Monthly Earnings

**Hours.** Most employed beneficiaries (86 percent) worked part time (fewer than 35 hours per week) and averaged 20 hours per week. SSI-only recipients were much more likely to be working full time (30 percent) relative to DI-only and concurrent beneficiaries (11 percent and 9 percent, respectively).

**Hourly wages.** On average, working beneficiaries were earning a little over \$8 per hour. DI-only beneficiaries reported the highest hourly wages (\$8.80), while concurrent beneficiaries reported the lowest (\$6.50). Many beneficiaries (32 percent) had hourly wages that were less than the federal minimum wage of \$7.25 per hour. Similar to the pattern of average wages, DI-only beneficiaries were much less likely to be working at subminimum wages (28 percent) compared to concurrent beneficiaries (41 percent), and somewhat less likely compared to SSI-only recipients (33 percent).

**Monthly earnings.** Among all working beneficiaries, monthly earnings averaged \$683. SSI-only recipients reported substantially higher average monthly earnings (\$930) relative to DI-only (\$658) and concurrent beneficiaries (\$524). Similarly, SSI-only recipients (37 percent) were much more likely to report earnings above the nonblind substantial gainful activity level (\$1,000 per month) compared with DI-only (19 percent) and concurrent beneficiaries (9 percent).

## 2. Job Tenure

Most employed beneficiaries (55 percent) had been working at their jobs for more than two years. The median number of months on the job was highest for concurrent beneficiaries (53) and lowest for SSI-only recipients (25).

## 3. Supported Employment

A large percentage of working beneficiaries (40 percent) reported that they were working in sheltered or supported employment settings. Concurrent beneficiaries were much more likely to report doing so (49 percent) than were DI-only beneficiaries (38 percent) and SSI-only recipients (37 percent).

## E. Awareness of Social Security Work Supports

Beneficiaries were asked if they had ever heard of the SSA work supports that were relevant to them, based on their DI and SSI program participation status at sampling. Those queried were most likely to be aware of the DI trial work period (35 percent), followed by the TITW program (27 percent), the DI extended period of eligibility (17 percent), and benefit specialists (16 percent).<sup>16</sup> All other work supports queried (Section 1619b, expedited reinstatement, SSI earned income exclusion, plans for achieving self-support, impairment-related work expenses, student earned income exclusion, and property essential for self-support) had awareness rates of less than 15 percent among those to whom the supports were applicable. Overall, DI-only beneficiaries had the highest rates of awareness, and SSI-only recipients had the lowest. Not surprisingly, employed beneficiaries were more likely to report having heard of nearly all applicable work supports relative to all beneficiaries. The exceptions include plans for achieving self-support, the student earned income exclusion, and property essential for self-support (Table III.24).

---

<sup>16</sup> The question in the 2010 NBS refers to the Work Incentives Planning and Assistance (WIPA) program. In previous rounds of the NBS, the question referred to benefit specialists and the Benefits Planning, Assistance, and Outreach (BPAO) program.

Awareness of TTW declines steadily with time since the most recent Ticket mailing.<sup>17</sup> About 50 percent of those who received a Ticket less than one year before the NBS interview were aware of TTW, compared to only 24 percent of those who received a Ticket more than five years before interview (Table III.25).

---

<sup>17</sup> In 2011, SSA ended the practice of automatically mailing Tickets to new SSI and DI beneficiaries. SSA now uses an algorithm to profile those most likely to assign their Tickets and leave benefits for purposes of the Ticket mailings.

Table III.2. Sociodemographic Characteristics

	All Beneficiaries	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only	All Employed Beneficiaries
<b>Sex (%)</b>					
Male	50.2	55.0	44.6	44.7	57.0
Female	49.8	45.0	55.4	55.3	43.0
Missing					
<b>Age in Years (%)</b>					
18-24	4.6	0.6	4.6	12.4	8.1
25-29	4.8	1.3	7.5	9.7	10.5
30-34	4.8	2.6	7.2	7.5	9.3
35-39	5.8	4.6	8.4	6.4	11.0
40-44	7.9	6.7	11.4	7.9	13.0
45-49	10.9	11.5	10.8	10.0	15.0
50-54	15.1	15.9	16.0	13.2	12.9
55-59	18.0	19.4	19.5	14.4	6.5
60 and over	28.0	37.3	14.7	18.6	13.6
Mean age (years)	50.1	54.1	46.7	44.6	43.2
<b>Race (%)</b>					
White only	69.9	76.9	64.9	59.5	71.4
Black or African American only	22.6	16.2	28.5	31.2	23.6
Other	7.5	6.9	6.6	9.3	5.0
<b>Ethnicity (%)</b>					
Hispanic or Latino	12.3	9.3	13.3	17.6	9.2
Not Hispanic or Latino	87.7	90.7	86.7	82.4	90.8
<b>Highest Grade in School (%)</b>					
Did not complete high school or GED	34.3	25.2	39.8	48.2	26.5
High school	38.8	39.3	38.6	37.9	47.2
Diploma	28.6	30.2	26.3	27.0	34.0
GED	6.3	6.2	6.9	6.0	3.0
Certificate	3.9	2.9	5.4	4.9	10.2
Some college/postsecondary vocational	15.0	18.8	12.2	9.4	10.6
Associate's or vocational diploma	5.4	8.0	2.8	2.1	4.9
Bachelor's degree	4.3	5.9	4.3	1.5	7.1
Graduate or professional work/degree	2.2	2.9	2.3	0.9	3.6
<b>Marital Status (%)</b>					
Married	30.7	46.4	14.1	11.1	18.8
Divorced	22.0	22.8	20.9	21.3	13.0
Separated	6.5	5.0	8.9	8.0	1.4
Widowed	4.9	4.5	5.3	5.6	2.1
Never married	35.8	21.4	50.8	54.1	64.6
<b>Household Income as a Percentage of Federal Poverty Level (%)</b>					
Less than 100	48.2	27.1	71.8	73.7	42.8
100-299	41.5	56.7	24.8	23.0	45.1
300 and over	10.3	16.3	3.4	3.3	12.1

Source: 2010 National Beneficiary Survey.

Table III.3. Living Arrangements

	All Beneficiaries	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only	All Employed Beneficiaries
<b>Living Arrangements (%)</b>					
Lives alone	24.4	21.2	32.8	25.5	21.5
Lives with spouse, partner, or relatives	64.2	70.2	51.4	60.9	61.0
Lives with friends or roommates	4.1	3.0	4.3	6.1	4.8
Lives in group setting with nonrelatives	6.7	5.4	10.7	6.7	11.6
Other	0.6	0.3	0.9	0.8	1.2
<b>Children (%)*</b>					
Has no children	81.3	83.6	80.3	77.4	83.7
Has children	17.5	15.3	17.7	21.7	14.5
Unknown	1.2	1.1	2.0	0.9	1.8
<b>Child Living Arrangements (%)</b>					
Lives with all or some of own children*	11.2	10.5	10.4	13.1	10.8
Does not live with any of own children*	6.2	4.8	7.3	8.3	3.3
Not applicable (no children)	81.3	83.6	80.3	77.4	83.7
Unknown	1.3	1.1	2.0	1.1	2.2
<b>Children Under Age 6 (%)</b>					
Has children under age 6	4.5	2.8	6.5	6.5	6.6
Has no children under age 6	13.0	12.5	11.2	15.1	7.9
Not applicable (no children)	81.3	83.6	80.3	77.4	83.7
Unknown	1.2	1.1	2.0	1.0	1.8

Source: 2010 National Beneficiary Survey.

Table III.4. Health Status

	All Beneficiaries	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only	All Employed Beneficiaries
<b>Self-Reported Reason(s) for Limitation (%)<sup>a</sup></b>					
Musculoskeletal disorders	39.0	45.3	33.8	30.2	26.3
Psychiatric disorders	33.7	28.9	40.5	38.7	37.2
Diseases of the circulatory system	22.4	26.0	17.4	18.5	8.0
Endocrine/nutrition disorders	18.3	21.1	18.0	13.2	6.1
Diseases of the nervous system	16.2	18.0	14.2	13.9	9.0
Injury or poisoning	13.9	16.5	10.9	10.8	7.2
Diseases of the respiratory system	9.5	9.0	7.7	11.4	1.8
Sensory disorders	8.6	7.8	7.9	10.5	8.2
Mental retardation	4.9	2.4	8.5	7.5	10.8
Other	33.6	35.0	29.1	33.8	39.4
No limitations	6.1	4.0	6.1	10.2	14.2
<b>Number of Conditions Causing Limitation (%)</b>					
0	6.1	4.0	6.1	10.2	14.2
1	30.0	28.1	35.0	30.7	38.8
2	33.2	34.7	31.4	31.4	28.9
3	17.4	18.6	17.3	15.3	11.5
4 or more	13.2	14.6	10.2	12.4	6.5
<b>Substance Abuse (%)</b>					
Indication of substance abuse	6.3	5.7	6.8	7.0	8.7
<b>Age at Disability Onset (%)</b>					
Under 18	22.2	10.7	32.6	37.9	49.2
18-24	9.5	6.6	15.2	11.4	11.1
25-39	25.9	26.7	27.1	23.6	17.5
40-54	30.5	38.2	19.5	22.8	18.2
55 and over	11.9	17.9	5.6	4.3	3.9
<b>General Health (%)</b>					
Excellent	3.0	1.9	4.0	4.5	11.8
Very good	7.0	6.9	6.6	7.4	21.0
Good	18.5	16.5	20.5	21.1	28.0
Fair	29.2	30.0	29.3	27.8	22.8
Poor	28.2	28.8	28.7	26.6	12.3
Very poor	14.2	16.0	10.9	12.7	4.1
<b>Current Health Compared to Last Year (%)</b>					
Much better	4.1	2.7	7.0	5.2	8.5
Somewhat better	9.5	8.6	10.4	10.8	11.3
About the same	43.6	43.9	47.3	40.8	53.3
Somewhat worse	26.2	28.1	21.8	25.0	20.6
Much worse	16.6	16.7	13.6	18.1	6.2
<b>Body Mass Index (%)</b>					
Less than 18.5 (underweight)	2.7	2.0	2.5	4.3	1.4
18.5-24.9 (normal weight)	22.8	20.8	19.9	28.5	27.1
25.0-29.9 (overweight)	30.3	30.4	32.5	28.7	28.6
30 or more (obese)	44.2	46.9	45.1	38.5	42.9

Source: 2010 National Beneficiary Survey.

<sup>a</sup>Multiple responses possible.

Table III.5. Difficulties with Specific Activities

	All Beneficiaries	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only	All Employed Beneficiaries
<b>Difficulty with Activities of Daily Living (ADL) (%)<sup>a</sup></b>					
Getting into or out of bed	38.3	43.8	29.3	33.5	16.0
Bathing or dressing	29.3	31.1	25.6	28.2	14.2
Getting around inside the house	24.2	26.9	16.9	23.8	8.2
Eating	17.4	16.9	16.7	18.8	3.4
None of the above	45.6	40.8	52.8	50.3	73.0
<b>Difficulty with Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (IADL) (%)<sup>a</sup></b>					
Getting around outside of the home	47.4	49.1	43.9	46.2	23.2
Shopping for personal items	36.1	36.0	31.7	39.0	29.7
Preparing meals	34.4	33.1	31.3	38.6	37.7
None of the above	40.3	39.3	42.8	40.6	52.0
<b>Difficulty with Functional Activities (%)<sup>a</sup></b>					
Walking three blocks, climbing 10 steps, standing for one hour, and/or crouching	83.6	88.7	76.9	78.1	60.9
Grasping, reaching, and/or lifting 10 pounds	67.9	72.6	63.5	61.5	45.9
Speaking, hearing, and/or seeing	60.5	64.1	52.2	58.8	40.9
Coping with stress	59.2	58.1	58.6	61.6	48.2
Concentrating	55.9	53.7	55.1	60.4	46.9
Getting along with others	29.6	26.2	27.7	37.2	23.0
<b>Number of ADL/IADL Difficulties (%)</b>					
0	28.2	25.7	32.6	30.3	47.8
1	18.5	18.9	19.4	17.1	14.4
2	13.8	14.5	14.5	12.0	13.5
3	11.5	11.0	11.7	12.5	14.1
4	9.0	10.1	6.4	8.3	5.3
5	8.2	8.1	8.6	8.0	3.0
6	6.2	6.7	3.8	6.6	1.6
7	4.7	5.0	2.9	5.3	0.4

Source: 2010 National Beneficiary Survey.

<sup>a</sup>Multiple responses possible.

Table III.6. Program Participation

	All Beneficiaries	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only	All Employed Beneficiaries
<b>SSA Program at Sampling (%)</b>					
DI only	54.1	100.0			58.2
Concurrent	17.4		100.0		21.9
SSI only	28.6			100.0	19.9
<b>Monthly SSA Benefit in Month Before Interview (%)</b>					
Less than \$500	10.1	5.4	7.6	20.4	22.7
\$500-\$1,000	55.5	35.5	83.0	76.8	44.5
More than \$1,000	34.4	59.1	9.4	2.8	32.8
<b>Mean Monthly SSA Benefit (\$)</b>	<b>941.6</b>	<b>1182.6</b>	<b>746.6</b>	<b>604.1</b>	<b>809.1</b>
<b>Monthly Non-SSA Benefit (%)</b>					
None	59.2	67.9	52.7	46.8	78.6
\$1-\$199	17.7	12.5	20.6	25.8	10.5
\$200-\$499	11.9	6.1	19.7	18.1	7.3
\$500 and over	11.2	13.5	7.0	9.3	3.7
<b>Mean Monthly Non-SSA Benefits (\$)</b>	<b>181.7</b>	<b>215.0</b>	<b>134.2</b>	<b>147.7</b>	<b>68.6</b>
<b>Months Since Initial SSA Award (%)</b>					
Fewer than 24	1.6	1.9	0.4	2.0	0.4
24-59	14.7	16.7	10.9	13.2	9.7
60-119	23.1	31.1	12.1	14.6	22.1
120 or more	60.5	50.3	76.6	70.2	67.8
<b>Mean Months Since Initial SSA Award</b>	<b>176.2</b>	<b>153.1</b>	<b>219.8</b>	<b>193.4</b>	<b>209.5</b>
<b>Income and Assistance in Month Before Interview (%)<sup>a</sup></b>					
SSA benefits	94.3	97.1	94.3	89.0	83.3
Food stamps (SNAP)	33.4	18.1	48.6	53.4	17.8
Earnings	6.1	6.5	7.6	4.5	80.1
Pensions	7.4	13.2	0.6	0.5	4.8
Veteran's benefits	3.1	5.1	0.6	0.7	0.0
Private disability insurance	2.7	4.6	0.7	0.4	1.3
Public cash assistance/welfare	3.8	0.9	5.4	8.2	1.8
Workers' Compensation	1.0	1.5	0.9	0.1	0.0
Unemployment Insurance	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.7	0.7
Other source	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.2

Source: 2010 National Beneficiary Survey.

<sup>a</sup>Multiple responses possible.

Table III.7. Sources of Health Insurance

	All Beneficiaries	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only	All Employed Beneficiaries
<b>Health Insurance at Interview (%)</b>					
Insured	97.0	98.2	97.5	94.4	96.1
Not insured	2.3	1.3	1.1	4.9	3.1
Unknown	0.8	0.6	1.4	0.7	0.8
<b>Sources of Health Insurance at Interview (%)<sup>a</sup></b>					
Medicaid or Medicare	92.7	92.8	96.0	90.6	90.4
Private insurance	19.0	30.1	5.8	6.0	27.2
Other insurance	6.7	10.8	1.8	2.0	0.8
No insurance	2.3	1.3	1.1	4.9	3.1
Unknown	0.8	0.6	1.4	0.7	0.8
<b>Private Insurance</b>					
Weighted number with private insurance	2,107,253	1,806,583	110,849	189,821	216,905
Weighted percentage with private insurance	19.0	30.1	5.8	6.0	27.2
<b>Source of Private Insurance (% among those with private insurance)</b>					
Through own employment	26.1	27.3	20.8	18.0	27.5
Through spouse	44.7	41.7	48.7	70.2	44.3
Self or family purchased	26.0	27.6	23.2	11.8	20.7
Other	2.4	2.4	7.3	0.0	7.5
Unknown	0.8	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source: 2010 National Beneficiary Survey.

<sup>a</sup>Multiple responses possible.

Table III.8. Service Use

	All Beneficiaries	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only	All Employed Beneficiaries
<b>Ever Used Services</b>					
Unweighted number	1,282	524	300	458	166
Weighted number	6,139,854	3,384,068	1,112,243	1,643,543	570,950
Weighted percentage	55.3	56.4	57.7	51.8	71.7
<b>Service Types Ever Used (% among those ever using services)<sup>a</sup></b>					
Mental health therapy/counseling	56.0	52.3	65.6	57.2	54.5
Medical services to improve functioning	58.6	64.4	47.9	53.9	46.7
Education/schooling	15.0	9.9	22.0	20.8	24.9
Training for new skills/job/career	15.1	13.4	19.9	15.4	34.1
Unknown	2.9	2.1	2.6	4.9	1.4
<b>Used Services in 2009</b>					
Unweighted number	799	339	183	277	104
Weighted number	3,810,525	2,155,229	674,863	980,433	325,387
Weighted percentage	34.3	35.9	35.0	30.9	40.9
<b>Reason(s) for Using Services in 2009 (% among users)<sup>a</sup></b>					
To improve health/well-being	79.8	78.1	80.3	83.2	67.0
To improve ability to do daily activities	27.9	27.5	27.6	29.0	24.7
To find a job or to get a better job	7.2	6.0	5.3	11.2	22.1
To access specific services	6.2	6.0	9.6	4.2	9.0
Someone pressured respondent to use services	1.8	0.3	4.0	3.5	0.0
To increase income	2.3	2.4	0.7	3.0	2.7
To avoid a continuing disability review	0.4	0.1	0.2	1.4	0.6
Other	7.2	8.6	5.3	5.6	7.3
Unknown	1.4	1.2	1.4	2.0	1.6
<b>Types of Services Used in 2009 (% among users)<sup>a</sup></b>					
Medical services	74.2	77.2	67.4	72.2	63.8
Personal counseling/group therapy	60.8	59.5	68.3	58.6	65.0
Occupational/physical/speech therapy	31.5	32.2	33.3	28.9	29.7
Special equipment or devices	23.1	25.4	22.8	18.1	11.6
Training/job modification advice/on-the-job training	18.4	14.9	22.9	23.1	58.1
Work assessment/help to find a job	20.3	17.8	29.8	19.1	54.3
Other	6.6	7.2	8.5	4.0	4.4

Source: 2010 National Beneficiary Survey.

<sup>a</sup>Multiple responses possible.

Table III.9. Services Needed but Not Received in 2009

	All Beneficiaries	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only	All Employed Beneficiaries
<b>Services Needed in 2009 but Not Received (% among all beneficiaries)</b>					
Yes	11.7	10.8	14.0	12.2	12.3
No	86.0	87.5	83.3	84.7	86.4
Unknown	2.3	1.7	2.7	3.1	1.3
<b>Reason Why Services Were Not Received (% among those with unmet service needs)</b>					
Could not afford services	17.0	19.0	16.7	13.7	25.1
Problems with services/agency	10.1	13.5	4.6	8.1	9.4
Wasn't eligible/request refused	11.3	11.7	10.5	11.4	4.6
Too difficult/confusing	2.4	4.3	0.5	0.4	0.0
Lack of information	12.5	9.8	14.2	15.7	15.0
Did not try to get services	2.2	3.6	0.9	0.8	1.9
Other	40.7	34.1	50.2	45.2	41.8
Unknown	3.8	3.9	2.5	4.6	2.1

Source: 2010 National Beneficiary Survey.

Table III.10. Employment Expectations

	All Beneficiaries	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only	All Employed Beneficiaries
<b>Goals Include Work/Career Advancement (%)</b>					
Yes	31.0	26.1	40.0	34.7	50.1
No	66.2	71.2	57.4	61.9	44.7
Unknown	2.9	2.6	2.7	3.4	5.3
<b>Sees Self Working for Pay:</b>					
<b>In the next year (%)</b>					
Agree/strongly agree	17.3	16.1	22.2	16.7	87.3
Disagree/strongly disagree	80.7	82.8	75.4	79.9	10.9
Unknown	2.0	1.1	2.4	3.4	1.8
<b>In the next five years (%)</b>					
Agree/strongly agree	26.5	22.7	32.3	30.1	73.7
Disagree/strongly disagree	71.0	75.6	64.6	66.0	23.7
Unknown	2.5	1.6	3.1	3.8	2.6
<b>Sees Self Working and Earning Enough to Stop Receiving Disability Benefits:</b>					
<b>In the next year (%)</b>					
Agree/strongly agree	5.8	5.3	6.0	6.7	13.1
Disagree/strongly disagree	10.6	10.3	15.8	8.1	71.1
Not applicable—does not see self working in next year	82.7	83.9	77.8	83.3	12.7
Unknown	0.9	0.5	0.4	1.9	3.1
<b>In the next five years (%)</b>					
Agree/strongly agree	15.8	12.7	19.0	19.8	22.5
Disagree/strongly disagree	9.4	9.1	12.1	8.6	47.6
Not applicable—does not see self working in next year	73.5	77.3	67.7	69.9	26.3
Unknown	1.2	1.0	1.2	1.7	3.5

Source: 2010 National Beneficiary Survey.

Table III.11. Employment

	All Beneficiaries	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only	All Employed Beneficiaries
<b>Ever Work for Pay (%)</b>					
Yes	82.0	92.1	78.4	65.0	100.0
No	17.3	7.8	20.6	33.2	0.0
Unknown	0.7	0.1	1.0	1.8	0.0
<b>Employment in 2009 (%)</b>					
Worked in 2009	9.9	9.4	14.3	8.3	91.5
Did not work in 2009	89.8	90.5	84.8	91.5	8.5
Unknown	0.3	0.1	1.0	0.2	0.0
<b>Employment Status at Interview (%)</b>					
Employed at interview	7.2	7.7	9.1	5.0	100.0
Not employed at interview	92.8	92.3	90.9	95.0	0.0
Did not seek work in past 4 weeks	87.8	88.4	84.0	89.0	0.0
Sought work in past 4 weeks	5.0	3.9	7.0	5.9	0.0
Unknown if sought work in past 4 weeks	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0

Source: 2010 National Beneficiary Survey.

Table III.12. Employment Rates (Percentages) for Specific Beneficiary Subgroups

	All Beneficiaries	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only
<b>All</b>	7.2	7.7	9.1	5.0
<b>Age</b>				
18-24	12.5	<sup>a</sup>	21.5	9.7
25-39	14.4	17.4	16.4	11.1
40-54	8.6	10.7	9.6	3.8
55 and over	3.1	4.4	1.8	0.0
<b>General Health Status</b>				
Excellent/very good	23.6	24.5	31.3	18.2
Good/fair	7.6	8.2	10.2	5.1
Poor/very poor	2.8	3.9	1.7	0.9
<b>Education Level</b>				
Less than high school	5.5	8.2	5.8	2.8
High school	8.7	7.5	14.5	7.6
More than high school	7.0	7.7	5.4	5.2
<b>Selected Self-Reported Conditions Causing Limitation</b>				
Mental retardation	15.7	22.8	17.9	10.0
Sensory disorder	6.8	8.9	5.6	4.3
Mental illness	7.9	11.7	5.1	4.4
Musculoskeletal disorder	4.8	5.9	4.7	2.0
Circulatory system disorder	2.6	2.9	0.5	2.7
<b>Age at Disability Onset</b>				
18-24	8.4	12.5	8.0	4.4
25-39	4.9	6.9	3.2	1.6
40-54	4.3	5.1	7.7	0.0
55 and over	2.3	2.9	<sup>a</sup>	<sup>a</sup>
<b>Difficulty with Selected Activities</b>				
Getting along with others	5.6	6.9	4.4	4.4
Concentrating	6.0	7.3	5.6	4.1
Coping with stress	5.8	7.1	4.8	4.2
Bathing or dressing	3.5	4.3	2.6	2.2
Getting around outside the home	3.5	4.3	2.4	2.6

Source: 2010 National Beneficiary Survey.

<sup>a</sup>Statistics not reported for subgroups with 30 or fewer observations.

Table III.13. Reasons for Not Working

	All Beneficiaries	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only
<b>Not Working at Interview</b>				
Weighted number	10,305,939	5,540,212	1,753,032	3,012,695
Weighted percentage	92.8	92.3	90.9	95.0
<b>Reasons for Not Working (% among those not working at interview)<sup>a</sup></b>				
Physical or mental condition prevents work	90.8	93.1	88.5	87.9
Discouraged by previous work attempts	26.0	26.1	27.4	25.1
Others do not think he/she can work	24.0	23.3	28.8	22.8
Workplaces not accessible to people with his/her disability	23.6	21.5	28.0	25.0
Cannot find a job he/she is qualified for	19.7	15.7	26.6	22.9
Lacks reliable transportation to/from work	15.3	10.9	19.2	21.2
Does not want to lose cash or health insurance benefits	13.8	11.7	17.3	15.7
Employers will not give him/her a chance	14.4	12.9	16.1	16.2
Cannot find a job he/she wants	8.7	7.5	8.1	11.3
Is caring for someone else	7.9	6.3	7.9	10.9
Waiting to finish school/ training program	3.0	1.4	4.6	5.2
Other	3.0	3.9	2.3	1.7

Source: 2010 National Beneficiary Survey.

<sup>a</sup>Multiple responses possible.

Table III.14. Hourly Reservation Wages Among Nonworking Beneficiaries Seeking Employment or Reporting Reasons Other Than Their Health for Not Working

	All Beneficiaries	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only
<b>Percentage Asked About Reservation Wage</b>	50.0	49.9	53.5	48.1
<b>Hourly Reservation Wage (% among those asked)</b>				
Less than \$6.00	2.7	2.9	2.1	2.9
\$6.00-\$7.24	5.2	3.5	6.3	7.9
\$7.25-\$9.99	26.0	21.2	34.0	29.9
\$10.00-\$14.99	21.9	22.9	19.4	21.6
\$15.00 or more	16.4	23.8	7.8	7.5
Unknown	27.8	25.7	30.3	30.2
<b>Median Reservation Wage (\$)</b>	10.0	10.0	8.8	9.0
<b>Average Reservation Wage (\$)</b>	13.2	15.5	10.2	10.2

Source: 2010 National Beneficiary Survey.

Note: The hourly reservation wage is the lowest hourly wage for which the respondent would be willing to work. The reservation-wage questions were only asked of nonproxy respondents who were not working at interview and who were either seeking work or indicated a reason other than their health for not working.

Table III.15. Summary of Employment-Related Activities and Expectations

	All Beneficiaries	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only	All Employed Beneficiaries
<b>Work-Related Activities (%)</b>					
Working at interview	7.2	7.7	9.1	5.0	100.0
Worked during previous year	9.9	9.4	14.3	8.3	91.5
Looked for work in past four weeks	5.0	3.9	7.0	5.9	0.0
<i>Any of the above work-related activities</i>	<i>14.6</i>	<i>13.3</i>	<i>20.9</i>	<i>13.2</i>	<i>100.0</i>
<b>Employment Service and Training-Related Activities (%)</b>					
Not working because waiting to finish school/training program	2.8	1.3	4.1	5.0	0.0
Used employment-specific services in previous year	9.1	8.8	11.9	8.0	27.6
Used employment or other services in previous year to get a job or to increase income	2.9	2.6	1.9	4.0	9.0
<i>Any of the above employment/training-related activities</i>	<i>11.6</i>	<i>10.2</i>	<i>14.8</i>	<i>12.5</i>	<i>28.1</i>
<b>Work-Related Goals and Expectations (%)</b>					
Goals include getting a job/new skills/career advancement	31.0	26.1	40.0	34.7	50.1
Sees self working for pay in the next year	17.3	16.1	22.2	16.7	87.3
Sees self working for pay in the next five years	26.5	22.7	32.3	30.1	73.7
Sees self working and earning enough to stop receiving disability benefits in the next five years	15.8	12.7	19.0	19.8	22.5
<i>Any of the above goals/expectations</i>	<i>41.0</i>	<i>37.2</i>	<i>46.8</i>	<i>44.7</i>	<i>93.0</i>
<b>Any of the Above (%)</b>	<b>44.9</b>	<b>40.5</b>	<b>52.4</b>	<b>48.5</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Source: 2010 National Beneficiary Survey.

Table III.16. Work Activity Relative to Work Capacity and Supports That Would Improve Work Capacity Among Recently Employed Beneficiaries

	All Beneficiaries	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only
<b>Employed at Interview or During Previous Year</b>				
Number	1,170,110	603,658	284,527	281,924
Percentage of All	10.5	10.1	14.8	8.9
<b>Worked Fewer Hours or Earned Less Than Was Able (%)</b>				
Yes	23.2	25.7	17.2	24.1
No	64.2	67.5	57.6	63.6
Unknown	12.6	6.8	25.2	12.3
<b>Reasons for Working/Earning Less Than Able Among Those Who Did So (%)</b>				
Wanted to keep cash benefits	41.4	51.3	a	a
Wanted to keep Medicare/Medicaid	39.6	47.0	a	a
Health reasons	30.4	38.0	a	a
Taking care of children/others	18.1	8.4	a	a
Didn't want to work more	12.8	16.9	a	a
Enrolled in school/training	15.0	10.0	a	a
Other	14.3	5.8	a	a
No reasons indicated	8.6	8.6	a	a
<b>Supports That Would Help Working Beneficiaries Work/Earn More (%)</b>				
Better job skills	32.6	24.2	34.7	48.5
Help finding a better job	31.8	25.6	26.1	50.9
Flexible work schedule	23.1	16.6	32.2	27.6
Reliable transportation to/from work	16.9	15.5	11.3	25.5
Help with personal care	10.3	13.0	4.3	10.7
Help caring for children/others	9.6	6.8	10.6	14.6
Special equipment/devices	5.9	6.3	0.9	10.1
Other	6.7	6.9	7.2	5.8
No supports indicated	47.4	53.5	49.3	32.3

Source: 2010 National Beneficiary Survey.

<sup>a</sup>Statistics not reported for subgroups with 30 or fewer observations.

Table III.17. Job Characteristics of Employed Beneficiaries

	All Beneficiaries	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only
Unweighted number working at interview	253	106	69	78
Weighted number working at interview	796,158	463,552	174,553	158,052
Weighted percentage working at interview	7.2	7.7	9.1	5.0
<b>Usual Hours per Week (%)</b>				
1-10	23.9	27.3	19.5	18.9
11-20	41.0	45.2	49.8	19.2
21-34	20.8	16.6	21.6	32.1
35 or more	14.3	10.9	9.1	29.8
<b>Average Hours per Week</b>	20.0	18.1	19.9	25.6
<b>Hourly Wage (%)</b>				
Less than \$5.00	20.8	13.2	35.0	27.3
\$5.00-\$5.99	4.6	7.3	1.4	0.0
\$6.00-\$7.24	6.3	7.1	4.6	5.9
\$7.25-\$9.99	42.9	44.8	41.8	38.8
\$10.00-\$14.99	18.0	17.4	15.0	23.0
\$15.00 or more	7.4	10.3	2.1	5.0
<b>Average Hourly Wage (\$)</b>	8.1	8.8	6.5	7.7
<b>Average Monthly Pay (\$)</b>	682.6	658.0	523.9	930.4
<b>Earning Above Substantial Gainful Activity (\$1,000 or more per month) (%)</b>	20.4	19.4	8.6	36.5
<b>Occupation (%)</b>				
Transportation and material moving	13.5	15.4	13.5	8.3
Production	6.7	3.1	14.6	8.5
Office and administrative support	11.0	11.1	7.3	15.1
Building and grounds cleaning/maintenance	13.4	14.3	14.5	9.4
Personal care and service	2.2	2.7	0.9	2.0
Sales	4.7	4.8	2.1	7.4
Food preparation/serving	8.8	6.8	14.9	8.0
Other occupation	38.9	41.8	32.2	37.9
Unknown	0.7	0.0	0.0	3.6
<b>Industry (%)</b>				
Health care and social assistance	54.9	52.3	65.2	50.8
Retail	9.3	10.8	8.0	6.3
Other services (except public administration)	3.1	4.6	1.0	1.1
Educational services	4.4	5.5	1.7	4.1
Accommodation and food services	8.7	8.1	12.7	6.1
Administration and support and waste management/remediation	2.5	2.0	4.0	2.2
Other industry	17.1	16.7	7.3	29.3
Unknown	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Self-Employed (%)</b>				
Yes	7.9	11.4	3.5	2.9
No	91.9	88.6	96.5	96.3
Unknown	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.9
<b>Sheltered Employment (%)</b>				
Yes	40.0	37.9	48.8	36.7
No	55.7	59.4	47.3	54.4
Unknown	4.2	2.7	3.9	8.9

Table III.17 (continued)

	All Beneficiaries	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only
<b>Months at Current Main Job (%)</b>				
Less than 1 month	1.4	0.5	2.2	3.4
1-6 months	16.2	16.4	11.7	20.4
7-12 months	7.5	6.7	5.3	12.5
13-24 months	11.0	9.7	14.4	11.1
25 months or more	55.3	55.7	60.8	47.9
Unknown	8.6	11.0	5.7	4.6
<b>Median Months at Current Main Job</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>25</b>

Source: 2010 National Beneficiary Survey.

Note: The job characteristics reported in the table refer to the characteristics of jobs held by sample members who were employed at interview. Among those who held multiple jobs (1.5 percent of those employed at interview), the characteristics reported refer to those of the main job, as designated by the respondent.

Table III.18. Job-Related Benefits

	All Beneficiaries	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only
Unweighted number working at interview	253	106	69	78
Weighted number working at interview	796,158	463,552	174,553	158,052
Weighted percentage working at interview	7.2	7.7	9.1	5.0
<b>Health Insurance (%)</b>				
Yes	15.7	13.2	8.7	29.9
No	81.8	86.1	85.8	66.1
Unknown	2.5	0.7	5.5	4.0
<b>Dental Insurance (%)</b>				
Yes	11.1	10.0	4.0	21.6
No	86.2	88.7	93.3	71.6
Unknown	2.7	1.2	2.7	6.8
<b>Flexible Health/Dependent Care Spending Account (%)</b>				
Yes	2.7	2.8	0.0	5.3
No	92.0	93.8	93.4	85.6
Unknown	5.3	3.4	6.6	9.1
<b>Sick Days with Pay (%)</b>				
Yes	23.6	22.3	27.3	23.1
No	73.6	75.3	69.2	74.0
Unknown	2.8	2.4	3.5	2.9
<b>Paid Vacation (%)</b>				
Yes	29.3	26.8	32.5	32.5
No	69.5	72.7	66.0	64.9
Unknown	1.2	0.5	1.5	2.6
<b>Long-Term Disability Benefits (%)</b>				
Yes	6.2	3.3	2.4	18.4
No	88.7	92.2	91.8	76.0
Unknown	5.0	4.5	5.8	5.6
<b>Pension or Retirement Benefits (%)</b>				
Yes	10.4	10.1	4.1	18.1
No	86.6	88.8	90.1	76.8
Unknown	3.0	1.1	5.8	5.2
<b>Free or Low-Cost Child Care (%)</b>				
Yes	1.8	1.6	0.0	4.4
No	93.1	92.9	97.7	88.6
Unknown	5.1	5.6	2.3	7.0
<b>Transportation Allowance or Discounts (%)</b>				
Yes	20.2	18.5	24.8	19.6
No	78.7	81.1	73.3	78.5
Unknown	1.1	0.5	1.9	1.8

Source: 2010 National Beneficiary Survey.

Note: Questions on job-related benefits were only asked of sample members who were working at interview and were not self-employed. The questions only refer to benefits associated with the main job (as designated by the respondent) among those with multiple jobs.

Table III.19. Job Satisfaction

	All Beneficiaries	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only
<b>Nonproxy Respondents Working at Interview</b>				
Unweighted number	158	78	35	45
Weighted number	523,474	327,394	103,059	93,022
Weighted percentage	4.7	5.5	5.3	2.9
<b>Overall Satisfaction with Job (%)</b>				
Very / somewhat satisfied	76.7	74.8	92.1	66.4
Not very / not at all satisfied	22.6	25.2	7.9	29.5
Unknown	0.7	0.0	0.0	4.1
<b>Satisfaction with Specific Job Features (%)</b>				
<b>Pay is good</b>				
Agree/agree strongly	57.4	54.7	79.2	42.8
Disagree/disagree strongly	41.8	45.3	20.8	53.0
Unknown or not applicable	0.7	0.0	0.0	4.1
<b>Benefits are good</b>				
Agree/agree strongly	25.7	17.1	40.9	39.1
Disagree/disagree strongly	45.5	49.9	37.2	39.3
Unknown or not applicable	28.7	32.9	21.9	21.7
<b>Job security is good/work is steady</b>				
Agree/agree strongly	50.0	42.7	70.2	53.1
Disagree/disagree strongly	39.6	43.9	26.4	39.5
Unknown or not applicable	10.4	13.4	3.5	7.5
<b>There are chances for promotion<sup>a</sup></b>				
Agree/agree strongly	28.8	24.0	31.1	41.8
Disagree/disagree strongly	63.3	67.1	68.9	45.1
Unknown or not applicable	7.8	8.9	0.0	13.1
<b>There are chances to develop abilities</b>				
Agree/agree strongly	63.6	60.1	80.1	57.6
Disagree/disagree strongly	31.4	35.0	18.0	33.8
Unknown or not applicable	5.0	4.9	1.9	8.6
<b>Receives recognition/respect from others</b>				
Agree/agree strongly	83.9	82.8	91.5	79.5
Disagree/disagree strongly	12.8	15.6	4.3	12.5
Unknown or not applicable	3.3	1.6	4.2	7.9
<b>Can work on own if desired</b>				
Agree/agree strongly	68.9	66.2	80.5	65.6
Disagree/disagree strongly	28.6	33.1	18.0	24.6
Unknown or not applicable	2.4	0.6	1.5	9.8
<b>Can work with others/team if desired</b>				
Agree/agree strongly	70.9	66.0	91.0	66.0
Disagree/disagree strongly	19.2	22.4	7.3	21.3
Unknown or not applicable	9.8	11.6	1.6	12.7
<b>Work is interesting/enjoyable</b>				
Agree/agree strongly	84.1	85.2	88.8	75.4
Disagree/disagree strongly	15.1	14.8	11.2	20.5
Unknown or not applicable	0.7	0.0	0.0	4.1

Table III.19 (continued)

	All Beneficiaries	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only
<b>Work gives feeling of accomplishment</b>				
Agree/agree strongly	89.0	88.5	96.5	82.6
Disagree/disagree strongly	9.9	11.5	1.6	13.3
Unknown or not applicable	1.1	0.0	1.9	4.1
<b>Supervisor is supportive<sup>a</sup></b>				
Agree/agree strongly	88.9	87.8	89.7	91.3
Disagree/disagree strongly	9.6	11.6	8.4	4.4
Unknown or not applicable	1.5	0.6	1.9	4.3
<b>Co-workers are friendly and supportive</b>				
Agree/agree strongly	83.7	83.4	89.7	78.3
Disagree/disagree strongly	8.5	8.3	5.9	11.9
Unknown or not applicable	7.8	8.3	4.4	9.8

Source: 2010 National Beneficiary Survey.

Note: Questions on job satisfaction were asked of nonproxy respondents working at interview.

<sup>a</sup>Question was not asked of those who were self-employed.

Table III.20. Job Accommodations and Supports

	All Beneficiaries	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only
<b>Working at Interview</b>				
Unweighted number	253	106	69	78
Weighted number	796,158	463,552	174,553	158,052
Weighted percentage	7.2	7.7	9.1	5.0
<b>Employer Made at Least One Accommodation (%)<sup>a</sup></b>				
Yes	58.6	58.7	65.0	51.1
No	39.9	41.3	33.6	42.9
Unknown	1.6	0.0	1.3	6.0
<b>Types of Accommodations Among Those Who Received Them (%)<sup>a,b</sup></b>				
Arranged for co-worker/others to assist	66.1	71.8	46.0	76.5
Changes to work schedule	44.5	46.1	56.8	22.4
Changes to work tasks	47.2	54.2	45.4	28.2
Changes to the physical work environment	43.0	58.3	23.0	23.9
Provided special equipment	7.5	7.5	8.3	6.2
Other	3.5	2.1	1.6	10.7
<b>Changes to Workplace Are Needed (%)</b>				
Yes	3.4	3.8	0.0	6.2
No	95.9	96.2	100.0	90.2
Unknown	0.7	0.0	0.0	3.6
<b>Uses Special Equipment at Work (%)</b>				
Yes	19.3	23.4	15.8	11.2
No	80.0	75.4	84.2	88.8
Unknown	0.7	1.2	0.0	0.0
<b>Types of Equipment Among Users (%)<sup>b</sup></b>				
Cane/brace/wheelchair/walker	79.1	c	c	c
Modified computer hardware/software	9.9	c	c	c
Other equipment	29.4	c	c	c
<b>Uses Personal Assistance at Work (%)</b>				
Yes	22.9	21.2	25.8	24.8
No	76.4	78.1	73.1	75.2
Unknown	0.6	0.7	1.1	0.0
<b>Types of Personal Assistance Among Users (%)<sup>b</sup></b>				
Job coach	76.1	c	c	c
Personal care assistance	17.2	c	c	c
Sign-language interpreter or reader for blind	3.1	c	c	c
Other	11.9	c	c	c

Source: 2010 National Beneficiary Survey.

<sup>a</sup>Questions were asked of employed sample members who were not self-employed.

<sup>b</sup>Multiple responses possible.

<sup>c</sup>Statistics not reported for subgroups with 30 or fewer observations.

**Table III.21. SSA Notification of Work Activity Following Job Start Among Beneficiaries Employed at Interview**

	All Beneficiaries	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only
<b>Employed at Interview</b>				
Weighted number	796,158	463,552	174,553	158,052
Weighted percentage	7.2	7.7	9.1	5.0
<b>Informed SSA When Started Current Job (%)</b>				
Yes	71.4	72.2	82.8	56.3
No	20.5	20.5	9.5	32.8
Unknown	8.1	7.3	7.7	10.9
<b>Of Those Who Informed SSA, How Soon After Job Start They Told SSA About Current Job (%)</b>				
Less than 1 month after start	66.2	62.3	75.9	64.6
1-3 months after start	17.4	18.2	15.8	17.1
4-12 months after start	1.3	1.3	0.0	3.3
More than 12 months after start	0.8	0.0	1.7	2.1
Unknown	14.4	18.2	6.6	12.9

Source: 2010 National Beneficiary Survey.

**Table III.22. Social Security Benefit Adjustment in Response to Work Activity Among Recently Employed Beneficiaries**

	All Beneficiaries	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only
<b>Employed at Interview or During the Previous Calendar Year</b>				
Weighted number	1,170,110	603,658	284,527	281,924
Weighted percentage	10.5	10.1	14.8	8.9
<b>Changes Needed to Benefits Due to Work (%)</b>				
Yes	16.0	4.6	24.3	32.2
No	66.7	82.6	47.7	51.7
Unknown	17.3	12.8	28.0	16.2
<b>Among Those Indicating Changes Needed, Social Security Paid Wrong Benefit Amount (%)</b>				
Yes	44.5	a	a	32.5
No	51.6	a	a	63.9
Unknown	3.9	a	a	3.6
<b>Beneficiary Was Asked to Repay Benefits Because of Overpayment (%)</b>				
Yes, overpayment due to work	13.3	3.4	27.7	20.1
Yes, overpayment due to other reason	6.2	3.6	7.3	10.6
No	63.8	82.1	33.8	55.0
Unknown	16.7	11.0	31.2	14.3

Source: 2010 National Beneficiary Survey.

<sup>a</sup>Statistics not reported for subgroups with 30 or fewer observations.

Table III.23. Benefits Reduced or Ended Due to Work Activity Among Recently Employed Beneficiaries

	All Beneficiaries	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only
<b>Employed at Interview or During the Previous Year</b>				
Weighted number	1,170,110	603,658	284,527	281,924
Weighted percentage	10.5	10.1	14.8	8.9
<b>Disability-Related Benefits Reduced or Ended Due to Work (%)</b>				
Yes	16.3	8.7	24.0	24.8
No	53.1	67.2	38.1	38.1
Unknown	30.6	24.1	37.9	37.1
<b>Benefits Affected Among Those Indicating Reductions/Terminations (%)</b>				
Social Security disability	77.6	a	a	93.9
Medicare	9.8	a	a	0.0
Food stamps	5.2	a	a	2.5
Medicaid	4.8	a	a	4.4
Other	12.7	a	a	6.1

Source: 2010 National Beneficiary Survey.

<sup>a</sup>Statistics not reported for subgroups with 30 or fewer observations.

Table III.24. Percentage of Respondents Aware of Social Security Work Supports (among those eligible for each item)

	All Respondents Eligible for Support	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only	All Employed Beneficiaries
Trial Work Period	35.0	37.6	26.9	n.a.	42.1
Ticket to Work	27.9	31.0	28.7	21.5	32.8
Extended Period of Medicare Eligibility	16.7	19.0	9.6	n.a.	24.0
1619(b) Continued Medicaid Coverage	12.8	n.a.	14.0	12.1	28.2
Expedited Reinstatement	10.3	13.3	8.5	5.7	20.8
Earned Income Exclusion	12.6	n.a.	13.9	11.9	23.1
Plan for Achieving Self Support	8.3	n.a.	9.1	7.8	7.3
Benefits Specialist	16.2	19.4	15.1	10.7	29.3
Impairment Related or Blind Work Expenses	7.9	10.3	8.1	3.1	13.9
Student Earned Income Exclusion <sup>a</sup>	8.2	n.a.	13.4	7.0	4.9
Property Essential for Self Support	4.2	n.a.	4.8	3.8	1.7

Source: 2010 National Beneficiary Survey.

<sup>a</sup>Awareness rate was calculated as a percentage of SSI recipients age 25 and under who began receiving benefits before age 22.

Table III.25. Awareness of the Ticket to Work Program by Time Since Ticket Mailing at Interview

	Number (unweighted)	Aware of TTW (weighted %)
<b>All Beneficiaries</b>	2,298	27.9
<b>Time since most recent Ticket mailing at Interview</b>		
Ticket mailed fewer than 12 months before interview	40	49.9
Ticket mailed 12 to 24 months before interview	304	41.9
Ticket mailed 25 to 36 months before interview	188	32.3
Ticket mailed 37 to 48 months before interview	190	32.8
Ticket mailed 49 to 60 months before interview	155	25.1
Ticket mailed 61 or more months before interview	1,356	24.0

Source: 2010 National Beneficiary Survey linked to the 2010 Ticket Research File.

Note: The Ticket mail date was missing or occurred after the NBS interview date for 65 respondents (1.7 percent of the weighted sample). These respondents were excluded from the calculation of awareness rates by time since Ticket mailing.

**This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.**

## REFERENCES

- Bethel, J., and D. Stapleton. "Evaluation Design for the Ticket to Work Program: Final Survey Sample Design." Falls Church, VA: The Lewin Group, July 2002.
- Livermore, G. "Earnings and Work Expectations of Social Security Disability Beneficiaries." Disability Policy Research Brief No. 08-01. Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, Center for Studying Disability Policy, August 2008.
- Livermore, G., N. Goodman, and D. Wright. "Social Security Disability Beneficiaries: Characteristics, Work Activity, and Use of Services." *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, vol. 27, no. 2, 2007, pp. 85-93.
- Livermore, G., D. Stapleton, and A. Roche. "Work Activity and Use of Employment Supports Under the Original Ticket to Work Regulations: Characteristics, Employment, and Sources of Support among Working-age SSI and DI Beneficiaries." Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, April 2009a.
- Livermore, G., D. Wright, A. Roche, and E. Grau. "2006 National Beneficiary Survey: Methodology and Descriptive Statistics." Report No. 4. In *Work Activity and Use of Employment Supports Under the Original Ticket to Work Regulations*. Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, 2009b.
- Stapleton, D., G. Livermore, C. Thornton, B. O'Day, R. Weathers, K. Harrison, S. O'Neil, E. Sama Martin, D. Wittenburg, and D. Wright. "Ticket to Work at the Crossroads: A Solid Foundation with an Uncertain Future." Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, September 2008.
- Thornton, C., T. Fraker, G. Livermore, D. Stapleton, B. O'Day, T. Silva, E. Sama Martin, J. Kregel, and D. Wright. "Evaluation of the Ticket to Work Program: Implementation Experience During the Second Two Years of Operations (2003-2004)." Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, January 2006.
- Thornton, C., G. Livermore, T. Fraker, D. Stapleton, B. O'Day, D. Wittenburg, R. Weathers, N. Goodman, T. Silva, E. Sama Martin, J. Gregory, D. Wright, and A. Mamun. "Evaluation of the Ticket to Work Program: Assessment of Post-Rollout Implementation and Early Impacts." Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, May 2007.
- Thornton, C., G. Livermore, D. Stapleton, J. Kregel, T. Silva, B. O'Day, T. Fraker, W. Grant Revell, H. Schroeder, and M. Edwards. "Evaluation of the Ticket to Work Program: Initial Evaluation Report." Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, February 2004.

**This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.**

**This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.**



**MATHEMATICA**  
Policy Research

[www.mathematica-mpr.com](http://www.mathematica-mpr.com)

Improving public well-being by conducting high-quality, objective research and surveys

Princeton, NJ ■ Ann Arbor, MI ■ Cambridge, MA ■ Chicago, IL ■ Oakland, CA ■ Washington, DC

Mathematica® is a registered trademark of Mathematica Policy Research

