

**PY 2012 Customer Satisfaction Survey of Participants
Nationwide Report
August 31, 2013**

I. Overview

The nationwide report for the PY 2012 participant customer satisfaction surveys consists of the tables below that present the nationwide scores for all of the survey questions, as well as the standard analyses – Key Drivers and Questions Most Closely Associated with ACSI Scores – in Section II K. Other than the driver analysis on pages 17-19, the usual narrative explanation has been omitted.

This nationwide report will be most useful if read in conjunction with the complete nationwide participant survey report for PY 2009. The PY 2009 nationwide report contains the background of the participant customer satisfaction survey project, the methodology employed by all grantees, an explanation of the nationwide results for each survey question, and an extended explanation of the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI).

II. Survey Results

A. Demographics and Service History

Table 1

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Gender	Female	6751	64.3%
		Male	3744	35.6%
		Did Not Volunteer	11	.1%
	Race	American Indian	372	3.5%
		Asian	598	5.7%
		Black	3699	35.3%
		Pacific Islander	17	.2%
		White	5348	51.0%
		Did Not Volunteer	456	4.3%
		Ethnicity	Hispanic	985
	Not Hispanic		9078	86.7%
	Did Not Volunteer		412	3.9%
	Education	Less than HS Diploma	2311	22.0%
		HS Diploma or GED	4059	38.7%
		Some College	2281	21.7%
		Post Secondary Certificate	188	1.8%

			Count	Percent
State Grantees		Associates Degree	334	3.2%
		BA/BS	931	8.9%
		Bachelor's Plus	389	3.7%
	Gender	Female	7796	70.0%
		Male	3326	29.9%
		Did Not Volunteer	17	.2%
	Race	American Indian	359	3.2%
		Asian	395	3.6%
		Black	3475	31.2%
		Pacific Islander	95	.9%
		White	6443	57.9%
		Did Not Volunteer	359	3.2%
		Ethnicity	Hispanic	820
	Not Hispanic		9855	88.5%
	Did Not Volunteer		462	4.1%
	Education	Less than HS Diploma	1981	17.8%
		HS Diploma or GED	4477	40.3%
		Some College	2557	23.0%
		Post Secondary Certificate	271	2.4%
		Associates Degree	434	3.9%
		BA/BS	922	8.3%
Bachelor's Plus		474	4.3%	
Nationwide	Gender	Female	14547	67.2%
		Male	7070	32.7%
		Did Not Volunteer	28	.1%
	Race	American Indian	731	3.4%
		Asian	993	4.6%
		Black	7174	33.2%
		Pacific Islander	112	.5%
		White	11791	54.5%
		Did Not Volunteer	815	3.8%
		Ethnicity	Hispanic	1805
	Not Hispanic		18933	87.6%
	Did Not Volunteer		874	4.0%
	Education	Less than HS Diploma	4292	19.9%
		HS Diploma or GED	8536	39.5%
		Some College	4838	22.4%
		Post Secondary Certificate	459	2.1%

			Count	Percent
		Associates Degree	768	3.6%
		BA/BS	1853	8.6%
		Bachelor's Plus	863	4.0%

Table 2

		Count	Percent
National Grantees	Less than 65	7212	68.6%
	65 or Older	3297	31.4%
State Grantees	Less than 65	7348	66.0%
	65 or Older	3790	34.0%
Nationwide	Less than 65	14560	67.3%
	65 or Older	7087	32.7%

Table 3

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Disability	No	8142	78.6%
		Yes	2213	21.4%
	LEP	No	9250	88.0%
		Yes	1261	12.0%
	Low Literacy Skills	No	8254	78.5%
		Yes	2257	21.5%
	Rural	No	7443	70.8%
		Yes	3068	29.2%
	Low Employment Prospects	No	1029	9.8%
		Yes	9482	90.2%
	Failed to Find Employment after WIA Services	No	8714	82.9%
		Yes	1797	17.1%
	Seventy-five or Older	No	9927	94.4%
		Yes	584	5.6%
	Homeless or at Risk of Homelessness	No	6611	62.9%
		Yes	3900	37.1%
	Veteran	No	9181	87.3%
		Yes	1330	12.7%
	Severe Disability	No	10287	97.9%
		Yes	224	2.1%

			Count	Percent	
	Frail	No	1323	98.7%	
		Yes	17	1.3%	
	Old Enough for but Not Receiving Social Security	No	1316	98.2%	
		Yes	24	1.8%	
	Severely Limited Employment Prospects	No	9076	86.3%	
		Yes	1435	13.7%	
State Grantees	Disability	No	8683	78.0%	
		Yes	2451	22.0%	
	LEP	No	10445	93.8%	
		Yes	695	6.2%	
	Low Literacy Skills	No	9761	87.6%	
		Yes	1379	12.4%	
	Rural	No	7139	64.1%	
		Yes	4001	35.9%	
	Low Employment Prospects	No	2908	26.1%	
		Yes	8232	73.9%	
	Failed to Find Employment after WIA Services	No	9143	82.1%	
		Yes	1997	17.9%	
	Seventy-five or Older	No	10460	93.9%	
		Yes	680	6.1%	
	Homeless or at Risk of Homelessness	No	8733	78.4%	
		Yes	2407	21.6%	
	Veteran	No	9669	86.8%	
		Yes	1471	13.2%	
	Severe Disability	No	10890	97.8%	
		Yes	250	2.2%	
	Frail	No	21526	99.4%	
		Yes	125	.6%	
	Old Enough for but Not Receiving Social Security	No	21366	98.7%	
		Yes	285	1.3%	
	Severely Limited Employment Prospects	No	9592	86.1%	
		Yes	1548	13.9%	
	Nationwide	Disability	No	16825	78.3%
			Yes	4664	21.7%
LEP		No	19695	91.0%	
		Yes	1956	9.0%	
Low Literacy Skills		No	18015	83.2%	
		Yes	3636	16.8%	

		Count	Percent
Rural	No	14582	67.4%
	Yes	7069	32.6%
Low Employment Prospects	No	3937	18.2%
	Yes	17714	81.8%
Failed to Find Employment after WIA Services	No	17857	82.5%
	Yes	3794	17.5%
Seventy-five or Older	No	20387	94.2%
	Yes	1264	5.8%
Homeless or at Risk of Homelessness	No	15344	70.9%
	Yes	6307	29.1%
Veteran	No	18850	87.1%
	Yes	2801	12.9%
Severe Disability	No	21177	97.8%
	Yes	474	2.2%
Frail	No	1323	98.7%
	Yes	17	1.3%
Old Enough for but Not Receiving Social Security	No	1316	98.2%
	Yes	24	1.8%
Severely Limited Employment Prospects	No	18668	86.2%
	Yes	2983	13.8%

Table 4

	Number of Barriers per Participant			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	10511	2.8	0	15
State Grantees	11140	2.5	0	14
Nationwide	21651	2.6	0	15

Table 5

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	Duration to Exit in Days	4054	856	0	7,227
	Number of Assignments	10511	1.9	1	12
State Grantees	Duration to Exit in Days	4257	926	1	8,348
	Number of Assignments	11140	1.7	1	15
Nationwide	Duration to Exit in Days	8311	892	0	8,348
	Number of Assignments	21651	1.8	1	15

Table 6

	Exit Reason	Count	Percent
National Grantees	Regular Employment	1222	11.6%
	Self-employment	48	.5%
	Other Reason	2784	26.5%
	Did Not Exit	6457	61.4%
State Grantees	Regular Employment	1180	10.6%
	Self-employment	63	.6%
	Other Reason	3014	27.1%
	Did Not Exit	6883	61.8%
Nationwide	Regular Employment	2402	11.1%
	Self-employment	111	.5%
	Other Reason	5798	26.8%
	Did Not Exit	13340	61.6%

B. Response Rate

Table 7

	Response Rate			
	Did Not Respond		Responded	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
AARP	660	43.0%	874	57.0%
ANPPM	121	32.7%	249	67.3%
ATD	130	35.1%	240	64.9%
Easter Seals	230	41.1%	330	58.9%
Experience Works	714	34.0%	1386	66.0%
Goodwill	163	38.8%	257	61.2%
Mature Services	109	29.5%	261	70.5%
ABLE	120	32.4%	250	67.6%
NAPCA	162	32.7%	334	67.3%
NCBA	207	32.9%	423	67.1%
NCOA	281	36.5%	489	63.5%
NICOA	117	31.4%	256	68.6%
Urban League	201	42.9%	267	57.1%
SER	196	35.0%	364	65.0%
SSAI	372	33.2%	748	66.8%
National Grantees	3783	36.0%	6728	64.0%
Alabama	90	32.0%	191	68.0%

	Response Rate			
	Did Not Respond		Responded	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Alaska	128	47.8%	140	52.2%
Arizona	91	43.8%	117	56.3%
Arkansas	73	32.9%	149	67.1%
California	143	38.6%	227	61.4%
Colorado	39	32.8%	80	67.2%
Connecticut	58	38.7%	92	61.3%
Delaware	114	38.9%	179	61.1%
District of Columbia	54	45.0%	66	55.0%
Florida	135	36.5%	235	63.5%
Georgia	115	40.6%	168	59.4%
Hawaii	92	29.2%	223	70.8%
Idaho	31	39.2%	48	60.8%
Illinois	127	34.5%	241	65.5%
Indiana	134	36.2%	236	63.8%
Iowa	65	36.7%	112	63.3%
Kansas	36	33.3%	72	66.7%
Kentucky	78	34.4%	149	65.6%
Louisiana	83	34.6%	157	65.4%
Maine	24	29.3%	58	70.7%
Maryland	51	35.4%	93	64.6%
Massachusetts	147	48.7%	155	51.3%
Michigan	124	33.5%	246	66.5%
Minnesota	113	30.6%	256	69.4%
Mississippi	46	29.5%	110	70.5%
Missouri	119	33.9%	232	66.1%
Montana	27	36.0%	48	64.0%
Nebraska	57	56.4%	44	43.6%
Nevada	30	50.8%	29	49.2%
New Hampshire	37	40.2%	55	59.8%
New Jersey	159	43.0%	211	57.0%
New Mexico	26	34.7%	49	65.3%
New York	145	39.2%	225	60.8%
North Carolina	125	35.9%	223	64.1%
North Dakota	32	39.5%	49	60.5%
Ohio	128	34.6%	242	65.4%
Oklahoma	64	32.7%	132	67.3%

	Response Rate			
	Did Not Respond		Responded	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Oregon	49	31.8%	105	68.2%
Pennsylvania	111	30.1%	258	69.9%
Rhode Island	23	39.7%	35	60.3%
South Carolina	90	42.5%	122	57.5%
South Dakota	35	35.7%	63	64.3%
Tennessee	72	25.3%	213	74.7%
Texas	134	36.2%	236	63.8%
Utah	28	35.4%	51	64.6%
Vermont	24	38.7%	38	61.3%
Virginia	90	32.8%	184	67.2%
Washington	50	28.7%	124	71.3%
West Virginia	52	35.9%	93	64.1%
Wisconsin	96	31.6%	208	68.4%
Wyoming	30	39.0%	47	61.0%
State Grantees	4024	36.1%	7116	63.9%
Nationwide	7807	36.1%	13844	63.9%

C. American Customer Satisfaction Index

Table 8

	ACSI			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
AARP	874	77.8	0	100
ANPPM	249	87.9	0	100
ATD	240	74.2	0	100
Easter Seals	330	80.1	0	100
Experience Works	1386	80.8	0	100
Goodwill	257	81.3	0	100
Mature Services	261	81.4	0	100
ABLE	250	77.2	0	100
NAPCA	334	82.2	0	100
NCBA	423	86.4	0	100
NCOA	489	81.2	0	100
NICOA	256	84.5	0	100
Urban League	267	78.1	0	100
SER	364	82.4	0	100

	ACSI			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
SSAI	748	84.5	0	100
National Grantees	6728	81.3	0	100
Alabama	191	87.4	8	100
Alaska	140	81.4	0	100
Arizona	117	75.3	0	100
Arkansas	149	84.2	0	100
California	227	79.5	0	100
Colorado	80	77.7	0	100
Connecticut	92	80.0	0	100
Delaware	179	83.9	0	100
District of Columbia	66	73.4	0	100
Florida	235	80.6	0	100
Georgia	168	80.6	0	100
Hawaii	223	87.1	4	100
Idaho	48	74.6	0	100
Illinois	241	81.6	0	100
Indiana	236	81.6	0	100
Iowa	112	77.4	9	100
Kansas	72	80.0	3	100
Kentucky	149	85.6	3	100
Louisiana	157	83.1	0	100
Maine	58	74.3	0	100
Maryland	93	86.7	20	100
Massachusetts	155	76.1	0	100
Michigan	246	80.8	0	100
Minnesota	256	81.6	0	100
Mississippi	110	88.1	27	100
Missouri	232	85.2	0	100
Montana	48	75.9	11	100
Nebraska	44	73.2	8	100
Nevada	29	88.4	0	100
New Hampshire	55	83.4	17	100
New Jersey	211	83.0	0	100
New Mexico	49	87.8	48	100
New York	225	78.5	0	100
North Carolina	223	88.1	0	100
North Dakota	49	83.1	0	100

	ACSI			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Ohio	242	78.9	0	100
Oklahoma	132	87.6	0	100
Oregon	105	68.8	0	100
Pennsylvania	258	77.8	0	100
Rhode Island	35	74.9	3	100
South Carolina	122	84.5	0	100
South Dakota	63	77.7	0	100
Tennessee	213	87.8	0	100
Texas	236	82.4	0	100
Utah	51	78.8	8	100
Vermont	38	68.1	0	100
Virginia	184	85.6	0	100
Washington	124	80.8	4	100
West Virginia	93	81.7	0	100
Wisconsin	208	81.7	0	100
Wyoming	47	80.1	4	100
State Grantees	7116	81.8	0	100
Nationwide	13844	81.5	0	100

D. Treatment by Sub-grantee

Table 9

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	4. The Older Worker Program staff gave me all the information I needed to understand the Older Worker Program.	6907	8.7	1	10
	5. The Older Worker Program staff understood my employment interests and needs.	6910	8.5	1	10
	11. There is someone in the Older Worker Program I can talk to when I need to.	6774	8.5	1	10

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
State Grantees	4. The Older Worker Program staff gave me all the information I needed to understand the Older Worker Program.	7308	8.7	1	10
	5. The Older Worker Program staff understood my employment interests and needs.	7347	8.6	1	10
	11. There is someone in the Older Worker Program I can talk to when I need to.	7199	8.6	1	10
Nationwide	4. The Older Worker Program staff gave me all the information I needed to understand the Older Worker Program.	14215	8.7	1	10
	5. The Older Worker Program staff understood my employment interests and needs.	14257	8.5	1	10
	11. There is someone in the Older Worker Program I can talk to when I need to.	13973	8.6	1	10

E. Supportive Services and Training

Table 10

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	6. The Older Worker Program helped me obtain the supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, housing, or medical care, that I needed to meet my employment goals.	5018	6.5	1	10
	7. Before your community service assignment with your host agency, how much of the training you needed to meet your employment goals did the Older Worker Program give you?	5852	6.8	1	10

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
	12. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	6386	8.2	1	10
State Grantees	6. The Older Worker Program helped me obtain the supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, housing, or medical care, that I needed to meet my employment goals.	5099	6.9	1	10
	7. Before your community service assignment with your host agency, how much of the training you needed to meet your employment goals did the Older Worker Program give you?	5946	6.7	1	10
	12. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	6604	8.1	1	10
Nationwide	6. The Older Worker Program helped me obtain the supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, housing, or medical care, that I needed to meet my employment goals.	10117	6.7	1	10
	7. Before your community service assignment with your host agency, how much of the training you needed to meet your employment goals did the Older Worker Program give you?	11798	6.8	1	10
	12. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	12990	8.2	1	10

F. Host Agency Assignment

Table 11

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	8. The Older Worker Program helped me obtain a community service assignment that was just right for me.	6823	8.5	1	10
	9. I understand that I have the right to ask for a different community service assignment if I don't like the one the Older Worker Program gave me.	6525	8.7	1	10
	13. I feel comfortable at my community service assignment.	6839	8.9	1	10
State Grantees	8. The Older Worker Program helped me obtain a community service assignment that was just right for me.	7202	8.5	1	10
	9. I understand that I have the right to ask for a different community service assignment if I don't like the one the Older Worker Program gave me.	6845	8.6	1	10
	13. I feel comfortable at my community service assignment.	7269	8.9	1	10
Nationwide	8. The Older Worker Program helped me obtain a community service assignment that was just right for me.	14025	8.5	1	10
	9. I understand that I have the right to ask for a different community service assignment if I don't like the one the Older Worker Program gave me.	13370	8.7	1	10
	13. I feel comfortable at my community service assignment.	14108	8.9	1	10

Table 12

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	10. Given your transportation situation, was your community service assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	6084	91.1%
		No	594	8.9%
	17. During my community service assignment, the Older Worker Program pressured me, before I was ready, to leave my community service assignment for unsubsidized employment.	Yes	901	14.9%
		No	5138	85.1%
State Grantees	10. Given your transportation situation, was your community service assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	6470	91.1%
		No	631	8.9%
	17. During my community service assignment, the Older Worker Program pressured me, before I was ready, to leave my community service assignment for unsubsidized employment.	Yes	747	11.5%
		No	5725	88.5%
Nationwide	10. Given your transportation situation, was your community service assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	12554	91.1%
		No	1225	8.9%
	17. During my community service assignment, the Older Worker Program pressured me, before I was ready, to leave my community service assignment for unsubsidized employment.	Yes	1648	13.2%
		No	10863	86.8%

G. Impact of SCSEP on Participant Wellbeing

Table 13

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	14. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program, would you say your physical health is better, worse, or about the same?	Better	1957	28.7%
		Worse	624	9.2%
		About the Same	4226	62.1%

		Count	Percent	
	15. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program, how would you rate your outlook on life?	Much More Negative	177	2.6%
		A Little More Negative	351	5.1%
		About the Same	1327	19.4%
		A Little More Positive	1833	26.8%
		Much More Positive	3144	46.0%
State Grantees	14. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program, would you say your physical health is better, worse, or about the same?	Better	2096	29.0%
		Worse	603	8.4%
		About the Same	4518	62.6%
	15. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program, how would you rate your outlook on life?	Much More Negative	222	3.0%
		A Little More Negative	390	5.4%
Nationwide	14. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program, would you say your physical health is better, worse, or about the same?	Better	4053	28.9%
		Worse	1227	8.7%
		About the Same	8744	62.4%
	15. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program, how would you rate your outlook on life?	Much More Negative	399	2.8%
		A Little More Negative	741	5.2%
	About the Same	2816	19.9%	
	A Little More Positive	3719	26.3%	
	Much More Positive	6446	45.6%	

Table 14

	16. The pay I receive from the Older Worker Program has made a substantial difference in the quality of my life.			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	6867	7.7	1	10
State Grantees	7284	7.6	1	10
Nationwide	14151	7.7	1	10

H. Unsubsidized Employment

Table 15

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	18. How much help did Older Worker Program staff give you in finding an unsubsidized job?	2827	7.2	1	10
	19. How much of the skills and training you need for your current job did you gain from your community service assignment?	2762	6.7	1	10
	20. Overall, how helpful was your community service assignment(s) in preparing you for success in your current unsubsidized job?	2676	7.5	1	10
State Grantees	18. How much help did Older Worker Program staff give you in finding an unsubsidized job?	2849	7.0	1	10
	19. How much of the skills and training you need for your current job did you gain from your community service assignment?	2818	6.5	1	10
	20. Overall, how helpful was your community service assignment(s) in preparing you for success in your current unsubsidized job?	2710	7.4	1	10
Nationwide	18. How much help did Older Worker Program staff give you in finding an unsubsidized job?	5676	7.1	1	10
	19. How much of the skills and training you need for your current job did you gain from your community service assignment?	5580	6.6	1	10
	20. Overall, how helpful was your community service assignment(s) in preparing you for success in your current unsubsidized job?	5386	7.5	1	10

I. Would Recommend

Table 16

	21. Would you recommend the services of the Older Worker Program to other older workers?			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	6558	9.2	1	10
State Grantees	6955	9.2	1	10
Nationwide	13513	9.2	1	10

J. Open-Ended Questions

The last two questions asked respondents to write what they felt was most valuable about the program and what they thought was most in need of improvement. Each grantee has received a CD with the comments that were included in the surveys completed by its participants.

K. Key Drivers and Questions Most Closely Associated with ACSI Scores

1. Driver Analysis

The driver analysis is conducted to determine which aspects of service were most important to overall satisfaction. Table 17 presents those results. First, each of the questions regarding customer service was correlated independently to the ACSI. The results are in the last column and indicate the strength of the relationship (the correlation) between each question's responses and the ACSI (the closer to 1.0, the stronger the relationship), the statistical significance of the relationship (the closer to zero, the more likely the relationship would not have appeared by chance), and the number of observations in the analysis. (Only those respondents who answered the particular question under consideration and all three ACSI questions are included in the analysis.) Then the questions were analyzed together in a regression analysis in relation to the ACSI to see which questions made a significant, unique contribution to understanding what drives overall satisfaction over and above the contribution of any other questions.¹ This analysis narrowed the number of questions with a unique relationship to the ACSI to five, which are shaded in the table. Questions with only smaller correlations or that contribute little unique understanding to the ACSI are unshaded,² even if the individual correlation is relatively strong. The analysis presented in Table 17 is based on the nationwide response to each question.

¹ In the regression equation, the strongest driver for the ACSI, as determined by the correlations, is entered into the equation first. Other drivers are entered into the equation after the strongest, but they are only kept in the equation if they make a significant contribution over and above the previous driver.

² Correlations from .1-.3 are usually considered small, .3-.5 moderate, and above .5 large or strong (D. Kenny, 1987. *Statistics for the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Little, Brown, and Company, Boston).

Five questions are shaded as the most significant independent drivers of satisfaction (Questions 4, 5, 8, 11 and 13). Questions 4 and 5, dealing with participants' treatment by the sub-grantee, are extremely highly correlated with the ACSI and each has a strong, unique influence on the ACSI. The extremely large size of these correlations means that any change in these scores is likely to have a direct and independent change on overall satisfaction. These two questions are areas of strength for the program. The score for Question 4 is high at 8.7; Question 5 at 8.5 has some room for improvement. Continued attention to how participants are treated will help ensure high levels of satisfaction.

The third shaded driver, Question 8, is also very important. It asks the participant to judge the degree to which the community service assignment was right for him or her. This question makes a substantial, unique contribution to the ACS and has a very high correlation. Moreover, the respondents rated this aspect of the program 8.5, indicating there is still some room for improvement.

The fourth shaded driver, Question 11, asks whether the participant has someone to talk to in the program. Like Question 8, this question has both a high correlation and, with a score of 8.6, some room for improvement. Question 13, the fifth shaded driver, asks about the participant's comfort at the community service assignment. Unlike questions 5 and 8, participants rate the program very high on their comfort with the assignment (8.9), meaning this is an important aspect of the program to maintain, but there is not much room for improvement.

Question 16, whether the pay makes a substantial difference in the participant's quality of life, is not as strongly related to the ACSI, and it does not make as strong a unique contribution to overall satisfaction, as the five shaded drivers. It is thus unshaded; however, it almost met the criteria for shading and it is still likely that it has some independent effect on overall satisfaction. Moreover, although the sub-grantees have limited control over this factor, the low score (7.7) indicates that there is substantial room for improvement, if not by raising pay rates, by maintaining the number of hours or providing adequate compensation for missed time. As was the case in PY 2011, many grantees had to reduce community service hours in PY 2012, and that may be continuing to affect this question. This question reminds us that changing people's lives for the better is at the heart of this program.

The remaining unshaded questions (6, 7, 9, 12, 18, 19, and 20) are all moderately or strongly correlated with overall satisfaction, but the correlations are somewhat smaller and they have smaller or little unique relationship to the ACSI. They nonetheless may still be important in individual instances. Many of these questions relate to and are subsumed by the shaded questions regarding how the staff treated the participant and the quality of the assignment. Put another way, sub-grantees that provide the right host agency assignment (Question 8) tend to give the participant the opportunity to request a different assignment (Question 9), and sub-grantees that understand participants' employment interests and needs (Question 5) tend to provide the needed training (Question 12).

Other questions remain important because they have very strong correlations and quite low scores. Questions 18 (7.1), 19 (6.6), and 20 (7.5) which relate to unsubsidized employment; Question 7 (6.8), regarding training provided prior to assignment; and Question 6 (6.7), regarding supportive services, are all areas that should not be neglected.

Table 17

		Relation to ACSI
4. The Older Worker Program staff gave me all the information I needed to understand the Older Worker Program.	Pearson Correlation	.730**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	13733
5. The Older Worker Program staff understood my employment interests and needs.	Pearson Correlation	.748**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	13618
6. The Older Worker Program helped me obtain the supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, housing, or medical care, that I needed to meet my employment goals.	Pearson Correlation	.612**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	9686
7. Before your community service assignment with your host agency, how much of the training you needed to meet your employment goals did the Older Worker Program give you?	Pearson Correlation	.578**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	11290
8. The Older Worker Program helped me obtain a community service assignment that was just right for me.	Pearson Correlation	.663**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	13408
9. I understand that I have the right to ask for a different community service assignment if I don't like the one the Older Worker Program gave me.	Pearson Correlation	.514**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	12786
11. There is someone in the Older Worker Program I can talk to when I need to.	Pearson Correlation	.649**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	13343
12. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	Pearson Correlation	.624**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	12426
13. I feel comfortable at my community service assignment.	Pearson Correlation	.570**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	13460
16. The pay I receive from the Older Worker Program has made a substantial difference in the quality of my life.	Pearson Correlation	.527**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	13510

18. How much help did Older Worker Program staff give you in finding an unsubsidized job?	Pearson Correlation	.571**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	5344
19. How much of the skills and training you need for your current job did you gain from your community service assignment?	Pearson Correlation	.506**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	5254
20. Overall, how helpful was your community service assignment(s) in preparing you for success in your current unsubsidized job?	Pearson Correlation	.626**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	5071

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

2. Other Questions Related to Satisfaction

Table 18

	10. Given your transportation situation, was your community service assignment convenient to where you live?			
	Yes		No	
	Count	ACSI Score	Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	5827	82.8	554	66.5
State Grantees	6155	83.4	602	66.5
Nationwide	11982	83.1	1156	66.5

Table 19

	14. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program, would you say your physical health is better, worse, or about the same?					
	Better		Worse		About the Same	
	Count	ACSI Score	Count	ACSI Score	Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	1863	88.1	594	67.6	4050	80.3
State Grantees	1977	88.5	580	69.1	4299	80.6
Nationwide	3840	88.3	1174	68.3	8349	80.4

Table 20

		ACSI		
		Count	ACSI Score	
National Grantees	15. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program, how would you rate your outlook on life?	Much More Negative	169	60.1
		A Little More Negative	341	65.4
		About the Same	1262	70.8
		A little more Positive	1761	80.3
		Much More Positive	2998	89.7

			ACSI	
			Count	ACSI Score
State Grantees	15. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program, how would you rate your outlook on life?	Much More Negative	208	61.0
		A Little More Negative	373	65.7
		About the Same	1407	72.4
		A little more Positive	1801	80.3
		Much More Positive	3136	90.3
Nationwide	15. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program, how would you rate your outlook on life?	Much More Negative	377	60.6
		A Little More Negative	714	65.6
		About the Same	2669	71.7
		A little more Positive	3562	80.3
		Much More Positive	6134	90.0

Table 21

	17. During my community service assignment, the Older Worker Program pressured me, before I was ready, to leave my community service assignment for unsubsidized employment.			
	Yes		No	
	Count	ACSI Score	Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	844	67.5	4930	84.4
State Grantees	705	65.9	5463	84.8
Nationwide	1549	66.7	10393	84.6

Table 22

		ACSI	
		Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	Male	2203	79.9
	Female	4512	82.0
	Did Not Volunteer	8	87.2
State Grantees	Male	1913	81.0
	Female	5191	82.1
	Did Not Volunteer	11	84.8
Nationwide	Male	4116	80.4
	Female	9703	82.0
	Did Not Volunteer	19	85.8

Table 23

		ACSI	
		Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	Less than HS Diploma	1402	85.9
	HS Diploma or GED	2482	82.2
	Some College	1385	78.4
	Post Secondary Certificate	113	78.4
	Associates Degree	217	77.2
	BA/BS	582	76.6
	Bachelor's Plus	228	75.3
State Grantees	Less than HS Diploma	1138	86.4
	HS Diploma or GED	2764	84.2
	Some College	1551	79.9
	Post Secondary Certificate	160	76.3
	Associates Degree	283	77.4
	BA/BS	579	75.1
	Bachelor's Plus	281	71.8
Nationwide	Less than HS Diploma	2540	86.1
	HS Diploma or GED	5246	83.3
	Some College	2936	79.2
	Post Secondary Certificate	273	77.2
	Associates Degree	500	77.4
	BA/BS	1161	75.8
	Bachelor's Plus	509	73.4

Table 24

			ACSI	
			Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	Barriers	1 or None	1476	81.2
		2	2419	81.1
		3	1959	81.3
		4 or More	874	82.0
State Grantees	Barriers	1 or None	2545	81.0
		2	2508	82.2
		3	1440	81.9
		4 or More	623	82.9

			ACSI	
			Count	ACSI Score
Nationwide	Barriers	1 or None	4021	81.1
		2	4927	81.6
		3	3399	81.6
		4 or More	1497	82.4

Table 25

Exit Reason		ACSI	
		Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	Regular Employment	703	80.5
	Self-employment	28	77.6
	Other Reason	1338	76.0
	Did Not Exit	4659	83.0
State Grantees	Regular Employment	711	82.2
	Self-employment	30	77.0
	Other Reason	1490	77.3
	Did Not Exit	4885	83.1
Nationwide	Regular Employment	1414	81.4
	Self-employment	58	77.3
	Other Reason	2828	76.7
	Did Not Exit	9544	83.0