

Contract No.: 0600-03-60130
MPR Reference No.: 8977-808

MATHEMATICA
Policy Research, Inc.

Center for
Studying 
DISABILITY POLICY

**Work Activity and Use of
Employment Supports
Under the Original Ticket
to Work Regulations**

**SSI and DI Beneficiaries
with Work-Related Goals
and Expectations**

Final Report

October 2009

*Gina Livermore
Allison Roche
Sarah Prenovitz*

Submitted to:
Social Security Administration
Office of Retirement and Disability Policy
500 E Street SW, 9th Floor
Washington, DC 20254

Submitted by:
Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
600 Maryland Ave., SW, Suite 550
Washington, DC 20024-2512
Telephone: (202) 484-9220

Project Officer: Paul O'Leary

Project Director: Gina Livermore

PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK TO ALLOW FOR DOUBLE-SIDED COPYING

ABSTRACT

In this report we present findings of an in-depth analysis of working-age Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and Social Security Disability Insurance (DI) beneficiaries who report having work goals and/or expectations. We refer to these individuals as “work-oriented” beneficiaries. Using data from the 2004 National Beneficiary Survey (NBS), we classify working-age SSI and DI beneficiaries by their work-orientation status and analyze their characteristics, service use patterns, awareness of Social Security Administration (SSA) work supports, and employment expectations. We also used four years (2004 – 2007) of SSA administrative data matched to the 2004 NBS to analyze the use of selected SSA work incentives and employment activity during the year including and three years following the 2004 NBS interview.

Because the period of our analysis precedes SSA’s implementation of new Ticket to Work (TTW) regulations (instituted July 2008), the report reflects experiences under the original TTW rules. We found that beneficiary work and work preparation activities were highly concentrated among the 40 percent of those classified as work-oriented. Relative to other beneficiaries, work-oriented beneficiaries were younger, had more education, had been on the disability rolls a shorter time for their most recent period of entitlement, had lower levels of non-SSA benefits and income from assistance programs, and reported being in better health. Just over half of this group were employed or engaged in work preparation activities around the time they were interviewed in 2004. Service use patterns and reported reasons for not working differed in many respects between beneficiaries who were work-oriented and those who were not. The same was true among work-oriented beneficiaries according to their program status. About half of all work-oriented beneficiaries were employed at some point during the 2004-2007 period, and of those who worked, about half did so in all four years. Although many were working, relatively few work-oriented beneficiaries used SSA work supports for which they were eligible during these four years. Just 10 percent left the disability rolls due to earnings for at least one month during this period. Although the administrative data suggest that many work-oriented beneficiaries fell short of their reported employment expectations, the findings suggest that most are actively attempting to work and many have experienced some success.

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

PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK TO ALLOW FOR DOUBLE-SIDED COPYING

CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	ABSTRACT.....	iii
I	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II	BACKGROUND.....	3
III	DATA AND METHODS.....	7
IV	PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS.....	11
	A. PROGRAM, SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC, AND HEALTH CHARACTERISTICS.....	11
	B. PREDICTORS OF WORK-ORIENTATION STATUS.....	15
V	EMPLOYMENT-RELATED EXPERIENCES AND OUTCOMES.....	19
	A. OVERVIEW OF EMPLOYMENT-RELATED ACTIVITIES.....	19
	B. SERVICE USE.....	21
	C. EMPLOYMENT EXPECTATIONS, EMPLOYMENT AND REASONS FOR NOT WORKING.....	23
	1. Employment Expectations Among Work-Oriented Beneficiaries.....	23
	2. Employment during 2004 – 2007.....	25
	3. Reasons for Not Working.....	28
	D. AWARENESS AND USE OF SSA WORK SUPPORTS.....	30
	E. MONTHS OFF THE ROLLS DUE TO WORK.....	31
	1. Months Off the Rolls Due to Work during 2004 – 2007.....	32
	2. Likelihood of Leaving the Disability Rolls among Those with Expectations of Doing So.....	34
	3. Determinants of Leaving the Rolls Due to Work.....	37
VI	SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION.....	39

Chapter	Page
REFERENCES	41
APPENDIX A: ADDITIONAL TABULATIONS	A-1
APPENDIX B: REGRESSION MODELS	B-1

EXHIBITS

Exhibit		Page
1	SELECTED SSI AND DI EMPLOYMENT SUPPORTS.....	6
2	2004 NBS SAMPLE SIZES, BY BENEFICIARY WORK-ORIENTATION STATUS	8
3	2004 NBS SAMPLES SIZES FOR DISABILITY PROGRAM SUBGROUPS OF WORK-ORIENTED BENEFICIARIES.....	8
4	DISABILITY PROGRAM PARTICIPATION BY WORK-ORIENTATION STATUS	12
5	SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF BENEFICIARIES BY WORK-ORIENTATION STATUS	13
6	HEALTH AND FUNCTIONAL STATUS INDICATORS BY WORK- ORIENTATION STATUS	14
7	EMPLOYMENT-RELATED ACTIVITIES BY WORK-ORIENTATION STATUS	20
8	EMPLOYMENT-RELATED ACTIVITIES OF WORK-ORIENTED BENEFICIARIES, BY PROGRAM.....	21
9	SERVICE USE BY WORK-ORIENTATION STATUS	22
10	SERVICE USE AMONG WORK-ORIENTED BENEFICIARIES, BY PROGRAM.....	23
11	EMPLOYMENT EXPECTATIONS AMONG WORK-ORIENTED BENEFICIARIES, BY PROGRAM.....	24
12	EMPLOYMENT ACTIVITY DURING 2004-2007 BY SELECTED BENEFICIARY SUBGROUPS.....	26
13	PERCENT WITH EARNINGS AND SELECTED EARNINGS CHARACTERISTICS AMONG THOSE WITH POSITIVE EARNINGS, BY YEAR AND WORK-ORIENTATION STATUS.....	27

Exhibit		Page
14	PERCENT OF WORK-ORIENTED BENEFICIARIES WITH EXPECTATIONS OF WORKING IN THE NEAR FUTURE WITH EARNINGS DURING 2004 – 2007, BY PROGRAM.....	28
15	REASONS FOR NOT WORKING AMONG THOSE NOT EMPLOYED AT INTERVIEW	29
16	REASONS FOR NOT WORKING AMONG WORK-ORIENTED BENEFICIARIES NOT EMPLOYED AT INTERVIEW, BY PROGRAM STATUS	30
17	AWARENESS OF SELECTED SSA WORK SUPPORTS.....	31
18	USE OF SELECTED SSA WORK SUPPORTS DURING THE 2004 – 2007 PERIOD	32
19	MONTHS OFF THE DISABILITY ROLLS DUE TO WORK DURING 2004-2007, BY WORK-ORIENTATION STATUS	33
20	MONTHS OFF THE DISABILITY ROLLS DUE TO WORK DURING 2004-2007 AMONG WORK-ORIENTED BENEFICIARIES, BY PROGRAM	35
21	WORK-ORIENTED BENEFICIARIES WITH EXPECTATIONS OF LEAVING THE DISABILITY ROLLS WHO DID SO DURING 2004 – 2007, BY PROGRAM.....	36

I. INTRODUCTION

The Social Security Administration (SSA) administers two programs that provide income support to nearly 11 million working-age people with disabilities—the Social Security Disability Insurance (DI) program and the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) program.¹ To qualify for either program, an applicant must demonstrate that he or she is unable to work at substantial levels due to a long-term, medically determinable impairment. The passage of the Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act of 1999 (Ticket Act) prompted numerous changes in the SSI and DI programs, intended to encourage and facilitate the return-to-work efforts of disability program participants. Over the past eight years, SSA has instituted initiatives that provide beneficiaries with information about how work affects their benefits, offer them more options for accessing employment services, allow them to return more easily to the disability rolls following unsuccessful work attempts, and facilitate the processing of earnings information by SSA staff. The Ticket Act also established the Ticket to Work (TTW) program, which greatly expanded the types of organizations that SSA would pay to support beneficiaries' employment efforts.

SSA's recent focus on employment represents a major change in the culture of the disability programs, which originally were established to provide income support to individuals deemed unable to work. While most beneficiaries do not attempt to secure a job once they are on the disability rolls, and few leave the rolls due to work in any given year, SSA's increased focus on employment reflects a more general change in our understanding of disability—with the appropriate support and economic incentives, many people with significant disabilities are capable of working and achieving a significant degree of independence.

In previous reports developed for the TTW program evaluation (Thornton et al. 2007; Stapleton et al. 2008), we presented data showing that a large minority of beneficiaries—about 40 percent—indicated, via national survey, that their personal goals included work and/or they saw themselves working in the near future. While this figure seems especially large in light of the stringent eligibility requirements for the disability programs, we also know from the analyses presented in the previous reports that about half of these individuals (about 20 percent of all beneficiaries) also reported having engaged in recent work and/or work preparation activities. Thus, the 40 percent figure might not be an unrealistic one.

The purpose of this report is to conduct a more in-depth analysis of those SSI and DI beneficiaries who report having work goals and expectations. Hereafter, we refer to these individuals as “work-oriented” beneficiaries. We use data from the 2004 National Beneficiary Survey (NBS) to classify working-age (18 to 64) SSI and DI beneficiaries by their work-

¹ The SSI program also serves children with disabilities and individuals age 65 and over.

orientation status and analyze their characteristics. We also use administrative data covering the years 2004-2007 that were linked to the 2004 NBS to analyze the use of selected SSA work incentives and employment activity during the year including and three years following the NBS interview. The analyses address the following issues:

- What are the characteristics of work-oriented beneficiaries and how do they differ from other beneficiaries? Among work-oriented beneficiaries, are there important differences across the SSI and DI programs?
- To what extent do work-oriented beneficiaries use selected SSA work incentives and become employed during the years including and following their interview in the 2004 NBS? How do they compare to those who do not indicate employment aspirations in the NBS?

A better understanding of the characteristics and experiences of those SSI and DI beneficiaries most likely to demand and use employment supports might help SSA and other federal agencies improve their programs and service delivery and better target their efforts to help these individuals obtain and maintain employment.

We find that beneficiary work and work preparation activities were highly concentrated among the 40 percent of beneficiaries classified as work-oriented. Relative to other beneficiaries, this group of beneficiaries was younger, had more education, had been on the disability rolls a shorter time for their most recent period of entitlement, had lower levels of non-SSA benefits and income from assistance programs, and reported being in better health. Among work-oriented beneficiaries, just over half had engaged in recent work or work preparation activities at the time they were interviewed in 2004. Service use patterns and reported reasons for not working differed in many respects between beneficiaries who were work-oriented and those who were not, and among work-oriented beneficiaries by program status. About half of all work-oriented beneficiaries worked at some point during the 2004-2007 period, and of those who worked, about half worked in all four years. Although many were working, relatively few work-oriented beneficiaries had used SSA work supports for which they were eligible during the 2004-2007 period, and just 10 percent left the disability due to earnings for at least one month during that period. Although the administrative data suggest that many work-oriented beneficiaries fell short of their reported employment expectations, the findings suggest that most are actively attempting to work and many have experienced some success.

In what follows, we first provide some background on the SSI and DI programs (Chapter II) and describe the data and methods used in the analyses (Chapter III). Next, we present the findings of descriptive and multivariate analyses comparing the characteristics of beneficiaries who do and do not report having work goals and expectations (Chapter IV). We then present analyses of the employment, service use, use of SSA work incentives, and month off the disability rolls due to work by work-orientation status (Chapter V). The final section presents summary and concluding remarks (Chapter VI).

II. BACKGROUND

The SSI and DI programs are designed to provide income support to those with significant disabilities who are unable to work at substantial levels. To qualify for either program, an applicant must demonstrate an inability to engage in substantial gainful activity (SGA) due to a medically determinable impairment that is expected to last at least 12 months or to result in death. As of 2009, SSA considers earnings above \$980 per month as SGA for most applicants. DI eligibility is also contingent on having a sufficient number of recent and lifetime quarters of Social Security-covered employment. The DI benefit level is based on past earnings—individuals with higher lifetime earnings are eligible for higher DI benefits. SSI is a means-tested program; eligibility is subject to strict income and resource limits. The SSI benefit is based on the individual's monthly income and living arrangement. Individuals may qualify for both programs if their incomes (including DI benefits) and assets are low enough to meet the SSI income limits. Eligibility for either program can also provide access to public health insurance. DI beneficiaries qualify for Medicare coverage after a 24-month waiting period, and most SSI beneficiaries are eligible for Medicaid automatically.

Though initial eligibility for both programs is contingent on limited work activity, DI and SSI differ markedly in terms of how income from earnings is treated in determining the monthly cash payments and ongoing eligibility for the programs. In the DI program, individuals are permitted to work and earn at any level for up to nine months without losing eligibility for DI cash benefits. This nine-month period is referred to as the trial work period.² As of 2009, an individual is considered to be in a trial work period if monthly earnings exceed \$700 or if they are working more than 80 self-employed hours per month. If individuals earn more than the SGA level in any month after completing this period, they become ineligible for any DI benefits, but remain eligible for Medicare if they completed the 24-month Medicare waiting period prior to becoming ineligible for DI.³

Earnings above \$65 per month will reduce SSI benefits by \$1 for every \$2 of earnings; thus, SSI benefits are reduced gradually as earnings rise. Provisions in the SSI program allow participants to earn above the SGA level and remain eligible for both SSI (Section 1619[a]) and Medicaid benefits even after SSI cash payments cease due to earnings (Section 1619[b]). Individuals remain eligible for Medicaid until their earnings exceed a “threshold amount,” which is based on annual per capita Medicaid expenditures for SSI recipients and varies by

² The nine months need not be consecutive and must occur within a rolling 60-month period.

³ DI beneficiaries eligible for Medicare can retain eligibility for premium-free Medicare Part A coverage for up to nine years after leaving the DI rolls due to work. Thereafter, they may be able maintain Part A coverage through the payment of a premium. Those eligible for Medicare Part A (premium free or otherwise) are also eligible to enroll in Parts B and D (both subject to monthly premiums).

state. The threshold can also be computed for individuals if their Medicaid expenditures exceed the state per capita amount.⁴ In 2009, state threshold amounts ranged from about \$24,000 to \$54,000.

The structure of the SSI and DI programs can create disincentives for employment. Beneficiaries who fear losing their cash or health insurance benefits may not wish to jeopardize them by engaging in employment, or may be willing to work only at levels where they will not lose benefits. This may particularly be the case among DI-only beneficiaries with high benefits, some of whom might also be receiving benefits for dependents.⁵ Fear of losing benefits due to increased earnings is just one of a long list of potential barriers to employment that beneficiaries may face. Others include:

- Poor health or functioning limiting the ability to engage in work or reducing the level of productivity
- Inadequate education, skills, training, or job-related experience
- Lack of reliable transportation
- Lack of specific supports needed while at work, or at home to prepare for/enable work
- Inaccessible workplaces and inflexible employment situations
- Discrimination and employer misconceptions of disability
- Lack of information about individual abilities and productivity
- Insufficient wages or benefits offered with employment
- Lack of information about employment-related supports and resources available
- Lack of information about the impact of work on cash and in-kind benefits

⁴ To be eligible for 1619(b), an SSI recipient cannot have earnings sufficient to replace SSI cash benefits, Medicaid benefits, and publicly-funded personal or attendant care that would be lost due to earnings. SSA uses the state 1619(b) thresholds to measure whether a beneficiary has sufficient earnings to replace these benefits. For those with earnings that exceed their states' threshold amounts, SSA can determine whether the individual would be eligible under an individualized threshold amount. The individualized threshold takes into account expected medical care expenditures exceeding the state threshold, the value of publicly-funded personal or attendant care, SSI state supplements, and approved impairment related work expenses and plans for achieving self support.

⁵ DI beneficiaries with dependent children under age 18 or still in high school receive additional benefits up to a family limit.

-
- Inadequate job search and interview skills or information.

The SSI and DI programs have a number of provisions in addition to those described above intended to help beneficiaries in their efforts to return to work. We summarize some of these in Exhibit 1. Most are intended to allow beneficiaries to maintain eligibility for health insurance and to keep more of their cash benefits while working or preparing for work, but others provide resources to help beneficiaries improve their ability to work and services intended to increase their knowledge of the resources available to them in their return-to-work efforts. Despite the existence of these supports, relatively few beneficiaries (about nine percent) are employed at any given time (Livermore et al. 2009) and few leave the programs due to work in a given year.⁶

It may be surprising that given the large share of beneficiaries (40 percent) who report having work goals or expectations noted previously, so few are actually working at any given time. But as we have shown in previous reports (Thornton et al. 2007; Stapleton et al. 2008; Livermore et al. 2009) many beneficiaries have characteristics that could limit their ability to secure and maintain employment despite a desire to do so. Aside from poor health, a large share have less than a high school level of education, about half are living in poverty, and many report a variety of obstacles to getting and keeping jobs, such as lack of reliable transportation, inaccessible workplaces, and discouragement from work either by others or through their own experiences. It is also possible that survey respondents exaggerate their interest in work.

This report builds on the previous studies by conducting a more in-depth analysis of the characteristics and employment outcomes of beneficiaries who report having work goals and expectations. Linking the survey data to administrative data sources also allows us to assess, to a limited degree, the extent to which beneficiaries with work goals and expectations were successful in meeting their stated goals during the period following their survey interview.

⁶ The number of DI beneficiaries terminated each year due to work is less than one half of one percent (SSA 2008b).

Exhibit 1. Selected SSI and DI Employment Supports

Applicable to DI	
Trial Work Period	Permits DI beneficiaries to test their ability to work for up to nine months without affecting their DI benefits.
Extended Period of Eligibility	Allows DI beneficiaries to earn any amount over a consecutive 36-month period following the completion of the trial work period without jeopardizing eligibility for benefits. Benefits are reduced to zero when earnings reach the SGA level, but during this period, beneficiaries can receive DI benefits in any month in which their earnings are below the SGA level.
Continuation of Medicare Coverage	Allows DI beneficiaries who leave the rolls due to work to remain eligible for Medicare for at least 93 months after completing the trial work period.
Applicable to SSI	
Earned Income Exclusion	Excludes the first \$65 of monthly earnings and one-half of the remainder when calculating the SSI payment amount.
Section 1619(a)	Provides continued Medicaid coverage and reduced SSI payments to recipients who earn more than the SGA amount but remain below the SSI break-even point (the earnings level where benefits are reduced to zero).
Section 1619(b)	Provides continued Medicaid coverage and SSI eligibility, but with no monthly payments to recipients whose income exceeds the SSI break-even point but is less than the state's 1619(b) threshold amount.
Plan for Achieving Self-Support	Allows a recipient to set aside income and/or resources for such things as education, vocational training, or starting a business, and not have the income/resources counted in the SSI income and resource eligibility tests.
Student Earned Income Exclusion	Allows a student under age 22 who attends school regularly to exclude up to \$1,550 of earned income per month (up to a maximum of \$6,240 per year) in computing the SSI benefit.
Property Essential for Self-Support	Excludes resources (such as tools, equipment, or business inventory or property) essential to self-support when determining ongoing eligibility for SSI.
Applicable to Both DI and SSI	
Ticket to Work	Allows beneficiaries to obtain employment, vocational rehabilitation, and other support services from participating providers. Providers are paid by SSA based on a beneficiary's employment outcomes.
Impairment-Related Work Expenses	Excludes from earnings the costs of certain impairment-related items or services a person needs for work when calculating benefits and ongoing eligibility.
Expedited Reinstatement	Allows individuals whose cash payments ended because of earnings to restart benefits without having to file a new application if they stop working within five years of benefit cessation.
Work Incentives Planning and Assistance	Community-based organizations funded by SSA to provide disability beneficiaries with information about how their benefits are affected by employment and community resources that support return to work.
Protection and Advocacy for Beneficiaries of Social Security	Agencies funded by SSA in each state to provide information and advocacy services to protect the rights of Social Security beneficiaries.

Source: SSA (2008a).

III. DATA AND METHODS

Three rounds of the National Beneficiary Survey (NBS) have been conducted as part of the TTW program evaluation, administered in each year from 2004 through 2006. A new, nationally representative sample of beneficiaries age 18 to 64 was selected for each round; 7,603 in 2004, 4,864 in 2005; and 2,508 in 2006.⁷ Each sample provides a wealth of information about the characteristics, service use, and employment activities of Social Security disability beneficiaries.

The analyses presented in this report are based on the 2004 NBS. We chose to use the 2004 NBS because, of the three NBS rounds, it permitted us the longest period to observe respondents via the SSA administrative data. Records in the 2004 NBS were matched to SSA administrative data contained in the 2007 Ticket Research File (TRF). The TRF is made up of data extracts from a number of SSA administrative data files and contains a record for all individuals ages 10 to 64 who have participated in the SSI and DI programs since 1996. From these data, we are able to analyze information about mortality, the use of SSA work supports, and the number of months that cash benefits were suspended or terminated due to work for respondents to the 2004 NBS during 2004-2007.

The 2004 NBS data also were matched to annual Internal Revenue Service (IRS) earnings records for 2004-2007 to analyze the earnings of NBS respondents during this time.⁸ The earnings data come from SSA's Master Earnings File (MEF), which contains wage and salary items from the employer-filed W-2 form, and information on other earnings not subject to FICA taxes.⁹

⁷ The surveys also include both cross-sectional and longitudinal samples of TTW participants. All statistics reported in this paper were derived from the 2004 national cross-sectional sample.

⁸ Due to restricted access to the IRS data, the IRS-NBS record linkage and earnings data analyses presented in this report were performed by SSA staff.

⁹ The primary source of information for the MEF is the W-2 form sent directly to SSA. W-2 forms arrive at SSA continuously and the MEF is updated with new W-2 information on a weekly basis. The un-posted detail segment contains detailed non-FICA-related earnings (earnings not subject to FICA tax), such as deferred Medicare earnings, self-employment earnings and earnings paid into retirement plans. Two variables from this detailed earnings record are used: W2_BOX5_WGE_MED corresponding to the amount contained in Box 5 of the form W-2, which includes taxable tips; and SEL_MED corresponding to any Medicare-covered self employment. The detailed earning record includes multiple employers per year and so for the analysis, these are summed to obtain total wages per year and total self-employment per year. These total annual wage and self-employment values are then summed to obtain total earnings for the year.

The 2004 NBS sample sizes are shown in Exhibit 2.¹⁰ The categorization of beneficiaries by work-orientation status is based on the sample member's reported work goals and expectations. Respondents were asked if their personal goals included getting a job, moving up in a job, or learning new job skills. Respondents were also asked if they saw themselves working for pay in the next year and in the next five years. If a sample member provided a positive response to any of these questions they were classified as work-oriented. Based on the responses to these questions, we classified 40 percent of the sample as work-oriented and 60 percent as not work-oriented (Exhibit 2).

Exhibit 2. 2004 NBS Sample Sizes, by Beneficiary Work-Orientation Status

	All Beneficiaries	Work-Oriented	Not Work-Oriented
Number (Unweighted)	7,603	4,433	3,170
Number (Weighted)	8,786,823	3,478,660	5,308,163
Percent of All Beneficiaries (Weighted)	100	40	60

For selected analyses of service use and employment outcomes, we present statistics for work-oriented beneficiaries by program to assess if there are differences in the experiences of work-oriented beneficiaries across the DI and SSI programs. Program participation status is defined as DI-only, concurrent (participating in both the SSI and DI programs), and SSI-only. The weighted and unweighted sample sizes for work-oriented beneficiaries by program are shown in Exhibit 3.

Exhibit 3. 2004 NBS Samples Sizes for Disability Program Subgroups of Work-Oriented Beneficiaries

	DI-only	Concurrent	SSI-only
Number (Unweighted)	1,790	909	1,734
Number (Weighted)	1,643,854	645,556	1,189,250
Percent of All Work-Oriented Beneficiaries (Weighted)	47	19	34
Percent of All Beneficiaries (Weighted)	19	7	14

¹⁰ Further information about the 2004 NBS is presented in Appendix B of Thornton et al. 2007.

All estimates presented were derived using the relevant survey weights, and all standard errors used to compute tests of statistical significance account appropriately for the survey's complex sampling design.¹¹ The statistics presented are representative of all working-age SSI and DI beneficiaries on the disability rolls as of June 2003.

¹¹ To efficiently meet the objectives of the survey, the sample design incorporates geographic primary sampling units (PSUs) and strata defined by age, TTW participation status, phase of TTW rollout, and TTW payment system. The relevant weights and PSU and strata indicators must be used to produce statistics that are representative of all working-age SSI and DI beneficiaries, and to generate standard errors of the estimates that are adjusted for the sample design. See Bethel and Stapleton (2002) and Appendix B in Thornton et al. (2007) for detailed descriptions of the survey objectives and sample design.

PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK TO ALLOW FOR DOUBLE-SIDED COPYING

IV. PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

A variety of personal characteristics have been shown to be associated with beneficiary employment-related activity and employment outcomes. In previous evaluation reports (Thornton et al. 2007; Stapleton et al. 2008) we have examined the characteristics associated with employment, service use, and use of the TTW program. Age, health status, and time on the disability rolls were among the characteristics shown to be significantly correlated with these outcomes.

In this chapter, we provide a more in-depth analysis of work-oriented beneficiaries and how they differ from other beneficiaries in terms of their programmatic, sociodemographic, and health characteristics than has been presented in previous reports. In what follows, we first present a variety of descriptive statistics by beneficiary work-orientation status. We then present the findings of a multivariate analysis of the predictors of work-orientation status. In the multivariate analyses, we treat program participation status as a characteristic potentially differentiating work-oriented and non-work oriented beneficiaries and assess the importance of a variety of personal characteristics after holding other characteristics constant.

A. PROGRAM, SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC, AND HEALTH CHARACTERISTICS

Work-oriented beneficiaries differed somewhat from those without work goals/expectations in terms of their SSA program participation status and average benefits (Exhibit 4). Work-oriented beneficiaries were significantly less likely to be DI-only beneficiaries and more likely to be participating in the SSI program. SSI benefits are lower, on average, than DI benefits, which might contribute to the finding that the average SSA benefits of work-oriented beneficiaries were significantly lower than those of beneficiaries who were not work-oriented. When we compare beneficiaries who are and are not work-oriented by their respective programs (Appendix Exhibit A-1), we also find that work-oriented beneficiaries in each program had lower benefits than their counterparts without work goals/expectations. Beneficiaries with and without work goals/expectations did not differ significantly in terms of time since their initial disability award. Just over one-half of both groups (53 percent) had their initial award ten or more years ago at the time of interview. When we compare the two groups by program (Appendix Exhibit A-1), this finding holds for DI-only beneficiaries, but the average time since initial award for work-oriented concurrent and SSI-only beneficiaries is about one to two years shorter than that of their counterparts without work goal/expectations. Those with and without work goals/expectations did differ in terms of time since their most *recent* award: time since most recent award was significantly shorter (by seven months on average) among work-oriented beneficiaries. When we compare the two groups by program (Appendix Exhibit A-1), this finding holds for concurrent and SSI-only beneficiaries, but time since most recent award did not differ between DI-only beneficiaries with and without work goals/expectations.

Exhibit 4. Disability Program Participation by Work-Orientation Status

	All Beneficiaries	Work-Oriented	Not Work- Oriented
Program status at interview (%)			
DI-only	53	47 [#]	57
Concurrent	16	19 [#]	15
SSI-only	31	34 [#]	28
Mean Monthly SSA benefit (\$)	788	742*	818
Months since initial award (%)			
< 24	4	5	3
24 - 59	20	20	20
60 - 119	23	22	24
120 +	53	53	53
Mean months since initial award	149	146	150
Months since most recent award (%)			
< 24	9	10 [#]	9
24 - 59	25	28 [#]	24
60 - 119	26	26 [#]	26
120 +	39	37 [#]	41
Mean months since most recent award	116	109*	116

Source: 2004 NBS linked to the 2004 TRF. Sample size = 7,603.

* Statistically different from beneficiaries who were not work oriented at the 0.05 level, two-tailed test.

[#] Distribution is statistically different from that of beneficiaries who were not work oriented at the 0.05 level, chi-square test.

Work-oriented beneficiaries also differed from those without work goals/expectations in terms of certain sociodemographic characteristics (Exhibit 5). On average, work-oriented beneficiaries were significantly younger and were more likely to be non-white. They were also more likely to have a high school education or a more advanced degree. These findings do not change when the groups are compared by program (Appendix Exhibit A-1). Beneficiaries overall differed somewhat by work-orientation status in terms of living arrangements. Work-oriented beneficiaries were equally likely to live alone as those without work goals/expectations, but were more likely to be living with children. When compared by program, we find that work-oriented SSI-only beneficiaries were much less likely to live alone than their counterparts without work goals/expectations. Both groups overall were similarly likely to be living in households with incomes below the federal poverty level. However by program, work-oriented SSI-only and concurrent beneficiaries were less likely to be in poverty than their counterparts without work goals/expectations (Appendix Exhibit A-1).

By a variety of indicators, work-oriented beneficiaries appear to be in better health than beneficiaries without work goals/expectations (Exhibit 6), and this is true regardless of program status (Appendix Exhibit A-1). Overall, work-oriented beneficiaries were significantly less likely to report being in poor/very poor health (30 percent compared with 52 percent), to report that their health was worse than last year (29 percent compared with

Exhibit 5. Sociodemographic Characteristics of Beneficiaries by Work-Orientation Status

	All Beneficiaries	Work-Oriented	Not Work- Oriented
Male (%)	50	51	49
Mean age (years)	49	44*	52
Race (%)			
White	71	67 [#]	74
Black	22	27 [#]	19
Other race	6	6 [#]	6
Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity (%)	11	12	10
Highest level of education (%)			
Did not obtain high school diploma or GED	42	38 [#]	45
High school diploma or GED	35	36 [#]	35
Education beyond high school	23	27 [#]	20
Living arrangement (%)			
Lives alone or with unrelated others	36	36 [#]	36
Lives with spouse/other relatives, no children	50	47 [#]	52
Lives with spouse and own children	8	9 [#]	7
Unmarried lives with own children	6	8 [#]	5
Household income % of federal poverty (%)			
<100	49	50	48
100-299	39	39	38
300 +	13	12	14

Source: 2004 NBS. Sample size = 7,603.

Note: The applicable Federal Poverty Level is based on family size and the ages of family members. In 2003 (the reference period for the household income question in the 2004 NBS), the Federal Poverty Level for one individual under age 65 was \$9,573 per year.

* Statistically different from beneficiaries who were not work oriented at the 0.05 level, two-tailed test.

Distribution is statistically different from that of beneficiaries who were not work oriented at the 0.05 level, chi-square test.

Exhibit 6. Health and Functional Status Indicators by Work-Orientation Status

	All Beneficiaries	Work-Oriented	Not Work-Oriented
Childhood Disability Onset (%)	23	32*	17
General Health (%)			
Excellent/very good	10	16 [#]	6
Good/fair	47	54 [#]	42
Poor/very poor	43	30 [#]	52
Current Health Compared to Last Year (%)			
Better	16	23 [#]	11
About the same	43	47 [#]	41
Worse	41	29 [#]	48
Selected Conditions Causing Limitation (%)			
Musculoskeletal	36	29*	41
Mental illness	31	35*	29
Other diseases of the nervous system	15	14	16
Sensory	9	9	9
Mental retardation	7	8*	7
Other	63	56*	68
No conditions limit activities	5	8*	2
Difficulty with Specific Activities (%)			
Walking 3 blocks, climbing 10 steps, standing 1 hour, or crouching	84	74*	91
Grasping, reaching, or lifting 10 pounds	68	55*	76
Speaking, hearing, or seeing	65	60*	68
Coping with stress	59	57	60
Concentrating	55	55	56
Getting around outside of the home	47	36*	54
Shopping for personal items	37	29*	42
Preparing meals	38	31*	42
Getting into or out of bed	37	29*	43
Bathing or dressing	29	22*	34
Getting along with others	26	28	25
Getting around inside the house	23	16*	27
Eating	15	11*	18
Died post-interview as of December 2007	9	6*	11

Source: 2004 NBS matched to the 2007 TRF. Sample size = 7,603.

* Statistically different from beneficiaries who were not work oriented at the 0.05 level, two-tailed test.

[#] Distribution is statistically different from that of beneficiaries who were not work oriented at the 0.05 level, chi-square test.

48 percent), and to report experiencing difficulty with a variety of activities. Work-oriented beneficiaries were significantly less likely to report all difficulties listed in Exhibit 6 except for coping with stress, concentrating, and getting along with others, for which they did not differ significantly from their counterparts without work goals/expectations. Based on administrative data we also found that work-oriented beneficiaries were significantly less likely to have died during the three-plus years following the NBS interview in 2004 (6 percent compared with 11 percent). Beneficiaries with and without work goals/expectations were similar in the extent to which they experienced difficulties with selected social and cognitive activities, including getting along with others, concentrating, and coping with stress.

The differences in health status might in part reflect the age difference between the two groups noted previously, as well as the nature of the underlying conditions causing disability. In addition to being younger on average (Exhibit 5), work-oriented beneficiaries, regardless of program, were significantly more likely to indicate that their disabilities began during childhood (Exhibit 6 and Appendix Exhibit A-1). Overall, work-oriented beneficiaries were significantly more likely to report mental health conditions and mental retardation, and less likely to report musculoskeletal conditions as limiting their daily activities (Exhibit 6). When we compare the reported limiting conditions of the two groups by program however, we find some differences: SSI-only beneficiaries with and without work goals/expectations were about equally likely to report mental health conditions, and concurrent and SSI-only beneficiaries in both groups were equally likely to report mental retardation (Appendix Exhibit A-1). Thus, the differences observed overall appear to be due to the relatively higher prevalence of both conditions among work-oriented DI-only beneficiaries and a higher prevalence of mental health conditions among work-oriented concurrent beneficiaries.

B. PREDICTORS OF WORK-ORIENTATION STATUS

In the previous section we noted a number of differences in the characteristic of beneficiaries with and without work goals/expectations. To determine which characteristics were significantly associated with work-orientation status after holding other characteristics constant we estimated a logistic regression model of the likelihood of being work-oriented as a function of a variety of personal characteristics. A description of the explanatory variables included in the model and the model estimates are presented in Appendix B (Exhibits B-1 and B-2, respectively).

Holding all other characteristics constant, the model estimates indicate the following:

- ***Program Status and Benefit Levels.*** DI-only beneficiaries were more likely to be work-oriented relative to other beneficiaries, but beneficiaries with a higher-than average lifetime earnings (a DI primary insurance amount of greater than 1,200) were significantly less likely to be work-oriented.¹² SSA benefit levels

¹² The primary insurance amount (PIA) is based on lifetime Social Security-covered earnings and therefore represents a rough indicator of the individual's lifetime labor market success. The higher the PIA, the

were not significant predictors after controlling for other characteristics, but those receiving more than \$500 per month in non-SSA benefits were significantly less likely to report having work goals or expectations. Time on the rolls for the most recent period of entitlement was also a significant predictor of work-orientation status. After the first year on the rolls, the more time that has passed since the most recent award, the less likely beneficiaries were to report having work goals or expectations.

- ***Age and Gender.*** The likelihood of being work-oriented decreases markedly with age. Gender was not a significant predictor of work-orientation status.
- ***Race and Ethnicity.*** Beneficiaries who are black and those who are of Hispanic/Latino ethnicity were significantly more likely to be work-oriented relative to beneficiaries of other races and those of non-Hispanic/Latino ethnicity.
- ***Education.*** The likelihood of being work-oriented increases with level of education.
- ***Living Arrangement.*** Living arrangement was not a significant predictor of work-orientation status after controlling for other characteristics.
- ***Health Status.*** Specific health conditions were not predictive of work-orientation status, but a variety of health status measures were significant predictors. With one exception, these measures indicated that those in better health were significantly more likely to be work-oriented relative to those in poorer health. The exception was the variable reflecting indicators of substance abuse. Those reporting such indicators were significantly more likely to be work-oriented than others.

While the findings indicate that many of the differences in characteristics between beneficiaries who were and were not work-oriented noted previously still hold after controlling for other characteristics, some do not. Though work-oriented beneficiaries were less likely to be DI-only, after controlling for other characteristics, DI-only status is a significant and positive predictor of being work-oriented. Another instance is Hispanic/Latino ethnicity. Though beneficiaries who were and were not work-oriented do not differ significantly with respect to this characteristic, after controlling for other

(continued)

higher the lifetime earnings and DI benefit amount. A PIA value of greater than 1,200 is an indicator of relatively high lifetime labor market activity. In our sample, just 15 percent of all beneficiaries had a PIA greater than 1,200 in 2004. Though related, PIA and Social Security benefit levels are not co-linear for a number of reasons: all SSI-only beneficiaries have a PIA of zero but have SSI benefits that vary substantially depending on other income and living arrangements; DI benefits may be based on a spouse's or a parent's PIA (rather than on one's own PIA); and DI benefits are affected by the number of dependents.

characteristics, Hispanic/Latino ethnicity is a significant predictor of being work-oriented. As shown previously, some of the differences are due to differences in the characteristics of beneficiaries across programs. The multivariate analysis allows us to see which characteristics are significantly associated with being work-oriented after controlling for program and other characteristics.

Consistent with findings on the determinants of work activity and work-orientation status presented in previous evaluation reports, the model indicates that younger ages, shorter time on the disability rolls, and higher levels of education are important positive predictors of the likelihood of beneficiaries reporting having work goals or expectations. Age in particular is a strong predictor. Those ages 18 to 24 (odds ratio of about eight) were most likely to report having work goals or expectations. The findings suggest that targeting information about employment supports and interventions to beneficiaries with these characteristics might lead to significant improvements in employment outcomes and reduced reliance on benefits.

PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK TO ALLOW FOR DOUBLE-SIDED COPYING

V. EMPLOYMENT-RELATED EXPERIENCES AND OUTCOMES

In this chapter we present information about the employment-related activities of beneficiaries, focusing on differences by work-orientation status. As there are significant differences in the SSI and DI programs in terms of eligibility requirements and the treatment of earnings, we also examine differences in employment and service use experiences among work-oriented beneficiaries by program. Because very few beneficiaries without work goals or expectations were engaged in these activities, we do not present similar analyses by program for this group.

In the sections that follow, we first provide an overview of the recent employment-related activities (including work and work preparation activities) in which beneficiaries report having been engaged. We then examine service use experiences, including the likelihood of using any services, and among users, we examine the types and intensity of services used and reasons for using them. Next, we analyze employment expectations, employment outcomes based on administrative data, and the reasons beneficiaries report for not working. We then assess beneficiary awareness and use of selected SSA employment supports. The chapter concludes with an examination of months off the disability rolls due to work.

A. OVERVIEW OF EMPLOYMENT-RELATED ACTIVITIES

In this section, we provide an overview of the employment-related activities undertaken by beneficiaries with and without work goals/expectations based on respondent reports in the NBS. In subsequent sections, we provide further detail on these activities utilizing both survey and administrative data.

Not surprisingly, work-oriented beneficiaries were much more likely to report engaging in a variety of work-related activities than beneficiaries without work goals/expectations (Exhibit 7). About one-quarter of work-oriented beneficiaries participated in training and/or received services during the previous year that were specifically intended to enhance their employment prospects, and 41 percent indicated recent work efforts (recent work or actively seeking work). By comparison, only 4 percent of beneficiaries classified as not work-oriented reported engaging in employment service/training activities and just 3 percent indicated any recent work efforts. Considering all of these activities, just over half (52 percent) of work-oriented beneficiaries indicated participating in recent employment-related activities, compared with just 6 percent of beneficiaries classified as not work-oriented.

Among work-oriented beneficiaries, some differences in the likelihood of engaging in specific employment-related activities by program participation status are evident (Exhibit 8). Relative to work-oriented DI-only beneficiaries, work-oriented SSI beneficiaries were

significantly more likely to report that a reason they are not working is because they were waiting to finish school or a training program, and also more likely to be looking for work at the time they were interviewed in the NBS. Although more likely to be seeking a job, work-oriented SSI-only beneficiaries were, overall, significantly less likely to have engaged in any recent work activities relative to DI-only beneficiaries. This is due to their much lower rates of employment at interview (15 percent compared with 25 percent) and during the previous year (22 percent compared with 33 percent). These findings seem logical given the differences in the eligibility criteria for the two programs. DI-only beneficiaries have more significant work histories that qualified them for DI benefits, whereas SSI-only beneficiaries have much more limited work histories that were insufficient to qualify for DI benefits. The same factors contributing to the differences in work histories also likely contribute to the differences in their recent employment success.

Exhibit 7. Employment-Related Activities by Work-Orientation Status

	All Beneficiaries	Work-Oriented	Not Work- Oriented
Recent Employment Service Use and Training Activities (%)			
Not working because waiting to finish school/training program	4	10*	1
Used employment or training services in previous year	9	17*	3
Used employment and/or other services in previous year, specifically for getting a job or increasing income	3	7*	1
<i>Any employment service/training activities</i>	12	24*	4
Recent Work-Related Activities (%)			
Working at interview	9	21*	1
Worked during the previous year	13	29*	2
Looked for work during past 4 weeks	6	13*	1
<i>Any recent work activities</i>	18	41*	3
<i>Any of the Above Activities (%)</i>	24	52*	6

Source: 2004 NBS. Sample size = 7,603.

* Statistically different from beneficiaries who were not work oriented at the 0.05 level, two-tailed test.

Exhibit 8. Employment-Related Activities of Work-Oriented Beneficiaries, by Program

	Work-Oriented Beneficiaries		
	DI-only	Concurrent	SSI-only
Recent Employment Service Use and Training Activities (%)			
Not working because waiting to finish school/training program	6	11 ⁺	15 ⁺
Used employment or training services in previous year	18	21	14
Used employment and/or other services in previous year, specifically for getting a job or increasing income	7	9	5
<i>Any service use/training activities</i>	22	27	24
Recent Work-Related Activities (%)			
Working at interview	25	22	15 ⁺
Worked during previous year	33	33	22 ⁺
Looked for work during past 4 weeks	10	17 ⁺	16 ⁺
<i>Any recent work activities</i>	42	45	36 ⁺
<i>Any of the Above Activities (%)</i>	51	56	50

Source: 2004 NBS. Sample size = 4,433.

⁺ Statistically different from work-oriented DI-only beneficiaries at the 0.05 level, two-tailed test.

B. SERVICE USE

Work-oriented beneficiaries were significantly more likely than others to have used services during the previous year intended to improve their ability to work or to live independently (40 percent compared with 25 percent). Among users, both groups used about the same median hours of services, between 15 and 20 hours for the year, but the mean for work-oriented beneficiaries was significantly higher (Exhibit 9). Among those who used services, the reasons for using them and the types of services received differed in many respects by work-orientation status. Relative to others, work-oriented beneficiaries were significantly less likely to report using services for purposes of improving their health (65 percent compared with 75 percent), and more likely to report using services for getting a job or increasing their income (19 percent compared with 2 percent).

Regarding the types of services used, work-oriented beneficiaries were less likely to use medical services (26 percent compared with 32 percent) and much more likely to use job training and other employment-related services (32 to 36 percent compared with 7 percent) relative to beneficiaries without work goals/expectations (Exhibit 9). Use of other types of services (counseling/group therapy, occupational/speech/physical therapy, special equipment/ devices) did not differ significantly between the two groups.

Exhibit 9. Service Use by Work-Orientation Status

	All Beneficiaries	Work-Oriented	Not Work-Oriented
Used services in 2003 (%)	31	40*	25
Service use characteristics among users:			
Reasons for using services (%)			
To improve health	70	65*	75
To improve ability to do daily activities/be more independent	25	25	26
To find a job/get a better job/increase income	10	17*	2
To access specific services	6	6	6
Someone pressured him/her to use services	4	3	5
Other	12	14*	10
Types of services used (%)			
Personal counseling/group therapy	69	71	67
OT/PT/speech therapy	39	37	40
Medical services	29	26*	32
Special equipment or devices	24	22	25
Training or job modification advice	22	36*	7
Work assessment/job search assistance	20	32*	7
Other	5	6*	4
Hours of Service Use (%)			
< 25	50	49 [#]	52
26 - 100	19	20 [#]	19
101 - 500	9	10 [#]	8
> 500	5	8 [#]	3
Unknown	16	14 [#]	19
Median service use hours	17	18	15
Mean service use hours	116	149*	80

Source: 2004 NBS. Sample size = 7,603.

* Statistically different from beneficiaries who were not work oriented at the 0.05 level, two-tailed test.

[#] Distribution is statistically different from that of beneficiaries who were not work oriented at the 0.05 level, chi-square test.

Among work-oriented beneficiaries, SSI-only beneficiaries were less likely than others to report having used any services in the previous year. Among work-oriented service users, no significant differences across programs in the reasons for using services or in the number of service hours are evident (Exhibit 10). Some differences by program are evident in the types of services used. Relative to work-oriented DI-only beneficiaries, concurrent beneficiaries were significantly less likely to use medical services (19 percent versus 31 percent) and special equipment/devices (18 percent versus 24 percent), and were more likely to use training or job modification advice services (42 percent versus 36 percent).

Exhibit 10. Service Use among Work-Oriented Beneficiaries, by Program

	Work-Oriented Beneficiaries		
	DI-only	Concurrent	SSI-only
Used services in 2003 (%)	41	43	36 ⁺
Service use characteristics among users:			
Reasons for using services (%)			
To improve health	66	66	63
To improve ability to do daily activities/be more independent	24	27	24
To find a job/get a better job/increase income	17	20	15
To access specific services	6	4	7
Someone pressured him/her to use services	3	3	4
Other	16	13	12
Types of services used (%)			
Personal counseling/group therapy	67	78	74
OT/PT/speech therapy	36	31	41
Medical services	31	19 ⁺	24
Special equipment or devices	24	18 ⁺	22
Training or job modification advice	36	42 ⁺	34
Work assessment/job search assistance	31	36	32
Other	6	6	6
Hours of Service Use (%)			
< 25	50	45	48
26 - 100	20	21	19
101 - 500	9	11	11
> 500	8	8	6
Unknown	13	15	16
Median service use hours	17	21	18
Mean service use hours	150	162	138

Source: 2004 NBS. Sample size = 4,433.

⁺ Statistically different from work-oriented DI-only beneficiaries at the 0.05 level, two-tailed test.

C. EMPLOYMENT EXPECTATIONS, EMPLOYMENT AND REASONS FOR NOT WORKING

1. Employment Expectations Among Work-Oriented Beneficiaries

By definition, all work-oriented beneficiaries reported having work goals or expectations, but not all saw themselves working for pay in the near future, and only a minority saw themselves working and earning enough to leave the disability rolls in the next

five years (Exhibit 11).¹³ Overall, about half saw themselves working for pay in the next year, and two-thirds saw themselves doing so in the next five years. Relative to work-oriented DI-only beneficiaries, work-oriented concurrent and SSI-only beneficiaries were somewhat more likely to see themselves working in the next five years (69 and 67 percent versus 62 percent). Though small, the differences might be due to a couple of factors. First, work-oriented DI-only beneficiaries are older on average than work-oriented concurrent and SSI-only beneficiaries,¹⁴ and so more might expect to retire from the labor market in the relatively near future. Second, as shown previously, work-oriented SSI-only and concurrent beneficiaries were significantly more likely to indicate that they were not working at the time of the interview because they were waiting to finish school or training and so more of them might have a longer time horizon for achieving employment relative to DI-only beneficiaries.

Exhibit 11. Employment Expectations among Work-Oriented Beneficiaries, by Program

	Work-Oriented Beneficiaries			
	All	DI-only	Concurrent	SSI-only
Sees self working for pay (%)				
In the next year	51	51	54	49
In the next five years	65	62	69 ⁺	67 ⁺
Sees self working and earning enough to stop receiving disability benefits (%)				
In the next year	19	15	19	24 ⁺
In the next five years	38	34	39	43 ⁺

Source: 2004 NBS. Sample size = 4,433.

⁺ Statistically different from work-oriented DI-only beneficiaries at the 0.05 level, two-tailed test.

When asked about their prospects of working and earning enough to leave the disability rolls in the near future, 19 percent of work-oriented beneficiaries saw themselves earning enough to do so in the next year, and nearly 40 percent believed they could do the same in the next five years. Relative to others, work-oriented SSI-only beneficiaries were significantly more likely to see themselves as earning enough to leave the disability rolls in one year and in five years. This might partly reflect the previously noted differences in the way earnings are treated in the two programs. Relative to DI benefits, SSI benefits are affected more readily

¹³ We do not differentiate by work-orientation status in the analysis of employment expectations because, by definition, none of those classified as ‘not work-oriented’ had employment expectations.

¹⁴ The mean age of work-oriented DI-only beneficiaries is 48 years, compared with a mean of 38 years for work-oriented SSI-only beneficiaries and 41 years for work-oriented concurrent beneficiaries.

by changes in earnings.¹⁵ In addition, those with high DI benefits might be unwilling or believe themselves to be unable to earn enough to replace the benefits that are lost when earnings exceed the SGA level, and so choose not to attempt to do so.

2. Employment during 2004 – 2007

Using the annual IRS earnings data that were matched to the 2004 NBS, we examined whether beneficiaries had any earnings in the years 2004-2007, and if so, the levels of those earnings (Exhibit 12).¹⁶ Overall, 27 percent of beneficiaries had earnings in at least one of the four years, and among those with any earnings, 25 percent earned above the annualized SGA level in at least one year. As expected, work-oriented beneficiaries were significantly more likely to have earnings and to have higher earnings relative to other beneficiaries. Nearly half of all work-oriented beneficiaries (45 percent) had earnings in at least one of the four years, compared to just 15 percent of those without work goals/expectations. Among those with earnings, work-oriented beneficiaries had higher average earnings (\$7,091 versus \$5,121), were significantly more likely to have worked above the annualized nonblind SGA level in at least one year (28 percent versus 19 percent), and were more likely to have earnings in multiple years (80 percent versus 66 percent).

Among work-oriented beneficiaries, SSI-only beneficiaries were significantly less likely than others to have earnings in any of the four years, and both SSI-only and concurrent beneficiaries had lower average earnings and were significantly less likely to earn above the annualized nonblind SGA level in at least one of the four years relative to work-oriented DI-only beneficiaries.¹⁷

¹⁵ SSI cash benefits are immediately reduced by \$1 for every \$2 of earnings above \$65. DI benefits are reduced (to zero) only after earnings exceed the SGA level subsequent to completion of the nine-month trial work period.

¹⁶ As noted in Chapter III, the IRS-NBS record linkage and earnings data analyses presented in this report were performed by SSA staff.

¹⁷The finding that SSI-only beneficiaries were less likely to work above SGA relative to DI-only beneficiaries is inconsistent with findings we have presented previously based on survey data (Livermore et al. 2009) and findings shown in Appendix Exhibit A-3. The survey data indicate that SSI-only beneficiaries who were working at the time they were interviewed were significantly more likely to report monthly earnings above SGA relative to their DI-only counterparts. The difference might be attributed to several factors. First, the survey data represent self-reported earnings and there may be differences in the propensities for SSI-only and DI-only beneficiaries to misreport their earnings. Second, the survey data represent a snapshot in time, whereas the administrative data follow beneficiaries for four years. As SSI-only beneficiaries are less likely to be working in all four years (Exhibit 12) they may be less likely to be working above SGA in at least one of the four years. Third, the survey data represent *monthly* earnings and are compared to the *monthly* SGA level, whereas the earnings obtained from administrative data are *annual* amounts compared to an *annualized* SGA level (the monthly SGA level multiplied by 12). All else constant, if employment among SSI-only beneficiaries is shorter-term or more sporadic relative to DI-only beneficiaries, then we would expect the average monthly earnings based on annual data to be less than the actual monthly earnings during the months when they are employed, and thus contribute to the finding that more are working above SGA when monthly values are analyzed relative to when annual values are analyzed.

Exhibit 12. Employment Activity During 2004-2007 by Selected Beneficiary Subgroups

	All Beneficiaries	All Not Work-Oriented	Work-Oriented Beneficiaries			
			All	DI-only	Concurrent	SSI-only
No earnings 2004-2007 (%)	73	85	56*	51	49	63 ⁺
Earnings in 1 year only (%)	7	5	9*	8	12	9
Earnings in all 4 years (%)	11	5	21*	24	23	15 ⁺
Earnings in any year 2004 -2007 (%)	27	15	45*	49	51	37 ⁺
Average annual earnings (\$) ^a	6,442	5,121	7,091*	8,605	4,781 ⁺	6,087 ⁺
Percent of earners with earnings above annualized SGA level in at least one year ^b	25	19	28*	32	23 ⁺	26 ⁺

Source: 2004 NBS matched to annual IRS earnings data. Sample size = 7,603.

Note: Earnings are expressed in 2007 dollars, adjusted based on the national Average Wage Index.

^a Computed as the mean of the individual averages across all years with earnings among those with earnings in any of the four years.

^b The annualized nonblind SGA level was approximately \$11,000 (ranging from \$10,788 to \$11,017) in each year when expressed in 2007 dollars.

* Statistically different from beneficiaries who were not work-oriented at the 0.05 level, two-tailed test.

⁺ Statistically different from work-oriented DI-only beneficiaries at the 0.05 level, two-tailed test.

When we look at the earnings of beneficiaries with and without work goals/expectations across the individual years, two interesting patterns are apparent (Exhibit 13). First, the percentages who were working in each group remain constant across all years—about one-third of work-oriented beneficiaries and about one-tenth of those without work goals/expectations had earnings in each of the four years. Second, we see a definite pattern of increasing earnings over the four-year period among work-oriented beneficiaries compared to a pattern of relatively flat earnings across the years among those who are not work-oriented. During the first year, though the share of work-oriented beneficiaries who are working is much greater, their average earnings and likelihood of earning above SGA did not differ significantly from other beneficiaries with earnings. Over the next three years, we see a steady increase in both the average earnings and likelihood of working above SGA among work-oriented beneficiaries that is not evident among other beneficiaries with earnings.

Exhibit 13. Percent with Earnings and Selected Earnings Characteristics Among Those with Positive Earnings, by Year and Work-Orientation Status

	All Beneficiaries	Work Oriented	Not Work Oriented
2004			
Percent with any earnings	18	33*	9
Average annual earnings (\$)	6,792	7,196	5,809
Earnings above annualized SGA level (%) ^a	19	20	18
2005			
Percent with any earnings	19	33*	9
Average annual earnings (\$)	7,488	8,110*	5,972
Earnings above annualized SGA level (%) ^a	20	22	17
2006			
Percent with any earnings	18	33*	9
Average annual earnings (\$)	7,739	8,649*	5,574
Earnings above annualized SGA level (%) ^a	22	24*	18
2007			
Percent with any earnings	18	31*	8
Average annual earnings (\$)	8,127	9,159* [^]	5,580
Earnings above annualized SGA level (%) ^a	23	26* [^]	16

Source: 2004 NBS matched to IRS earnings data. Sample size = 7,603.

Note: Earnings are expressed in 2007 dollars based on the national Average Wage Index.

^a The annualized nonblind SGA level was approximately \$11,000 (ranging from \$10,788 to \$11,017) in each year when expressed in 2007 dollars.

* Statistically different from beneficiaries who were not work oriented at the 0.05 level, two-tailed test. Tests of significance were not performed on median values.

[^] 2007 value is statistically different from the corresponding 2004 value at the 0.05 level, two-tailed test. Statistical tests of significance were not performed on median values.

Looking at the shares of work-oriented beneficiaries who had earnings specifically among those who reported expectations of working in the near future, we find that about half (52 percent) met those expectations during the 2004-2007 period (Exhibit 14). Work-oriented SSI-only beneficiaries were significantly less likely than others to have met their expectations during the 2004-2007 period.

Exhibit 14. Percent of Work-Oriented Beneficiaries with Expectations of Working in the Near Future with Earnings During 2004 – 2007, by Program

	Work-Oriented Beneficiaries Who Saw Themselves Working in the Next Year and/or Next 5 Years			
	All	DI-only	Concurrent	SSI-only
Number (weighted)	2,664,587	1,242,785	513,470	908,332
Percent of all beneficiaries (weighted)	30	14	6	10
Earnings in at least one year during 2004-2007 (%)	52	56	58	44 ⁺

Source: 2004 NBS matched to IRS earnings data. Sample size = 3,693 work-oriented beneficiaries with expectations of working in the next year or next five years.

⁺ Statistically different from work-oriented DI-only beneficiaries at the 0.05 level, two-tailed test.

3. Reasons for Not Working

As all beneficiaries provided evidence of health conditions that substantially limit their ability to engage in work, it is not surprising that, among beneficiaries who were not working when interviewed in 2004, the most frequently reported reason for not working was a physical or mental health condition that prevented work (96 percent) (Exhibit 15). Health conditions were not the only reasons reported by a substantial share of beneficiaries, however. About two-thirds of all beneficiaries reported reasons other than their health for not working (statistics not shown). The most common reasons (each given by more than one-quarter of all beneficiaries) were: being discouraged by previous work attempts; being discouraged by the perceptions of others concerning their ability to work; inaccessible workplaces; and the inability to find a job for which they were qualified. The reasons for not working differed somewhat by work-orientation status. Work-oriented beneficiaries were less likely to report their health as a reason for not working (90 percent compared with 98 percent) and much more likely to report nearly all other non-health related reasons probed at the interview.

Among work-oriented beneficiaries who were not employed at interview, differences in the reasons reported for not working were evident by program (Exhibit 16). The findings indicate that work-oriented SSI-only and concurrent beneficiaries were significantly more likely to face a variety of employment obstacles relative to DI-only beneficiaries. Though SSI-only and concurrent beneficiaries were less likely to say their health prevented them from working, they were significantly more likely to report that they could not find a job for which they were qualified, lacked reliable transportation, could not find a job they wanted,

didn't want to lose cash or health insurance benefits, were waiting to finish school or a training program, and workplaces were not accessible.

Exhibit 15. Reasons for Not Working Among Those Not Employed at Interview

	All Beneficiaries	Work-Oriented	Not Work-Oriented
Not Working at Interview (%)	91	79*	99
Reasons for Not Working (%)			
Physical or mental condition prevents work	96	90*	98
Discouraged by previous work attempts	30	40*	24
Workplaces are not accessible	28	34*	24
Cannot find a job for which job he/she is qualified	28	39*	22
Others do not think he/she can work	27	30	26
Employers will not give him/her a chance	18	30*	12
Lacks reliable transportation to/from work	18	28*	13
Cannot find a job he/she wants	13	25*	6
Doesn't want to lose cash/health insurance benefits	11	16*	8
Is caring for someone else	6	9	4
Waiting to finish school/training program	4	10*	1
Other reason	3	5	2

Source: 2004 NBS. Sample size = 7,603.

*Statistically different from beneficiaries who were not work-oriented at the 0.05 level, two-tailed test.

Exhibit 16. Reasons for Not Working among Work-Oriented Beneficiaries Not Employed at Interview, by Program Status

	Work-Oriented Beneficiaries		
	DI-only	Concurrent	SSI-only
Not Working at Interview (%)	75	78	85 ⁺
Reasons for Not Working (%)			
Physical or mental condition prevents work	93	87 ⁺	88 ⁺
Discouraged by previous work attempts	39	44	40
Cannot find a for which job he/she is qualified	34	44 ⁺	43 ⁺
Workplaces are not accessible	31	37 ⁺	37 ⁺
Employers will not give him/her a chance	28	34	32
Others do not think he/she can work	28	30	32
Lacks reliable transportation to/from work	21	35 ⁺	33 ⁺
Cannot find a job he/she wants	21	35 ⁺	26 ⁺
Doesn't want to lose cash/health insurance benefits	12	21 ⁺	18 ⁺
Is caring for someone else	8	8	10
Waiting to finish school/training program	6	11 ⁺	15 ⁺
Other reason	4	5	5

Source: 2004 NBS. Sample size = 4,433.

⁺ Statistically different from work-oriented DI-only beneficiaries at the 0.05 level, two-tailed test.

D. AWARENESS AND USE OF SSA WORK SUPPORTS

The employment support provisions of the DI and SSI programs promote employment by providing information about the effect of work on benefits, providing the means to obtain vocational rehabilitation or other employment supports, allowing beneficiaries to maintain cash and health insurance benefits while working, and allowing beneficiaries to return to the rolls quickly when their work attempts are unsuccessful.

Awareness of DI and SSI work incentives was generally low and differed significantly by work-orientation status in only two instances (Exhibit 17).¹⁸ With two exceptions, 20 percent of beneficiaries or less had heard of each of several work incentives applicable to them. The two exceptions were the DI trial work period and the TTW program (41 percent and 26 percent of beneficiaries to whom the programs are applicable, respectively). These were also the work incentives work-oriented beneficiaries were significantly more likely to be aware of relative to beneficiaries without work goals/expectations. The relatively high rates of TTW awareness might reflect the fact that most beneficiaries in the sample had received

¹⁸ We did not assess all SSA work incentives. For some, information about awareness was not available from the survey and for others, information about use was not available from the TRF.

information about this program (in the form of the Ticket and related materials being mailed to them) relatively recently,¹⁹ and that SSA has made efforts to market the TTW program to beneficiaries.

Exhibit 17. Awareness of Selected SSA Work Supports

	All Beneficiaries	Work-Oriented	Not Work-Oriented
Heard of Provision (%)			
Trial Work Period	41	46*	38
Extended Period of Eligibility	20	20	20
1619(b) Continued Medicaid Coverage	17	20	14
Plan for Achieving Self Support	13	16	11
Ticket to Work	26	33*	21
Impairment-Related Work Expenses	11	13	10

Source: 2004 NBS. Sample size = 7,603.

Note: Statistics for each work incentive provision were computed among those to whom the provision was applicable, based on DI/SSI status at interview.

* Statistically different from beneficiaries who were not work oriented at the 0.05 level, two-tailed test.

Use rates for selected SSA work supports over the 2004-2007 period (based on administrative data) were extremely low overall. With one exception, the use rates were five percent or less (Exhibit 18). Use of section 1619(b) (continued Medicaid coverage) represents the exception, with seven percent of all beneficiaries to whom the provision was applicable (concurrent and SSI-only beneficiaries) having used the provision at some point during the four-year period. As might be expected, work-oriented beneficiaries were significantly more likely to use all of the SSA work supports examined with the exception of Plans for Achieving Self Support (PASS). PASS was used by less than one percent of all beneficiaries during 2004-2007, regardless of work-orientation status.

E. MONTHS OFF THE ROLLS DUE TO WORK

We used administrative data in the TRF to determine the share of beneficiaries who left the SSA disability rolls due to work during the 2004-2007 period by their work-orientation status. Leaving the rolls due to work is defined as having cash disability benefits suspended

¹⁹ Sample members who would not have received a Ticket by the time they were interviewed in 2004 were those residing in phase 3 rollout states interviewed prior to receiving their Tickets (the phase 3 rollout was completed in September 2004, and the 2004 NBS was administered from February to October 2004), and those categorized by SSA as “medical improvement expected” who were ineligible for TTW because they had not yet completed their first continuing disability review.

or terminated for at least one month by reason of work activity.²⁰ In the sections that follow we examine the likelihood of leaving the rolls due to work, assess the extent to which beneficiaries who reported expectations of leaving the rolls due to work were successful in doing so, and present the findings of a multivariate analysis of the determinants of leaving the rolls due to work.

Exhibit 18. Use of Selected SSA Work Supports during the 2004 – 2007 Period

	All Beneficiaries	Work-Oriented	Not Work-Oriented
Used provision at some time during 2004-2007(%)			
Trial Work Period	5	10*	2
Extended Period of Eligibility	5	10*	1
1619(a) Continued SSI eligibility	3	6*	1
1619(b) Continued Medicaid Coverage	7	14*	2
Plan for Achieving Self-Support	<1	<1	<1
Ticket to Work	2	5*	<1
Impairment-Related Work Expenses	<1	1*	<1

Source: 2004 NBS matched to the 2007 TRF. Sample size = 7,603.

Note: Statistics for each work incentive provision were computed among those to whom the provision was applicable, based on DI/SSI status at interview.

* Statistically different from beneficiaries who were not work oriented at the 0.05 level, two-tailed test.

1. Months Off the Rolls Due to Work during 2004 – 2007

Though generally an infrequent occurrence, work-oriented beneficiaries were more than twice as likely to have left due to work for at least one month relative to those who were not work-oriented (10 percent versus 3 percent) (Exhibit 19). Among work-oriented beneficiaries who left due to work for at least one month, about half (4.5 percent overall) left the rolls for longer than one year. Given the lack of work expectations and limited recent work-related activities observed among those without work goals/expectations, it is perhaps surprising that even 3 percent left the rolls due to work for at least one month during 2004-2007. It might be that circumstances and work expectations changed subsequent to the interview in 2004. It is also true that for some beneficiaries, recent work activity at the time of interview was not synonymous with reporting work-related goals or expectations. As shown previously in Exhibit 7, six percent of beneficiaries who did not report having work

²⁰ The TRF variables used to identify those who left program due to work are monthly indicators constructed based on administrative data indicating that DI and/or SSI cash benefits were either suspended or terminated because of earnings. For concurrent beneficiaries to be classified as having left due to work, both SSI and DI cash benefits must have ceased in a given month, and the reason for the cessation in at least one of the programs must be due to work.

goals or expectations reported having engaged in recent employment-related activities when interviewed in 2004. And among those reporting work goals or expectations, nearly half (48 percent) had not engaged in any recent employment-related activities at interview.

Exhibit 19. Months off the Disability Rolls Due to Work During 2004-2007, by Work-Orientation Status

	All Beneficiaries	Work-Oriented	Not Work-Oriented
Months off cash benefits due to work during 2004-2007 (%)			
0 months	94.1	90.3 [#]	96.6
1-3 months	1.2	2.0 [#]	0.6
4 -12 months	2.0	3.1 [#]	1.2
13 - 24 months	1.8	2.3 [#]	1.5
25 - 48 months	0.9	2.2 [#]	0.1

Source: 2004 NBS matched to the 2007 TRF. Sample size = 7,603.

[#] Distribution is statistically different from that of beneficiaries who were not work-oriented at the 0.05 level, chi-square test.

We analyzed the likelihood of leaving the rolls due to work among work-oriented beneficiaries differentiated by those who had and had not engaged in recent work activities at interview. The findings (shown in Appendix Exhibit A-2) indicate that work-oriented beneficiaries who were not engaged in employment-related activities at interview did not differ significantly from beneficiaries who were not work-oriented in terms of their likelihood of leaving the disability rolls due to work over the 2004-2007 period. This does not mean that some or many of these beneficiaries did not engage in any work activity during this period. While many may have worked, they did not work at levels sufficient for them to leave the rolls due to work at rates any greater than beneficiaries who were not work-oriented.²¹

Although the administrative data are likely imprecise in terms of attributing cash benefit suspensions and terminations to work activity,²² the findings suggest that work-oriented

²¹ The IRS earnings data analyses conducted for this report by SSA staff did not differentiate work-oriented beneficiaries on the basis of their employment-related activities at interview. Therefore, we cannot determine the extent to which those with no recent work activities at interview engaged in employment subsequent to interview.

²² The TRF variables used to construct the indicators of leaving DI and SSI due to work are likely imprecise for two primary reasons: work activity not reported by beneficiaries or not processed by SSA at the time the TRF file was created will not be reflected in the indicators; and in some instances the reason noted for benefit cessation may be other than due to work (for example, medical improvement) but employment could have been concurrent with or material to the documented reason for benefit cessation. Both factors will lead to underestimates of months off the rolls due to work in our sample.

beneficiaries might typically overestimate the likelihood that they will work and earn enough to leave the disability rolls. As shown previously in Exhibit 11, 19 percent of all work-oriented beneficiaries saw themselves leaving the rolls due to work within one year, and 38 percent saw themselves doing so within five years. Administrative data covering the year of and three years following their NBS interview indicate that just 10 percent had left the rolls due to work for at least one month. Though lower than their stated expectations, this is still a significant number of exits due to work and suggests that the expectations of work-oriented beneficiaries are not entirely unrealistic.

Among work-oriented beneficiaries, there were differences across programs in the likelihood of leaving the rolls due to work (Exhibit 20). Work-oriented SSI-only and concurrent beneficiaries were significantly more likely (11 percent) to leave the rolls for at least one month due to work relative to their DI-only counterparts (8 percent). This may be due to the reasons noted previously: SSI benefits are more readily affected by earnings relative to DI benefits, DI benefits take longer to go to zero when working above SGA due to the nine-month trial work period, and those with high DI benefits might be unwilling or unable to earn enough to replace the benefits that are lost when earnings exceed the SGA level.²³

2. Likelihood of Leaving the Disability Rolls among Those with Expectations of Doing So

When we examine the shares of work-oriented beneficiaries who left the disability rolls, specifically among those who reported expectations of doing so, we find that only a minority met those expectations during the 2004-2007 period (Exhibit 21). Overall, 14 percent of work-oriented beneficiaries who believed they would earn enough to leave the disability rolls in the next year or next five years had done so for at least one month during the 2004-2007 period. The shares did not vary by program. It is interesting to note that, regardless of whether they saw themselves leaving within the next year or next five years, the large majority of those who did so left the rolls for at least one month by the end of the 2005, or within approximately 1.5 years of interview. This is particularly apparent among the relatively small group of work-oriented beneficiaries who saw themselves leaving the rolls in the next year where 21 percent of them actually did so. The findings in Exhibit 21 suggest that those who achieved their expectations did so fairly quickly (or had done so already at the time they were interviewed).

²³ Cross-sectional statistics of employed beneficiaries portray a somewhat different picture (see Appendix Exhibit A-3). At a given point in time, employed DI-only beneficiaries are about equally likely to be off the disability rolls due to work as employed SSI-only beneficiaries, and both of these groups are more likely to be off the rolls due to work relative to employed concurrent beneficiaries. It is interesting to note that among all SSI-only beneficiaries who were off the rolls due to work at interview, just 45 percent reported being employed at that time, compared with 81 percent of all DI-only beneficiaries. We do not have an explanation for the low rate of employment among SSI-only beneficiaries for whom SSA administrative data indicate are off the rolls due to work. For the sixth TTW evaluation report, we will be conducting an in-depth analysis of the longitudinal employment outcomes and months off the rolls of SSI beneficiaries which may shed light on this finding.

Exhibit 20. Months off the Disability Rolls Due to Work during 2004-2007 Among Work-Oriented Beneficiaries, by Program

	Work-Oriented Beneficiaries		
	DI-only	Concurrent	SSI-only
Months off the Disability Rolls Due to Work during 2004-2007 (%)			
0 months	92.0	88.9 [#]	88.8 [#]
1-3 months	1.3	2.4 [#]	2.8 [#]
4 -12 months	2.1	4.5 [#]	3.9 [#]
13 - 24 months	1.1	3.1 [#]	3.4 [#]
25 - 48 months	3.5	1.1 [#]	1.2 [#]

Source: 2004 NBS matched to the 2007 TRF. Sample size = 4,433.

[#] Distribution is statistically different from that of work-oriented DI-only beneficiaries at the 0.05 level, two-tailed test.

Exhibit 21. Work-Oriented Beneficiaries with Expectations of Leaving the Disability Rolls Who Did So During 2004 – 2007, by Program

	All	DI-only	Concurrent	SSI-only
Work-Oriented Beneficiaries Who Saw Themselves Working and Earning Enough to Leave the Disability Rolls in the Next Year				
Number (weighted)	648,682	242,666	122,600	283,416
Percent of all beneficiaries (weighted)	7	3	1	3
Left rolls due to work for at least one month in 2004-2005 (%)	19	22	17	17
Left rolls due to work for at least one month in 2004-2007 (%)	21	23	22	19
Work-Oriented Beneficiaries Who Saw Themselves Working and Earning Enough to Leave the Disability Rolls in the Next 5 Years^a				
Number (weighted)	1,313,595	554,263	252,795	506,536
Percent of all beneficiaries (weighted)	15	6	3	6
Left rolls due to work for at least one month in 2004-2005 (%)	12	14	10	11
Left rolls due to work for at least one month in 2004-2007 (%)	14	15	14	14
Work-Oriented Beneficiaries Who Saw Themselves Working and Earning Enough to Leave the Disability Rolls in the Next Year and/or Next 5 Years^a				
Number (weighted)	1,426,051	604,900	268,364	552,787
Percent of all beneficiaries (weighted)	16	7	3	6
Left rolls due to work for at least one month in 2004-2005 (%)	12	13	11	11
Left rolls due to work for at least one month in 2004-2007 (%)	14	14	14	14

Source: 2004 NBS matched to the 2007 TRF. Sample size = 3,693 work-oriented beneficiaries with expectations of leaving the rolls in the next year or next five years.

^a Most NBS respondents were interviewed mid-2004. Therefore, information covering only about 3.5 years after interview was available as of the end of 2007, and not the full five-year time period queried of survey respondents with respect to their employment expectations.

3. Determinants of Leaving the Rolls Due to Work

To explore which characteristics were significantly associated with leaving the disability rolls due to work after holding other characteristics constant we estimated a logistic regression model of the likelihood of leaving the rolls for one month or longer during the 2004-2007 period as a function of a variety of personal characteristics. The full sample of all beneficiaries was used to estimate the model. A description of the explanatory variables included in the model and the model estimates are presented in Appendix B (Exhibits B-1 and B-3, respectively).

Holding all other characteristics constant, the model estimates indicate the following:

- ***Program Status and Benefit Levels.*** SSI-only beneficiaries were more likely to leave the rolls due to work relative to other beneficiaries. Those with low SSA benefits (less than \$500 per month) were also significantly more likely to have left the rolls for at least one month during the four-year observation period. Time on the rolls for the most recent period of entitlement was a significant predictor of leaving the rolls due to work for those observed in their second year on the rolls. These individuals were more likely to leave the rolls due to work relative to others during the four year observation period.
- ***Age and Gender.*** After controlling for other characteristics, neither age nor gender is a significant predictor of leaving the rolls due to work.
- ***Race and Ethnicity.*** Those classified as ‘other’ race (neither black nor white) were significantly less likely to leave the rolls relative to others. Hispanic/Latino ethnicity is not a significant predictor of leaving the rolls due to work.
- ***Living Arrangement.*** Beneficiaries who were married with children were more likely than those in other living arrangements to leave the rolls.
- ***Health Status.*** Specific health conditions were generally not predictive of leaving the disability rolls due to work with the exception of mental retardation and those with conditions grouped in the ‘other’ category (conditions other than mental illness, mental retardation, musculoskeletal conditions, sensory impairments, or nervous system disorders). Beneficiaries with these conditions were significantly less likely to leave the rolls relative to others. Three health status measures were significant predictors. Those with severe physical limitations and those requiring assistance with at least one activity/instrumental activity of daily living were significantly less likely than others to leave the

disability rolls due to work, and those in good physical and mental health were significantly more likely to do so.²⁴

In general, few variables in the model were predictive of leaving the rolls due to work during the 2004-2007 period. Some of the findings are consistent with the findings of other models we estimated to explore the characteristics associated with work orientation and employment, however, others are not. For example, age was not a significant predictor of leaving the rolls due to work. This is surprising because age was a significant predictor of work orientation and employment.²⁵ And although DI-only beneficiaries were less likely to leave the rolls due to work during the 2004-2007 period, they were more likely to be work-oriented and employed at the time of the interview. Those with high Social Security benefits and those with severe physical and activity limitations were significantly less likely to be working and also less likely to leave the rolls due to work. The fact that time on disability rolls was only significant among those in their second year on the rolls is not inconsistent with analyses where we found that those on the rolls for one to five years are more likely than others to be work-oriented and employed. Given the four-year observation period for the variable reflecting leaving the rolls due to work used in the model, the outcomes of those in their second year on the rolls at the time of the interview in 2004 were observed until well into their fourth or early into their fifth year on the rolls by the end of 2007.

The finding that age is not a significant predictor of leaving the rolls bears further discussion. Although we have found that age is an important predictor of work-orientation and employment, and that the likelihood of leaving the disability rolls does decline with age,²⁶ after controlling for other characteristics, including program status and benefit levels, it is not a significant predictor. The logit model findings suggests that, with respect to leaving the rolls, the structure of the disability programs (in terms of their treatment of earnings) and benefit levels are more important factors than age.

²⁴ Physical and mental health status was based on the SF-8. See Appendix Exhibit B-1 for the definition of good physical and mental health used in the regression analysis.

²⁵ Logistic regression models predicting employment using the 2004 NBS are presented in Appendix B of Thornton et al. (2007).

²⁶ Among work-oriented beneficiaries, the likelihood of leaving the rolls due to work over the four-year period declines from 10 percent among those ages 18-24 to 6 percent among those age 55 and over.

VI. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The NBS data indicate that a large minority of Social Security disability beneficiaries work and engage in work preparation activities, and many more see themselves as working in the future. In 2004, 40 percent of all beneficiaries reported having work-related goals or expectations. Even if their expectations regarding employment seem somewhat optimistic, they do not appear to be excessively so, given the fairly large share (roughly half) who reported having been engaged in recent work and training activities. Tracking their employment activity over a longer period indicated that nearly half also worked at some time during the 2004-2007 period. It is also interesting to note that the half of work-oriented beneficiaries who had not engaged in recent employment activities at interview were equally likely as those without work goals/expectations to leave the rolls due to work during 2004 – 2007.

The findings suggest that, at any given time, there are three large beneficiary groups that can be characterized by their work-related efforts and expectations. The largest group (60 percent) is made up of beneficiaries without plans or expectations of working. Members of the second group of beneficiaries (20 percent) indicate that they have an interest in or expectations of pursuing work, but are not and have not recently engaged in any work-related activities. A large share of this group might represent beneficiaries with exaggerated expectations, but many might also be dealing with health problems or other circumstances that currently limit their ability to actively prepare for or pursue employment.²⁷ Members of the third group (20 percent) have work goals and expectations and are actively pursuing them. This is perhaps the group to which policies designed to promote and support work will be most successful, although such policies could also be instrumental in converting members of the second group into members of the third. Either way it appears that there is considerable potential to benefit both the government and program participants by structuring the programs in ways that provide greater economic incentives for employment.

The findings suggest that beneficiaries with certain characteristics should be targeted for more intensive information and/or intervention efforts. In particular, finding ways to successfully address the employment obstacles of younger beneficiaries and attempting to do so for all beneficiaries very early in their tenure on the disability rolls seem like strategies that could prove successful in the long-run. In nearly all of the analyses we have conducted for this and previous reports, age and time on the disability rolls were significant and relatively

²⁷ The economy could also play a role, however, during the period covered by this study (2004-2007) unemployment rates were fairly low and steady. The effects of the recent recession were not apparent until early 2008.

important predictors of a variety of employment-related outcomes. But the findings also suggest that even if beneficiaries are working, the structure of the DI program might provide incentives to keep earnings below the level that would reduce benefits to zero. Age was not a significant predictor of leaving the rolls due to work, whereas DI-only status and having high benefit levels were significant and negative predictors of leaving the rolls due to work.

Addressing the limited awareness of the SSA work supports might be one way to facilitate better employment outcomes, but this will only be successful to the extent that awareness and/or use positively affects employment behavior. It is interesting that, with a few exceptions, awareness of the work incentive provisions did not vary by beneficiary work-orientation status. This may in part be because many of the work incentive provisions are “automatic” in the sense that beneficiaries make use of them, regardless of their awareness, as their earnings reach certain levels (for example, the trial work period, extended period of eligibility, 1619(a) and (b)). Greater awareness of these work supports might induce some beneficiaries to attempt work, but greater awareness might also simply allow beneficiaries who would have otherwise gone to work to plan better. The work incentives that are not “automatic” and that require some action on the part of beneficiaries to make use of them (for example, TTW, plans for achieving self support, and impairment-related work expenses) were those that had the lowest use rates, and with the exception of TTW, had the lowest rates of awareness. Awareness might contribute to their lack of use, but it might also be that these supports are poorly designed and/or are not applicable to most work-oriented beneficiaries.

Work-oriented beneficiaries who were not employed at the time of the interview indicated a variety of employment barriers that, in theory, could be addressed by providers in the TTW program. For example, lack of transportation, inability to find jobs for which they were qualified, and workplace inaccessibility were frequently reported barriers that could be addressed by providers, assuming they have the expertise and financial incentives to do so. The new TTW program regulations have increased the financial incentives to serve beneficiaries. In future reports, we will look for evidence that these greater financial incentives led to greater access to services and improved employment outcomes.

REFERENCES

- Bethel, J. and D. Stapleton. "Evaluation Design for the Ticket to Work Program: Final Survey Sample Design." Fairfax, VA: The Lewin Group, July 2002.
- 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, Inc., April 2009.
- Social Security Administration. "2008 Red Book: A Summary Guide to Employment Supports for Individuals with Disabilities Under the Social Security Disability Insurance and Supplemental Security Income Programs." Baltimore, MD: Social Security Administration. Available at [<http://www.ssa.gov/redbook/eng/main.htm>]. 2008a.
- Social Security Administration. "Annual Statistical Report on the Social Security Disability Insurance Program, 2007." Baltimore, MD: Social Security Administration. Available at [http://www.socialsecurity.gov/policy/docs/statcomps/di_asr/2007/index.html]. 2008b.
- 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, Inc., 2008.
- 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, Inc., May 2007.
- Ware, J.E., M. Kosinski, J.E. Dewey, and B. Gandek. "How to Score and Interpret Single-Item Health Status Measures: A Manual for Users of the SF-8 Health Survey." Lincoln, RI: QualityMetric Inc., 2001.

PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK TO ALLOW FOR DOUBLE-SIDED COPYING

APPENDIX A
ADDITIONAL TABULATIONS

PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK TO ALLOW FOR DOUBLE-SIDED COPYING

Exhibit A-1. Personal Characteristics by Program and Work-Orientation Status

	All	Work-Oriented				Not Work-Oriented			
	Beneficiaries	All	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only	All	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only
Number (weighted)	8,786,823	3,478,660	1,643,854	645,556	1,189,250	5,308,163	3,038,249	779,082	1,490,832
Program Characteristics									
Title (%)									
DI-only	53.3	47.3	100.0			57.2	100.0		
Concurrent	16.2	18.6		100.0		14.7		100.0	
SSI-only	30.5	34.2			100.0	28.1			100.0
Monthly SSA Benefit (\$)	788.0	741.7	962.2	645.8	489.1	818.2	1014.4	652.5	505.1
Months Since Initial Award (%)									
<24	3.8	4.5	6.1	4.3	2.4	3.3	4.3	2.1	1.9
24 - 59	19.8	20.0	29.0	13.8	11.0	19.6	28.0	9.1	7.9
60 - 119	23.2	22.1	23.9	18.5	21.5	23.8	27.8	17.1	19.2
120+	53.3	53.4	41.0	63.4	65.1	53.2	39.8	71.6	70.9
Mean Months Since Initial Award	148.8	146.2	122.3	173.1	164.7	150.4	121.8	204.5	180.3
Months Since Most Recent Award (%)									
<24	9.3	9.5	8.3	16.7	7.4	9.2	9.7	14.9	5.3
24-59	25.3	27.6	31.1	30.1	21.4	23.8	27.1	20.8	18.6
60-119	26.1	25.7	25.1	29.2	24.7	26.3	27.8	25.9	23.4
120+	39.3	37.1	35.6	24.0	46.5	40.7	35.4	38.5	52.8
Mean Months Since Most Recent Award	113.3	109.0	107.8	85.5	123.5	116.2	108.3	104.0	138.5
Sociodemographic Characteristics									
Mean Age (Years)	48.7	43.5	48.3	41.0	38.3	52.0	54.7	49.2	48.1
Male (%)	49.7	51.0	54.3	51.3	46.1	48.8	54.9	44.0	39.0
Race (%)									
White	71.3	66.5	75.2	66.1	54.7	74.4	80.1	71.9	64.1
Black	22.4	27.2	20.9	25.8	36.7	19.3	15.7	20.5	25.9
Other race	6.3	6.3	3.9	8.1	8.7	6.3	4.2	7.6	9.9
Hispanic /Latino Ethnicity (%)	10.6	11.6	8.4	16.3	13.5	9.9	5.4	15.0	16.2
Education (%)									
< High school diploma	41.9	37.9	26.5	39.8	52.6	44.5	31.5	61.1	62.4

	All Beneficiaries	Work-Oriented				Not Work-Oriented			
		All	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only	All	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only
High school diploma	35.3	35.5	37.5	36.8	31.9	35.2	41.2	26.8	27.1
> High school diploma	22.8	26.6	36.0	23.4	15.5	20.3	27.3	12.1	10.5
Marital Status/Living Arrangement (%)									
Lives alone or with unrelated others	35.7	35.8	31.2	47.9	35.6	35.6	28.4	43.9	45.9
Lives with spouse or other relatives, no kids	50.0	46.8	52.3	36.8	44.6	52.1	59.7	45.1	40.0
Lives with spouse and own kids	8.1	9.2	10.6	7.7	8.2	7.4	8.9	4.9	5.6
Unmarried lives with own kids	6.3	8.2	5.9	7.6	11.6	5.0	3.0	6.1	8.5
Income as a Percent of Federal Poverty Level (%)									
<100	48.5	49.5	30.2	65.6	67.6	47.9	27.4	73.8	76.0
100 - 299	38.6	38.9	52.1	28.7	26.4	38.4	51.4	23.3	20.0
300+	12.8	11.5	17.8	5.7	6.0	13.7	21.2	2.9	4.0
Health Characteristics									
Childhood Disability Onset (%)	22.8	31.5	17.2	40.1	46.8	17.0	8.4	29.5	28.0
General Health (%)									
Excellent/very good	10.0	16.0	12.6	17.3	20.0	6.0	4.9	6.3	8.1
Good/fair	46.9	53.8	54.4	59.1	50.1	42.4	40.7	48.1	43.0
Poor/very poor	43.1	30.2	33.1	23.6	29.9	51.6	54.4	45.6	48.9
Health Compared to Last Year (%)									
Better	16.1	23.3	22.1	25.1	23.9	11.4	10.5	11.7	13.2
About the same	43.2	47.4	46.5	48.6	48.0	40.5	38.5	43.8	42.8
Worse	40.7	29.3	31.4	26.3	28.1	48.1	51.0	44.5	44.0
Self-Reported Limiting Conditions (%)*									
Mental illness	31.0	34.8	31.7	41.3	35.5	28.5	24.2	31.1	36.0
Mental retardation	7.2	8.1	5.3	11.7	10.2	6.5	3.4	12.3	9.9
Musculoskeletal	36.1	28.5	33.5	26.6	22.6	41.0	45.1	37.9	34.2
Sensory disorders	9.0	8.9	8.6	10.4	8.5	9.0	8.5	10.2	9.4
Other nervous system diseases	15.1	14.0	14.5	13.4	13.8	15.9	18.1	12.9	12.9
Other	63.2	56.1	58.2	50.4	56.3	67.8	69.6	66.0	65.0
No conditions limit activities	4.6	7.9	6.3	8.1	9.9	2.4	2.3	3.7	2.1

	All Beneficiaries	Work-Oriented				Not Work-Oriented			
		All	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only	All	DI-Only	Concurrent	SSI-Only
Difficulty with Specific Activities (%)									
Walking 3 blocks, climbing 10 steps, standing 1 hour, or crouching	84.4	74.3	79.9	71.0	68.4	91.0	94.0	87.0	86.9
Grasping, reaching, or lifting 10 lbs.	67.5	54.5	59.1	48.6	51.3	76.0	79.4	71.7	71.4
Speaking, hearing, or seeing	65.3	60.4	60.5	58.5	61.3	68.4	66.7	69.1	71.7
Coping with stress	58.7	56.9	53.3	61.2	59.6	59.9	54.8	67.8	66.1
Concentrating	55.1	54.6	52.9	53.4	57.7	55.5	50.7	59.2	63.4
Getting around outside the home	46.6	36.1	38.4	32.5	34.8	53.5	53.1	51.0	55.6
Shopping for personal items	37.1	28.9	29.1	30.6	27.9	42.4	39.1	46.1	47.2
Preparing meals	38.0	31.4	30.0	33.4	32.3	42.3	39.3	48.7	45.3
Getting into or out of bed	37.2	29.1	33.2	24.9	25.6	42.5	45.7	31.8	41.6
Bathing or dressing	28.7	21.5	24.3	17.7	19.6	33.5	32.8	31.7	35.9
Getting along with others	26.4	28.0	22.1	33.9	33.1	25.4	20.9	29.3	32.3
Getting around inside the house	22.8	16.2	18.4	13.7	14.6	27.2	28.8	22.4	26.2
Eating	15.4	11.2	10.8	11.0	12.0	18.2	17.3	21.7	18.0
Died post-interview as of December 2007 (%)	8.6	5.8	7.5	4.1	4.2	10.5	11.4	9.1	9.3
Employment									
Worked in 2003 (%)	12.9	29.4	33.1	33.0	22.2	2.1	1.9	3.8	1.6
Working at interview (%)	8.7	20.7	24.5	22.1	14.6	0.9	1.1	1.5	0.4
Goals include work/career advancement (%)	30.2	76.2	72.3	76.9	81.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sees Self Working for Pay (%)									
In the next year	20.1	50.8	51.0	53.8	49.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
In the next five years	25.7	64.9	61.8	68.8	67.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sees Self Earning Enough to Stop Receiving Disability Benefits (%)									
In the next year	7.4	18.6	14.8	19.0	23.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
In the next five years	14.9	37.8	33.7	39.2	42.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source: 2004 NBS linked to the 2007 TRF.

Exhibit A-2. Months Off the Disability Rolls Due to Work Among Work-Oriented Beneficiaries, by Those Who Had and Had Not Engaged in Recent Employment-Related Activities at Interview

	Work-Oriented Beneficiaries		Not Work-Oriented
	Recent Work-Related Activities at Interview ^{a, b}	No Recent Work-Related Activities at Interview	
Months off the Disability Rolls Due to Work during 2004-2007 (%)			
0 months	84.7	96.3	96.6
1-3 months	3.3	0.7	0.6
4 -12 months	4.6	1.6	1.2
13 - 24 months	3.6	0.9	1.5
25 - 48 months	3.9	0.5	0.1

Source: 2004 NBS matched to the 2007 TRF. Sample size = 7,603.

^a Beneficiaries who reported the following at interview were classified as having engaged in recent work-related activities: not working because waiting to finish school or training program; used employment or training services in previous year; used employment and/or other services in the previous year specifically for getting a job or increasing income; working at interview; worked during the previous year; and/or looked for work during past 4 weeks. See Exhibit 7 for the percentages of beneficiaries who reported these activities.

^b Distribution is significantly different from that of work-oriented beneficiaries with no recent work-related activities at interview and from that of beneficiaries who were not work oriented at the 0.05 level, chi-square test. Distributions for the other two groups did not differ significantly from each other.

Exhibit A-3. Likelihood of Being Off the Disability Rolls Due to Work Among All Beneficiaries and All Work-Oriented Beneficiaries, by Selected Characteristics

	All Beneficiaries				Work-Oriented Beneficiaries			
	All	DI-only	Concurrent	SSI-only	All	DI-only	Concurrent	SSI-only
Number (weighted)	8,786,823	4,682,103	1,424,638	2,680,082	3,478,660	1,643,854	645,556	1,189,250
Off rolls due to work at interview (%)	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.6	2.7	3.3	2.2	2.2
Working at interview (% of those off rolls due to work)	66.8	80.6	75.9	44.9	78.8	80.2	83.3	73.6
Working at interview								
Number (weighted)	768,452	435,962	153,741	178,749	718,784	403,021	142,372	173,391
Percent (weighted)	8.7	9.3	10.8	6.7	20.7	24.5	22.1	14.6
Off rolls due to work (%)	10.0	10.3	8.4	10.7	10.4	10.8	8.2	11.0
Working above nonblind SGA (\$810/month)	20.2	17.1	13.8	33.5	20.8	17.2	14.9	33.9
Off rolls due to work (% of those working above nonblind SGA)	29.8	36.2	14.1	27.3	31.0	38.8	14.1	27.8

Source: 2004 NBS linked to the 2007 TRF.

Note: Statistics for beneficiaries who were not work-oriented are not shown due to small sample sizes of those who worked or left the rolls due to work.

PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK TO ALLOW FOR DOUBLE-SIDED COPYING

APPENDIX B
REGRESSION MODELS

PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK TO ALLOW FOR DOUBLE-SIDED COPYING

Exhibit B-1. Logit Model Variable Definitions

Variable Name	Description
Concurrent	=1 if concurrent beneficiary at interview (or at sample date if not on the rolls at interview); 0 otherwise. Based on administrative data.
DI-only	=1 if DI-only beneficiary at interview (or at sample date if not on the rolls at interview); 0 otherwise. Based on administrative data.
Omitted = SSI-only	SSI-only recipient at interview (or at sample date if not on the rolls at interview). Based on administrative data.
PIA >1200	=1 if Primary Insurance Amount (PIA) is greater than 1200; 0 otherwise. Based on administrative data. Proxy measure for high lifetime earnings.
SSA Benefits 500-1000	=1 if total monthly Social Security disability benefits in the absence of earnings are \$500 - \$1000; 0 otherwise. Calculated based on benefit amounts due and countable earnings information obtained from administrative data. Includes all state, federal, and dependent SSI and DI benefits.
SSA Benefits > 1000	=1 if total monthly Social Security disability benefits in the absence of earnings are greater than \$1000; 0 otherwise. Calculated based on benefit amounts due and countable earnings information obtained from administrative data. Includes all state, federal, and dependent SSI and DI benefits.
Omitted = SS Benefits <500	Total monthly Social Security disability benefits in the absence of earnings are less than \$500. Calculated based on benefit amounts due and countable earnings information obtained from administrative data. Includes all state, federal, and dependent SSI and DI benefits.
Other Benefits 1-199	=1 if total monthly dollar value of non-Social Security cash and in-kind benefits is \$1 - \$199; 0 otherwise. Includes only the following other benefits that could potentially be affected by earnings: food stamps; energy, housing, or other in-kind assistance; public assistance; workers' compensation; Veterans' benefits; private disability insurance; unemployment insurance; and pension income among those under age 59.
Other Benefits 200-499	=1 if total monthly dollar value of non-Social Security cash and in-kind benefits is \$200 - \$499; 0 otherwise. Includes only the following other benefits that could potentially be affected by earnings: food stamps; energy, housing, or other in-kind assistance; public assistance; workers' compensation; Veterans' benefits; private disability insurance; unemployment insurance; and pension income among those under age 59.
Other Benefits 500+	=1 if total monthly dollar value of non-Social Security cash and in-kind benefits is \$500 or more; 0 otherwise. Includes only the following other benefits that could potentially be affected by earnings: food stamps; energy, housing, or other in-kind assistance; public assistance; workers' compensation; Veterans' benefits; private disability insurance; unemployment insurance; and pension income among those under age 59.
Omitted = Other Benefits=0	Total value of other non-SSA benefits is equal to zero.
0-12 Months on rolls	=1 if start of most recent period of entitlement is less than 12 months ago; 0 otherwise. Based on administrative data. Time calculated as of date of interview.
13-24 Months on rolls	=1 if start of most recent period of entitlement is less than 13-24 months; 0 otherwise. Based on administrative data. Time calculated as of date of interview.

Variable Name	Description
25-60 Months on rolls	=1 if start of most recent period of entitlement is less than 13-24 months ago; 0 otherwise. Based on administrative data. Time calculated as of date of interview.
61-120 Months on rolls	=1 if start of most recent period of entitlement is less than 13-24 months ago; 0 otherwise. Based on administrative data. Time calculated as of date of interview.
Omitted = 121+ Months on rolls	Start of most recent period of entitlement is more than 120 months ago. Based on administrative data. Time calculated as of date of interview for models estimating outcomes as of interview.
Age 18-24	=1 if age at interview is 18 - 24 years; 0 otherwise. Based on administrative data.
Age 25-39	=1 if age at interview is 25 - 39 years; 0 otherwise. Based on administrative data.
Age 40-54	=1 if age at interview is 40 - 54 years; 0 otherwise. Based on administrative data.
Omitted = Age 55 +	Age 55 or older at interview. Based on administrative data.
Male	=1 if male; 0 otherwise. Based on administrative data.
Black	=1 if self-reported race is black; 0 otherwise.
Other race	=1 if self-reported race is other than white, black or African American; 0 otherwise.
Omitted = white	Self-reported race is white.
Hispanic/Latino	= 1 if self-reported ethnicity is Hispanic or Latino; 0 otherwise.
Education =high school	= 1 if self-reported highest level of education is equal to high school diploma or GED; 0 otherwise.
Education beyond high school	=1 if self-reported highest level of education is beyond a high school diploma or GED; 0 otherwise.
Omitted = Education < high school	Highest level of education is less than a high school diploma or GED.
Lives with spouse or relatives, no kids	=1 if lives with spouse, partner, or other relatives, but has no children living with him or her; 0 otherwise.
Married with kids	= 1 if married and living with spouse or partner in marriage-like relationship, and lives with own children; 0 otherwise.
Unmarried with kids	= 1 with unmarried and living with own children; 0 otherwise.
Omitted = lives alone or with unrelated others	Lives alone or with unrelated others and has no own children living with him or her.
Lives with kids < age 6	= 1 if has own children under the age of 6 living with him or her; 0 otherwise.
Mental illness	= 1 if a mental health condition is reported as a main reason for activity limitation; 0 otherwise.
Mental retardation	= 1 if mental retardation is reported as a main reason for activity limitation; 0 otherwise.
Musculoskeletal	= 1 if a musculoskeletal condition is reported as a main reason for activity limitation; 0 otherwise.

Variable Name	Description
Sensory	= 1 if a sensory disorder is reported as a main reason for activity limitation; 0 otherwise.
Other disorders of the nervous system	=1 if a condition of the nervous system other than a sensory disorder is reported as a main reason for activity limitation; 0 otherwise.
Other condition causing limitation	= 1 if a condition other than those listed above is reported as a main reason for activity limitation; 0 otherwise.
No condition causing limitation	= 1 if reports that no condition limits activities.
MCS = 44-51	= 1 if the SF-8 Mental Component Summary (MCS) health measure is 44-51; 0 otherwise. The MCS is a mental health status measure where higher scores are associated with better mental health. A score of 44 - 51 corresponds approximately to the 25th to 50th percentiles for the general U.S. adult population. See Ware et al. (2001) for a description of the SF-8.
MCS > 51	= 1 if the SF-8 Mental Component Summary (MCS) health measure is > 51; 0 otherwise. The MCS is a mental health status measure where higher scores are associated with better mental health. A score of > 51 corresponds approximately to above the 50th percentile for the general U.S. adult population. See Ware et al. (2001) for a description of the SF-8.
Omitted = MCS < 44	SF-8 Mental Component Summary (MCS) health measure is < 44. The MCS is a mental health status measure where higher scores are associated with better mental health. A score of < 44 corresponds approximately to the lowest 25th percentile for the general U.S. adult population. See Ware et al. (2001) for a description of the SF-8.
PCS = 44-51	= 1 if the SF-8 Physical Component Summary (PCS) health measure is 44-51; 0 otherwise. The PCS is a physical health status measure where higher scores are associated with better physical health. A score of 44 - 51 corresponds approximately to the 25th to 50th percentiles for the general U.S. adult population. See Ware et al. (2001) for a description of the SF-8.
PCS > 51	= 1 if the SF-8 Physical Component Summary (PCS) health measure is > 51; 0 otherwise. The PCS is a physical health status measure where higher scores are associated with better physical health. A score of > 51 corresponds approximately to above the 50th percentile for the general U.S. adult population. See Ware et al. (2001) for a description of the SF-8.
Omitted = PCS < 44	SF-8 Physical Component Summary (PCS) health measure is < 44. The PCS is a physical health status measure where higher scores are associated with better physical health. A score of < 44 corresponds approximately to the lowest 25th percentile for the general U.S. adult population. See Ware et al. (2001) for a description of the SF-8.
PCS51 * MCS51	Interaction of PCS >51 and MCS > 51. Indicator of higher than the U.S. population average for both physical and mental health status.
No ADL, IADL, or functional limitations	= 1 if no reported Activities of Daily Living (ADL), Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (IADL), or functional limitations; 0 otherwise.
At least one ADL or IADL requiring assistance	= 1 if reported having at least one ADL or IADL difficulty for assistance was required; 0 otherwise. ADLs include: bathing or dressing; getting around the house; getting into or out of bed; and eating. IADLs include: getting around outside of the home, shopping for personal items, and preparing meals.
At least one severe physical limitation	= 1 if reported at least one severe physical limitation; 0 otherwise. A severe physical limitation is defined as the inability to: walk, climb steps, lift 10 lbs., grasp, reach, stand, and/or crouch.

Variable Name	Description
Obese	= 1 if Body Mass Index (BMI) is 30 or greater; 0 otherwise. Calculated based on self-reported weight and height.
Substance abuse	= 1 if reported symptoms of substance abuse; 0 otherwise. Symptoms of substance abuse include: a CAGE alcohol score of 2 or greater; being advised to stop using alcohol or drugs by a health professional in past 12 months; receiving treatment for alcohol or drug use in past 12 months; and/or indicating drug use in past 12 months AND the need for larger amounts to get an effect, or having emotional or physical problems from using drugs.
FPL 300+	= 1 if household income is 300% or more of the Federal Poverty Level for a family of the given household's size; 0 otherwise.

Exhibit B-2. Logit Model Estimates of the Likelihood of Being Work-Oriented

	Coefficient	Standard Error	Odds Ratio
Constant	-1.68	0.23	0.19
Concurrent	0.11	0.11	1.12
DI-only	0.23	0.11	1.26
PIA >1200	-0.47	0.13	0.63
SSA Benefits 500-1000	-0.04	0.12	0.97
SSA Benefits > 1000	-0.08	0.14	0.92
Other Benefits 1-199	0.00	0.10	1.00
Other Benefits 200-499	0.01	0.15	1.01
Other Benefits 500+	-0.37	0.15	0.69
0-12 Months on rolls	-0.13	0.26	0.88
13-24 Months on rolls	0.50	0.16	1.65
25-60 Months on rolls	0.27	0.11	1.32
61-120 Months on rolls	-0.04	0.10	0.96
Age 18-24	2.11	0.15	8.22
Age 25-39	1.36	0.12	3.91
Age 40-54	0.83	0.11	2.30
Male	0.03	0.08	1.03
Black	0.39	0.10	1.48
Other race	0.14	0.17	1.15
Hispanic/Latino	0.36	0.13	1.44
Education =high school	0.21	0.09	1.23
Education beyond high school	0.81	0.12	2.24
Lives with spouse or other relatives, no kids	-0.07	0.11	0.93
Married with kids	-0.08	0.16	0.92
Unmarried with kids	0.15	0.15	1.17
Lives with kids < age 6	0.31	0.17	1.37
Mental illness	0.08	0.09	1.08
Mental retardation	-0.19	0.14	0.83
Musculoskeletal	0.03	0.08	1.03
Sensory	0.11	0.15	1.12
Other disorders of the nervous system	-0.05	0.10	0.95

	Coefficient	Standard Error	Odds Ratio
Other condition causing limitation	-0.01	0.08	0.99
No condition causing limitation	0.51	0.22	1.66
MCS 44-51	0.16	0.12	1.17
MCS > 51	0.10	0.09	1.11
PCS 44-51	0.30	0.11	1.35
PCS > 51	0.47	0.14	1.59
MCS > 51 and PCS > 51	0.37	0.16	1.45
	0.44	0.23	1.55
No ADL, IADL, or functional limitations			
At least one ADL/IADL requiring assistance	-0.26	0.09	0.77
At least one severe physical limitation	-0.41	0.08	0.67
Obese	0.08	0.08	1.09
Substance abuse	0.55	0.18	1.74
FPL 300+	-0.10	0.12	0.91

Source: 2004 NBS. Sample size=7,603.

Note: Bold type indicates statistical significance at the 0.05 level.

Exhibit B-3. Logit Model Estimates of the Likelihood of Leaving the Disability Rolls for One Month or Longer during 2004 – 2007

	Coefficient	Standard Error	Odds Ratio
Constant	-0.86	0.37	0.42
Concurrent	-0.03	0.18	0.97
DI-only	-1.11	0.23	0.33
PIA >1200	-0.13	0.34	0.88
SSA Benefits 500-1000	-0.95	0.16	0.39
SSA Benefits > 1000	-0.83	0.3	0.43
Other Benefits 1-199	0.03	0.19	1.03
Other Benefits 200-499	-0.18	0.26	0.84
Other Benefits 500+	-0.21	0.3	0.81
0-12 Months on rolls	-0.01	0.35	0.99
13-24 Months on rolls	0.74	0.27	2.09
25-60 Months on rolls	0.29	0.19	1.33
61-120 Months on rolls	0.23	0.18	1.26
Age 18-24	-0.12	0.26	0.89
Age 25-39	0.13	0.22	1.14
Age 40-54	-0.08	0.23	0.92
Male	-0.15	0.14	0.86
Black	-0.1	0.19	0.91
Other race	-0.81	0.33	0.44
Hispanic/Latino	-0.32	0.25	0.72
Education =high school	-0.29	0.15	0.75
Education beyond high school	0.25	0.21	1.29
Lives with spouse or other relatives, no kids	0.18	0.17	1.2
Married with kids	0.65	0.23	1.91
Unmarried with kids	-0.26	0.24	0.77
Lives with kids < age 6	-0.05	0.18	0.95
Mental illness	-0.22	0.2	0.8
Mental retardation	-0.54	0.18	0.58
Musculoskeletal	-0.09	0.2	0.91
Sensory	0.17	0.28	1.18
Other disorders of the nervous system	-0.11	0.22	0.9

	Coefficient	Standard Error	Odds Ratio
Other condition causing limitation	-0.38	0.16	0.68
No condition causing limitation	-0.03	0.3	0.97
MCS 44-51	0.02	0.2	1.02
MCS > 51	-0.32	0.22	0.73
PCS 44-51	0.15	0.21	1.17
PCS > 51	-0.15	0.24	0.86
MCS > 51 and PCS > 51	0.63	0.29	1.87
No ADL, IADL, or functional limitations	-0.07	0.28	0.93
At least one ADL/IADL requiring assistance	-0.55	0.16	0.57
At least one severe physical limitation	-0.41	0.15	0.67
Obese	0.05	0.16	1.05
Substance abuse	-0.17	0.28	0.85
FPL 300+	0.3	0.19	1.34

Source: 2004 NBS linked to the 2007 TRF. Sample size=7,603.

Note: Bold type indicates statistical significance at the 0.05 level.