# VIII   APPENDICES

1. **APPENDIX I: Survey Questionnaire**

Note to IRB Reviewers: This questionnaire will be researcher-administered.  Verbal translation of the questions from English into a different language will be required with some of the research participants.  Such translation will be part of the responsibilities of the respective field assistants who have the required linguistic proficiency.  The field assistants have been identified to reflect the linguistic diversity of the study population.  Many of the potential participants are illiterate (i.e. cannot read or write) in any language, and therefore translating this questionnaire into any of the African languages will not make it any more useful for the illiterate participants, not eliminate the need for verbal translation.

Opening Remarks by Researcher:  Greetings, and thank you for accepting to participate in this short survey.  My name is Utiang Ugbe.  I am from Nigeria, and am a student at Southern New Hampshire University in Manchester.   We are studying the factors affecting employment and entrepreneurial activities among African refugees in New Hampshire.  We expect the survey take about ten minutes of your time.  We will read each question to you, and record your answer accordingly.

Before starting the survey, we want you to listen carefully while we explain further the purpose of the study, and we will ask you to sign a Consent Form to indicate that you willingly participated in the survey.  [NOW READ THE CONSENT FORM TO THE PARTICIPANT, AND RESPOND TO ANY QUESTIONS THEY MAY ASK FOR CLARITY]

(WHEN RESPONDENT IS READY TO START, PROCEED AS FOLLOWS)


1. What is your age?   _____


2. Do you have children?  (CHECK "YES" OR "NO" BELOW, AS APPLICABLE)


Yes/No

[IF THE ANSWER IN 2 ABOVE IS "YES", GO TO QUESTION 3; IF "NO", GO TO QUESTION 4]


3. How many children do you have?          _____

4. What is your marital status? (PLEASE CHECK THE ONE APPLICABLE BELOW)

(a) Single

(b) Married

(c) Separated

(d) Divorced

(e) Widowed

5. What is your spouse's occupation?

6. What is your native language?          _____

7. What other languages do you speak and understand?     _____

8. What is your nationality of origin?                    _____

9. Are you a male or a female? (CHECK "MALE" OR "FEMALE" BELOW, AS APPLICABLE)

Male/Female

10. What year did you arrive in America?     _____

11. What was your occupation in your country of origin before you became a refugee?

_____

12. What other occupational skills did you have before you came to America?

　　_____

13. What is your current occupation?　　_____

14. What other occupations have you been engaged in since you came to America?

　　_____

15. What is your current hourly or weekly wage?　　_____

16. Could we please have your telephone number, to enable us contact you again?
(CHECK "YES" OR "NO", AS PER RESPONDENT'S DECISION)

　　　　Yes/No

　　_____

(IF YES TO QUESTION 14, WRITE THE TELEPHONE NUMBER ON THE LINE ABOVE.  IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 15)

17. Could we please have your name?　 Yes/No

(IF YES TO QUESTION 15, WRITE THE NAME ON THE LINE ABOVE.  IF NO, GO TO CLOSING REMARK)

Closing remarks: Thank you for your cooperation in completing this survey.  Goodbye!

## 2. APPENDIX II: Interview Question Guide

*Introduction*

GREETINGS! (Researcher will learn from Field Assistant how to greet in the participant's language).

OPENING STATEMENT (to be interpreted by Field Assistant if participant does not understand English):

My name is Utiang Ugbe. I am from Nigeria, and am studying at southern New Hampshire University. I am conducting a research on factors affecting employment and entrepreneurial activities among African refugees in New Hampshire. The purpose of the study is to understand the factors in order to recommend appropriate policy, program and self-help interventions for promoting economic self-reliance among African refugees in New Hampshire. Thank you for accepting to participate in this interview, which we expect to take about one hour and thirty minutes.

Before we start, we want to further explain the purpose of the study and the interview method, and we will ask you to sign a Consent Form to show that you are willingly participating in the interview. [NOW READ THE CONSENT FORM TO THE PARTICIPANT, AND RESPOND TO ANY QUESTIONS THEY MAY ASK FOR CLARITY]

WHEN PARTICIPANT IS READY, AND AFTER SIGNING THE CONSENT FORM, PROCEED WITH THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

Question 1
   Would you like us to use your true name, or a nickname? You may choose to be identified by any name instead of your true name. We will respect your decision and choice on this. What name would you like us call you?

Question 2
   What is your country of origin?

Question 3
   In what year did you arrive in America?

Question 4
   ⇨ (a) Where were you living before you came to America? (b) Were you living in a refugee camp, or staying on your own?

   ⇨ (b) How long did you live there before coming to America?

Question 5
⇨ (a) Since you arrived in America, where else have you lived outside New Hampshire?

⇨ (b) {IF PARTICIPANT MOVED TO NEW HAMPSHIRE FROM ANOTHER PART OF THE USA – IF PARTICIPANT IS A SECONDARY MIGRANT} Why did you move to New Hampshire?

Question 6
⇨ (a) Please tell us about your personal experiences that made you leave your country of origin.

⇨ (b) {AFTER RESPONDING TO QUESTION 6(a) What did you do, or what did someone do to make you stay alive and safe during that difficult time?

Question 7
⇨ (a) What level of formal schooling have you completed?

⇨ (b) {IF THE INFORMATION IS NOT INCLUDED IN RESPONDENT'S ANSWER TO QUESTION 7(a) What occupational or professional training have you completed?

⇨ (c) What was your occupation in your country of origin before you became a displaced person?

⇨ Is there anything else you would like to tell us about your occupational experience during the period before you came to America?

Question 8
⇨ (a) What is your current occupation?

⇨ (b) If you don't mind telling us, how much money do you earn from your job each week?

⇨ (c) What other jobs have you held since your arrival in America?

⇨ (d) {IF RESPONDENT HAS PREVIOUSLY HAD OTHER JOBS} Why did you leave your previous job for the current job?

⇨ (e) {IF RESPONDENT'S OCCUPATION IS DIFFERENT FROM THE ONE SHE/HE WAS ENGAGED IN HER/HIS COUNTRY OF ORIGIN} Why are you in a different occupation now than the occupation you had in your country of origin?

Question 9
Please tell us about your experiences in your current job or occupation.

{IF RESPONDENT IS NOT CURRENTLY EMPLOYED, ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS}

Question 10
Why are you not currently employed?

Question 11
⇨ (a) As an unemployed person, how are you able to afford your housing, food, healthcare, clothing, and family upkeep expenses?

⇨ (b) {IF RESPONDENT IS EMPLOYED BUT HAS A LOW WEEKLY INCOME RELATIVE TO FAMILY SIZE, FOR EXAMPLE $400 FOR A FAMILY OF 6} Given the number of people in your family, how are you able to afford your housing, food, healthcare, clothing, and family upkeep expenses?

{IF RESPONDENT'S ANSWER TO QUESTION 11(a)/11(b) IS NOT CLEAR, ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS}

⇨ (c) Are you currently receiving housing assistance? If yes, where are you getting the assistance from?

⇨ (d) Are you currently receiving food assistance? If yes, where are you getting the assistance from?

⇨ (e) Are you currently receiving healthcare assistance? If yes, where are you getting the assistance from?

⇨ (f) Are you currently receiving clothing assistance? If yes, where are you getting the assistance from?

⇨ (g) What other type of assistance are you getting to support yourself or your family?

{IF RESPONDENT IS ENGAGED IN ENTREPRENEURIAL OR ANY OTHER INCOME-GENERATING ACTIVITIES, ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTION}

Question 12
> (a) What income-generating activities do you engage in either sometimes or regularly?

> (b) What type of people are your clients or customers?
> (c) Why do you think the clients or customers come to you and not somewhere else?

> (d) Since you can make money from these activities, why have you not started a formal business to enable you make more money?

Question 13
What economic activities (e.g. occupational skill) are you considering in your future plans?

Question 14
> (a) What other experiences are you having in America that you would like to tell us about?

{FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS IF NEEDED}

> (b) Are you married?

> (c) {IF YES TO QUESTION 14 (b)} Are you living with your spouse now?

> (d) What is your spouse's occupation?

> (e) Do you have children?

> (f) {IF YES TO QUESTION 14 (e)} How many children do you have?

> (g) Is everything going well in your family?

> (h) Are you in the process of reuniting with your family members who are still in your country of origin?

> (i) {IF YES TO QUESTION 14 (h)} Why did your family member(s) not accompany you to America when you came?

> (j) Who looks after your children when you have to go somewhere?

> (k) How do you conduct transactions outside your home where you need to communicate in English?

> (l) What is your impression of the American way of life?

⇨ (m) Tell us about friends and people you usually associate with here in New Hampshire.

⇨ (n) What is your native language?

⇨ (o) What other languages do you speak or understand?

⇨ (p) In what language do you communicate with people outside your home here in New Hampshire?

Question 15
⇨ (a) We would like to interview some other refugees from your country, and we need you to introduce us to three of such persons. Could you do that for us?

{IF RESPONDENT AGREES TO THE REQUEST IN Question 15 (a), FOLLOW UP WITH Question 15 (b) and (c) BELOW}

⇨ (b) What are the names and telephone numbers of the three persons?

⇨ (c) When do you think would be the best time to meeting them?

⇨ (d) When we contact these persons, may we say that we got their names and telephone numbers from you?

⇨ (e) We would like to have your telephone number to enable call you if we need to. If that is fine with you, what is your number?

Question 16
Are there any questions you would like to ask us now?

CLOSING STATEMENT:
Thank you for your time today. We have learned a lot from you, and we would like to come back and talk with you again soon if we need to. Good bye.

### 3. APPENDIX III: Trustworthiness of the Data

During the fieldwork, some participants hesitated before responding to some of the questions. Such questions generally had to do with (1) the participants' age; (2) whether the participant are receiving housing, food or medical subsidies; (3) whether they are engaging in any informal income-generating activities working from home, (4) the aspects of personal information that could enable one to construct a profile of the participant; and (5) the narrative of personal experiences relating to the events that led to the participant's flight into exile.

Below are the specific incidents that could have affected the trustworthiness of the data collected in those situations.

i.) <u>Age of Participants</u>

Many of the participants did not know their true date of birth. In response to the question "What is your age?" one participant replied: "do you want my real age or the one on my Passport?" Several other participants, particularly the illiterate ones did not know their true age because they did not know their year of birth, but had been an arbitrary age by aid agencies during their sojourn in refugee camps in Africa. In such situations, the official date of birth on the participant (as in a Passport or any official document) served to determine his/her age.

ii.) <u>Identifying With  the Welfare System</u>

On the question of who was receiving housing, food or medical subsidies from public or private (nonprofit) sources, some interview participants seemed reluctant to provide a straight-forward answer. For example, one participant who was employed said

that he did not want to report that he was working because it was not a permanent job, and reporting it could lead to his subsidies being withheld. He said that he made such a mistake before, and his family experienced severe hardship because shortly after reporting, his subsidies were withdrawn and he lost the job. He claimed that it took more than six weeks to restore his TANF, and vowed never to "make that mistake again."

iii.) Declaring Informal Income

Indeed, most participants did deny engaging in any informal income-generating activities, despite the availability of such information from an indirect source prior to meeting with some of the participants. Most of the participants understood that living in Section 8 housing prohibited them from engaging in income-generating activities, and that reporting such income could jeopardize the housing subsidy. One participant said that her income from hairstyling was sporadic, and therefore she did not want to declare it and lose her current benefits.

iv.) Giving Incomplete Information

One female participant, who had three children, had initially said that she was a widow, and was living in a fully subsidized apartment and receiving food stamps. After the interview, and just before the research team could leave the apartment, a man opened the front door with his own key and walked in, saying hello to us and entering a bedroom. The woman said something to the field assistant in their native language, and the research team left the room. Once outside, the field assistant revealed that the woman had cautioned him to say that the man was her brother just visiting for a few days, instead of

the truth which was that the man was her live-in spouse and was a full-time factory employee.

v.) Other Forms of Information Management by Participants

Another example was the way that the male respondents avoided revealing any information on the possibility that they had a military background. Even the Sudanese participants, regardless of the well-known, decades-long military draft for all male high-school graduates in that country, did not mention being involved in the military when they talked about their previous occupational backgrounds. Across the nationality cohorts sampled, it was learned from indirect sources that some of the male participants had been combatants under a variety of situations before becoming refugees. Many of the male respondents did not want to talk about the events that led to their becoming refugees. They generally just said 'civil war' or 'persecution'. The female participants, on the contrary, were generally more informative on the immediate events which led to their flight into exile.

vi.) Polygamous Families

The study found a few cases of polygamy among the participants; perhaps further inquiry could find out the extent to which the practice exists among the African refugee population in New Hampshire. The first information on this was accessed by accident. A participant, who initially had said that she was a widow and also had children and a full-time job, was asked who looked after the children when she was at work. She replied that her mate (the other wife) lived only a few blocks from hers. She further revealed that when her husband was visiting on his one-week-per-month scheduled visits, her children

did not need to go anywhere because the man's job was in the second shift and it was part-time.

The man had three wives who all lived in Manchester but at different street addresses. The rotating husband spent two weeks per month with the senior wife and one week per month with each of the junior wives. The researcher gathered that the two junior wives had declared as widows during the asylum application process and were fortunate to all be accepted into the same country. In this case, although it appears that all of the three wives were not initially resettled in New Hampshire, reuniting was relatively easier within the United States once they were in the country. Some polygamous families were not so fortunate because the different wives and children were resettled in different Western countries separated by long distances. There were two other cases of polygamy among the participants, and the practice existed among the three nationality cohorts sampled. That polygamous practices have continued to thrive among the resettled African refugee populations in a Western context where it is illegal, as well as the fact that it survived the rigorous asylum eligibility screening process, attests to (1) the ability of refugees to survive through adaptation to a variety of constraining situations; (2) the difficulty of obtaining factual information from (and the risk of being deceived by) African refugees in formal institutional settings; and (3) the insightful point made by Kibreab (2004) that some African refugees appear to operate under two different moral codes of behavior – one when under formal institutional settings and another when dealing with cultural or ethnic kindred.

It seems that refugees, being essentially survivors and capable of adapting to constraining situations, are careful to reveal only the information that will not jeopardize

their best interest in any given situation. Gaim Kibreab, an experienced researcher on African refugees in Ethiopia, Egypt, Kenya, and Tanzania, reports (Kibreab 2004: 1-3) that many refugees do exhibit "cavalier attitudes towards the rules that govern allocation and distribution of [humanitarian] aid and [some also show a] propensity to behave in a morally unrestrained manner in their interactions with [formal institutions] . . ." However, the same individuals would exhibit a strong loyalty to "their pre-displacement social [cultural] institutions." This prompts Kibreab to ask: why do refugees behave differently under two different moral systems with different actors, and how should this problem be solved?

On why researchers are not reporting cases of cheating among refugees, Kibreab (2004: 2) posits the following reasons:

> Firstly, the fact that maximizing benefits through misrepresentation is considered common knowledge may suggest to some researchers that it is not worth discussing. Secondly, some may believe that in a climate increasingly hostile to asylum seekers, research findings about cheating may be used to further erode the principles, rules, and norms of the international protection regime which are already under threat. Thirdly, researchers may fear that if it is admitted that some refugees [are cheating], donors might use this pretext to reduce their contributions, exacerbating the plight of those whose survival is dependent on international handouts. Fourthly, many believe that that the reasons why refugees resort to cheating is a psychological change they undergo as a result of the refugee experience (the infamous 'refugee syndrome'). Fifthly, some may argue that there is nothing surprising about refugees cheating because any in their position would adopt the same survival strategy. Sixthly, some may see this behavior as part of the general human tendency to maximize self-interest at the expense of others, and therefore as needing no explanation. Lastly and most importantly, researchers may avoid talking about this problem for reasons of political correctness.

Kibreab further narrates how some aid agencies and host national government agencies engage in coaching refugees to provide deceitful population numbers because of

the implication for the inflow of aid money or food from the international community.

Citing a number of situations from Somalia as an example, Kibreab (2004:4) continues:

> Though the figure circulating among international aid agencies in the country in 1980 was 650,000 (which was no more than a guess), the government insisted that it had actually registered 1.3 million refugees [and claiming] that another half million were self-settled in towns and rural areas. The officials of the National Refugee Council (NRC) achieved this by different deceitful measures. Some refugee families received preferential treatment to register as many as 30 members (with most of them fictitious), either because of their wealth or clan-based affiliation with NRC staff. Many refugee families also exaggerated their household sizes and collected more rations than they would have been entitled to. It was also common for refugees to register in more than one camp and to hold two or more entitlement cards enabling them to collect double, triple or even more rations. Large numbers of Somali citizens also bribed NRC officials in return for being registered as refugees so that they could also collect food rations in the camps (Tucker 1982:22).

On the basis of the incidents and literature cited and discussed above, it is reasonable and realistic to expect that some of the information collected from interview participants in this study was not completely factual. However, the compiled aggregate traits, trends, tendencies, perceived problems, and general experiences add up to, and reflect, a true, fair, and accurate characterization of the study population and its socioeconomic conditions. This is because the participants' information on their labor market was triangulated with secondary data collected from the Lutheran Social Services of New England (LSS-NE), while other aspects of the information were triangulated with the field assistants and the community-based resource persons who were interviewed.

# 4. Appendix IV: Methodological Findings

Methodological findings are related to the peculiarities of research design, the methods of data collection, or the study population. Reporting the methodological findings is important because it enables researchers intending to focus on similar study populations, or use similar research design or data collection methods, to be aware of the possible outcomes. Another intention for presenting the methodological findings here is provide a context to enable readers to understand some of the core findings of the research.

## A  Signing the Consent Form

The plan for administering the Participant Consent Form assumed that illiterate participants would thumb-print the Form if they agreed to the purpose of the research. Therefore, the research team acquired violet ink pads for that purpose prior to fieldwork. It turned out that none of the initial thirty survey or interview participants wanted to thumb-print the Consent Form. They all chose to inscribe their name in any way they could, or have either their child or the field assistant sign on their behalf.

All the thirty illiterate participants who refused to thumb-print were Sudanese, since that was the first nationality cohort surveyed or interviewed. The field assistant explained that he thought there were two possible reasons for the refusal. The first was that he thought such participants were probably making a statement to the effect that "I may be illiterate, but here's my son or daughter who can write for me;" and the second was that for many rural dwellers in African countries, thumb-printing a document was

historically associated with very important legal transactions, such as the sale of land or a peace treaty between warring parties. They did not accord the survey such importance.

Furthermore, illiterate participants who refused to thumb-print the consent form and did not want their children to sign it on their behalf, but asked the field assistant to sign for them, were probably demonstrating their distrust and self-defense. One participant said, laughingly, that he had been in New Hampshire since 2002, and nobody had ever asked him to thumb-print any document. He said: "Even when I obtained my driver's license, nobody required me to thumb-print. And when I'm applying for a new job, I get my nephew to fill out the job application form and sign it for me, and I'm usually there myself. Please go ahead with your interview."

The other participant who declined to sign the Consent Form was illiterate, but had a teenage son who collected the form, stared blankly at the page, and handed it back to the field assistant. The woman then told the research team that her husband had cautioned her against signing documents on her own. When informed that her husband had previously agreed to her participating, she threw up her arms and shook her head, implying 'No'. The team left the apartment. Over the phone, the man later claimed to be too busy to take part in the survey or interview, and said that his wife would not know the answers to the questions.

## B  *Refusal to Participate in the Study*

Five individuals – including two Nigerians and three Sudanese, declined to participate in the study. The Sudanese said that they did not have the time to be interviewed. As with most of the participants, the two Nigerians had been approached in advance to schedule the interview date, time and place. But they later declined to

participate, and their reasons were similar to each other, even though the researcher had not mentioned being in touch with the other person. The two seemed to have talked about the study and resolved to not participate. It seems that they did not want to participate because the researcher was a Nigerian, although they did not explicitly say so.

One of the Nigerians said that he did not consider himself a refugee anymore and, therefore, did not belong to the study population. In his words, "a refugee is someone who has no home, no job, and no money. I have a job, a car, and a place to live. I don't beg anyone for food or house rent. Therefore I'm not a refugee. You said it yourself that you're looking for refugees, and I'm not one of them." The participant's intriguing self-identity illustrates the theoretical view that development practitioners and intended beneficiaries can sometimes have contrasting perspectives on reality (Chambers, 1999), and that lack of awareness of one's socioeconomic context can be a major cause of economic poverty (Burkey, 2000).

The other Nigerian insisted that he did not understand the motive of the study, despite being briefed twice. According to him, "Americans researchers themselves have been coming here to interview me and my family about our health, so I don't know why they should send you to come and question me again. Nobody can force me to go back to Nigeria, because when I was there, nobody cared about me. By God's grace, I will only go back one day on my own."

## 5. Appendix V: SPSS Outputs for Statistical Measures of Association

# Frequencies

**Statistics**

Participants' Current Hourly Wage Rate (US dollars)

| N | Valid | 279 |
|---|---|---|
| | Missing | 0 |
| Mean | | 7.6297 |
| Median | | 8.2500 |
| Mode | | 8.00 |
| Range | | 14.00 |
| Minimum | | .00 |
| Maximum | | 14.00 |

# Crosstabs

**Case Processing Summary**

| | Cases | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Participants' Current Hourly Wage Rate (Recoded) * Level of Formal Education Completed by Participants | 250 | 89.6% | 29 | 10.4% | 279 | 100.0% |

**Participants' Current Hourly Wage Rate (Recoded) * Level of Formal Education Completed by Participants Crosstabulation**

% within Level of Formal Education Completed by Participants

| | | Level of Formal Education Completed by Participants | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | No school at all | Elementary School | High School | Still a college student | College or Technical Institute graduate | Total |
| Participants' Current Hourly Wage Rate (Recoded) | $5 or less | 3.4% | | | | | 2.0% |
| | More than $5 to $10 | 96.6% | 90.3% | 77.8% | | 66.7% | 89.2% |
| | More than $10 | | 9.7% | 22.2% | 100.0% | 33.3% | 8.8% |
| Total | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Chi-Square Tests**

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pearson Chi-Square | 52.856[a] | 8 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 53.628 | 8 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 41.553 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 250 | | |

a. 10 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

# Crosstabs

**Case Processing Summary**

| | Cases | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Participants' Current Hourly Wage Rate (US dollars) * Participants age (in years) | 250 | 89.6% | 29 | 10.4% | 279 | 100.0% |

**Chi-Square Tests**

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 1187.837[a] | 896 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 532.997 | 896 | 1.000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 7.479 | 1 | .006 |
| N of Valid Cases | 250 | | |

a. 955 cells (99.8%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .00.

**Symmetric Measures**

| | | Value | Asymp. Std. Error[a] | Approx. T[b] | Approx. Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Interval by Interval | Pearson's R | .173 | .071 | 2.771 | .006[c] |
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Spearman Correlation | .225 | .065 | 3.628 | .000[c] |
| N of Valid Cases | | 250 | | | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Based on normal approximation.

# Crosstabs

**Case Processing Summary**

| | Cases | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Level of Formal Education Completed by Participants * Participants' age recoded | 279 | 100.0% | 0 | .0% | 279 | 100.0% |

**Level of Formal Education Completed by Participants * Participants' age recoded Crosstabulation**

% within Participants' age recoded

| | | Participants' age recoded | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 | 4.00 | |
| Level of Formal Education Completed by Participants | No school at all | 58.3% | 53.8% | | 100.0% | 55.9% |
| | Elementary School | 12.2% | 15.0% | | | 13.6% |
| | High School | 26.1% | 20.6% | | | 22.6% |
| | Still a college student | .9% | .6% | | | .7% |
| | College or Technical Institute graduate | 2.6% | 10.0% | 100.0% | | 7.2% |
| Total | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Chi-Square Tests**

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 22.041[a] | 12 | .037 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 16.350 | 12 | .176 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 1.107 | 1 | .293 |
| N of Valid Cases | 279 | | |

a. 12 cells (60.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .01.

**Symmetric Measures**

| | | Value | Asymp. Std. Error[a] | Approx. T[b] | Approx. Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Gamma | .083 | .101 | .825 | .409 |
| N of Valid Cases | | 279 | | | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

# Crosstabs

**Case Processing Summary**

| | Cases | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Participants' Current Hourly Wage Rate (US dollars) * Participants age (in years) | 250 | 89.6% | 29 | 10.4% | 279 | 100.0% |

**Chi-Square Tests**

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 1187.837[a] | 896 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 532.997 | 896 | 1.000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 7.479 | 1 | .006 |
| N of Valid Cases | 250 | | |

a. 955 cells (99.8%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .00.

**Symmetric Measures**

| | | Value | Asymp. Std. Error[a] | Approx. T[b] | Approx. Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Interval by Interval | Pearson's R | .173 | .071 | 2.771 | .006[c] |
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Spearman Correlation | .225 | .065 | 3.628 | .000[c] |
| N of Valid Cases | | 250 | | | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Based on normal approximation.

# Crosstabs

**Case Processing Summary**

| | Cases | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Level of Formal Education Completed by Participants * Participants' age recoded | 279 | 100.0% | 0 | .0% | 279 | 100.0% |

**Level of Formal Education Completed by Participants * Participants' age recoded Crosstabulation**

% within Participants' age recoded

| | | Participants' age recoded | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 | 4.00 | |
| Level of Formal Education Completed by Participants | No school at all | 58.3% | 53.8% | | 100.0% | 55.9% |
| | Elementary School | 12.2% | 15.0% | | | 13.6% |
| | High School | 26.1% | 20.6% | | | 22.6% |
| | Still a college student | .9% | .6% | | | .7% |
| | College or Technical Institute graduate | 2.6% | 10.0% | 100.0% | | 7.2% |
| Total | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Chi-Square Tests**

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 22.041[a] | 12 | .037 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 16.350 | 12 | .176 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 1.107 | 1 | .293 |
| N of Valid Cases | 279 | | |

a. 12 cells (60.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .01.

**Symmetric Measures**

| | | Value | Asymp. Std. Error[a] | Approx. T[b] | Approx. Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Gamma | .083 | .101 | .825 | .409 |
| N of Valid Cases | | 279 | | | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

# Crosstabs

**Case Processing Summary**

| | Cases | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Participants' Current Hourly Wage Rate (Recoded) * Gender of Participants | 250 | 89.6% | 29 | 10.4% | 279 | 100.0% |

**Participants' Current Hourly Wage Rate (Recoded) * Gender of Participants Crosstabulation**

% within Gender of Participants

| | | Gender of Participants | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | Male | Female | Total |
| Participants' Current Hourly Wage Rate (Recoded) | $5 or less | .7% | 3.8% | 2.0% |
| | More than $5 to $10 | 87.6% | 91.4% | 89.2% |
| | More than $10 | 11.7% | 4.8% | 8.8% |
| Total | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Chi-Square Tests**

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pearson Chi-Square | 6.419[a] | 2 | .040 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 6.740 | 2 | .034 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 5.964 | 1 | .015 |
| N of Valid Cases | 250 | | |

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.10.

**Symmetric Measures**

| | | Value | Approx. Sig. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Nominal by Nominal | Phi | .160 | .040 |
| | Cramer's V | .160 | .040 |
| N of Valid Cases | | 250 | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

# T-Test

**Group Statistics**

|  | Gender of Participants | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Participants' Current Hourly Wage Rate (Recoded) | Male | 145 | 2.1103 | .33577 | .02788 |
|  | Female | 105 | 2.0095 | .29402 | .02869 |

**Independent Samples Test**

|  |  | Levene's Test for Equality of Variance | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
|  |  | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | Lower | Upper |
| Participants' Current Hourly Wage R (Recoded) | Equal variances assumed | 10.970 | .001 | 2.467 | 248 | .014 | .1008 | .04087 | .02033 | .18131 |
|  | Equal variances not assumed |  |  | 2.520 | 239.146 | .012 | .1008 | .04001 | .02200 | .17964 |

# Crosstabs

**Case Processing Summary**

| | Cases | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Level of Formal Education Completed by Participants * Gender of Participants | 279 | 100.0% | 0 | .0% | 279 | 100.0% |

**Level of Formal Education Completed by Participants * Gender of Participants Crosstabulation**

% within Gender of Participants

| | | Gender of Participants | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Male | Female | Total |
| Level of Formal Education Completed by Participants | No school at all | 42.7% | 73.0% | 55.9% |
| | Elementary School | 15.9% | 10.7% | 13.6% |
| | High School | 29.9% | 13.1% | 22.6% |
| | Still a college student | 1.3% | | .7% |
| | College or Technical Institute graduate | 10.2% | 3.3% | 7.2% |
| Total | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Chi-Square Tests**

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 27.386[a] | 4 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 28.986 | 4 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 23.402 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 279 | | |

a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .87.

**Symmetric Measures**

| | | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Nominal by Nominal | Phi | .313 | .000 |
| | Cramer's V | .313 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | | 279 | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

# T-Test

**Group Statistics**

| | Gender of Participants | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Level of Formal Education Completed by Participants | Male | 157 | 2.20 | 1.290 | .103 |
| | Female | 122 | 1.50 | .956 | .087 |

**Independent Samples Test**

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | Lower | Upper |
| Level of Formal Education Complete by Participants | Equal variance assumed | 21.273 | .000 | 5.046 | 277 | .000 | .70 | .139 | .429 | .978 |
| | Equal variance not assumed | | | 5.234 | 276.416 | .000 | .70 | .134 | .439 | .969 |

# Crosstabs

**Case Processing Summary**

| | Cases | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Participants' Current Hourly Wage Rate (Recoded) * Participants' Country of Origin | 250 | 89.6% | 29 | 10.4% | 279 | 100.0% |

**Participants' Current Hourly Wage Rate (Recoded) * Participants' Country of Origin Crosstabulation**

% within Participants' Country of Origin

| | | Participants' Country of Origin | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DR Congo | Ethiopia | Liberia | Somalia | Sudan | Congo | Rwanda | Total |
| Participants' Cur Hourly Wage Ra (Recoded) | $5 or less | | | 3.1% | 2.1% | 2.2% | | | 2.0% |
| | More than $5 to | 100.0% | 100.0% | 96.9% | 95.8% | 75.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 89.2% |
| | More than $10 | | | | 2.1% | 22.8% | | | 8.8% |
| Total | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Chi-Square Tests**

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 37.340[a] | 12 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 42.709 | 12 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 3.464 | 1 | .063 |
| N of Valid Cases | 250 | | |

a. 14 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

**Symmetric Measures**

| | | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Nominal by Nominal | Phi | .386 | .000 |
| | Cramer's V | .273 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | | 250 | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

227

# Oneway

**Descriptives**

Participants' Current Hourly Wage Rate (Recoded)

|  | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | 5% Confidence Interval for Mean | | Minimum | Maximum |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |  | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |  |  |
| DR Cong | 6 | 2.0000 | .00000 | .00000 | 2.0000 | 2.0000 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Ethiopia | 1 | 2.0000 | . | . | . | . | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Liberia | 65 | 1.9692 | .17404 | .02159 | 1.9261 | 2.0124 | 1.00 | 2.00 |
| Somalia | 48 | 2.0000 | .20628 | .02977 | 1.9401 | 2.0599 | 1.00 | 3.00 |
| Sudan | 92 | 2.2065 | .45785 | .04773 | 2.1117 | 2.3013 | 1.00 | 3.00 |
| Congo | 5 | 2.0000 | .00000 | .00000 | 2.0000 | 2.0000 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Rwanda | 33 | 2.0000 | .00000 | .00000 | 2.0000 | 2.0000 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Total | 250 | 2.0680 | .32217 | .02038 | 2.0279 | 2.1081 | 1.00 | 3.00 |

**ANOVA**

Participants' Current Hourly Wage Rate (Recoded)

|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2.829 | 6 | .472 | 4.979 | .000 |
| Within Groups | 23.015 | 243 | .095 |  |  |
| Total | 25.844 | 249 |  |  |  |

# Oneway

**Descriptives**

Participants' Current Hourly Wage Rate (US dollars)

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | 95% Confidence Interval for Mean | | Minimum | Maximum |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound | | |
| DR Congo | 6 | 8.1250 | .94538 | .38595 | 7.1329 | 9.1171 | 7.00 | 9.00 |
| Ethiopia | 1 | 8.5000 | . | . | . | . | 8.50 | 8.50 |
| Liberia | 65 | 7.9934 | .86395 | .10716 | 7.7793 | 8.2075 | 5.00 | 10.00 |
| Somalia | 48 | 8.1481 | 1.06777 | .15412 | 7.8381 | 8.4582 | 5.00 | 10.60 |
| Sudan | 92 | 9.2663 | 1.59859 | .16666 | 8.9352 | 9.5974 | 5.00 | 14.00 |
| Congo | 5 | 7.9500 | 1.53501 | .68648 | 6.0440 | 9.8560 | 5.75 | 9.50 |
| Rwanda | 33 | 8.1364 | .86397 | .15040 | 7.8300 | 8.4427 | 5.75 | 9.50 |
| Total | 250 | 8.5147 | 1.35179 | .08549 | 8.3463 | 8.6831 | 5.00 | 14.00 |

**ANOVA**

Participants' Current Hourly Wage Rate (US dollars)

| | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 83.316 | 6 | 13.886 | 9.078 | .000 |
| Within Groups | 371.688 | 243 | 1.530 | | |
| Total | 455.004 | 249 | | | |

# Crosstabs

**Case Processing Summary**

| | Cases | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Length of Stay in USA * Participants' Country of Origin | 279 | 100.0% | 0 | .0% | 279 | 100.0% |

**Length of Stay in USA * Participants' Country of Origin Crosstabulation**

% within Participants' Country of Origin

| | | Participants' Country of Origin | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DR Congo | Ethiopia | Liberia | Somalia | Sudan | Congo | Rwanda | Total |
| Length of Stay in USA | .00 | | | 8.0% | 5.6% | 3.8% | | | 4.7% |
| | 1.00 | 100.0% | 100.0% | 54.7% | 61.1% | 25.0% | | 58.8% | 45.5% |
| | 2.00 | | | 37.3% | 31.5% | 24.0% | 100.0% | 35.3% | 31.2% |
| | 3.00 | | | | | 5.8% | | | 2.2% |
| | 4.00 | | | | | 7.7% | | | 2.9% |
| | 5.00 | | | | 1.9% | 26.0% | | | 10.0% |
| | 6.00 | | | | | 7.7% | | 5.9% | 3.6% |
| Total | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Chi-Square Tests**

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 114.839[a] | 36 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 132.370 | 36 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 17.225 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 279 | | |

a. 38 cells (77.6%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

**Symmetric Measures**

| | | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Nominal by Nominal | Phi | .642 | .000 |
| | Cramer's V | .262 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | | 279 | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

230

# Oneway

**Descriptives**

Length of Stay in USA

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | 95% Confidence Interval for Mean | | Minimum | Maximum |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound | | |
| DR Congo | 6 | 1.0000 | .00000 | .00000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ethiopia | 1 | 1.0000 | . | . | . | . | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Liberia | 75 | 1.2933 | .61012 | .07045 | 1.1530 | 1.4337 | .00 | 2.00 |
| Somalia | 54 | 1.3333 | .75235 | .10238 | 1.1280 | 1.5387 | .00 | 5.00 |
| Sudan | 104 | 2.9712 | 1.85104 | .18151 | 2.6112 | 3.3311 | .00 | 6.00 |
| Congo | 5 | 2.0000 | .00000 | .00000 | 2.0000 | 2.0000 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Rwanda | 34 | 1.6471 | 1.20309 | .20633 | 1.2273 | 2.0668 | 1.00 | 6.00 |
| Total | 279 | 1.9749 | 1.50398 | .09004 | 1.7977 | 2.1522 | .00 | 6.00 |

**ANOVA**

Length of Stay in USA

| | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Between Groups | 170.600 | 6 | 28.433 | 16.878 | .000 |
| Within Groups | 458.225 | 272 | 1.685 | | |
| Total | 628.824 | 278 | | | |

# Crosstabs

**Case Processing Summary**

| | Cases | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Length of Stay in USA * Participants' Current Hourly Wage Rate (Recoded) | 250 | 89.6% | 29 | 10.4% | 279 | 100.0% |

**Length of Stay in USA * Participants' Current Hourly Wage Rate (Recoded) Crosstabulation**

% within Participants' Current Hourly Wage Rate (Recoded)

| | | Participants' Current Hourly Wage Rate (Recoded) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | $5 or less | More than $5 to $10 | More than $10 | Total |
| Length of Stay in USA | .00 | | 1.8% | 4.5% | 2.0% |
| | 1.00 | 60.0% | 49.8% | 9.1% | 46.4% |
| | 2.00 | 20.0% | 36.8% | 9.1% | 34.0% |
| | 3.00 | 20.0% | 1.8% | 4.5% | 2.4% |
| | 4.00 | | .9% | 22.7% | 2.8% |
| | 5.00 | | 7.2% | 31.8% | 9.2% |
| | 6.00 | | 1.8% | 18.2% | 3.2% |
| Total | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Chi-Square Tests**

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 85.113[a] | 12 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 56.154 | 12 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 40.978 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 250 | | |

a. 13 cells (61.9%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .10.

**Symmetric Measures**

| | | Value | Asymp. Std. Error[a] | Approx. T[b] | Approx. Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Gamma | .624 | .124 | 3.729 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | | 250 | | | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

# Oneway

**Descriptives**

Participants' Current Hourly Wage Rate (Recoded)

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | 95% Confidence Interval for Mean | | Minimum | Maximum |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound | | |
| .00 | 5 | 2.2000 | .44721 | .20000 | 1.6447 | 2.7553 | 2.00 | 3.00 |
| 1.00 | 116 | 1.9914 | .20833 | .01934 | 1.9531 | 2.0297 | 1.00 | 3.00 |
| 2.00 | 85 | 2.0118 | .18861 | .02046 | 1.9711 | 2.0524 | 1.00 | 3.00 |
| 3.00 | 6 | 2.0000 | .63246 | .25820 | 1.3363 | 2.6637 | 1.00 | 3.00 |
| 4.00 | 7 | 2.7143 | .48795 | .18443 | 2.2630 | 3.1656 | 2.00 | 3.00 |
| 5.00 | 23 | 2.3043 | .47047 | .09810 | 2.1009 | 2.5078 | 2.00 | 3.00 |
| 6.00 | 8 | 2.5000 | .53452 | .18898 | 2.0531 | 2.9469 | 2.00 | 3.00 |
| Total | 250 | 2.0680 | .32217 | .02038 | 2.0279 | 2.1081 | 1.00 | 3.00 |

**ANOVA**

Participants' Current Hourly Wage Rate (Recoded)

| | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 6.766 | 6 | 1.128 | 14.364 | .000 |
| Within Groups | 19.078 | 243 | .079 | | |
| Total | 25.844 | 249 | | | |

# Homogeneous Subsets

**Participants' Current Hourly Wage Rate (Recoded)**

| | Length of Stay in USA | N | Subset for alpha = .05 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Tukey B[a,b] | 1.00 | 116 | 1.9914 | | |
| | 3.00 | 6 | 2.0000 | | |
| | 2.00 | 85 | 2.0118 | | |
| | .00 | 5 | 2.2000 | 2.2000 | |
| | 5.00 | 23 | 2.3043 | 2.3043 | |
| | 6.00 | 8 | | 2.5000 | 2.5000 |
| | 4.00 | 7 | | | 2.7143 |
| Scheffe[a,b] | 1.00 | 116 | 1.9914 | | |
| | 3.00 | 6 | 2.0000 | | |
| | 2.00 | 85 | 2.0118 | | |
| | .00 | 5 | 2.2000 | 2.2000 | |
| | 5.00 | 23 | 2.3043 | 2.3043 | 2.3043 |
| | 6.00 | 8 | | 2.5000 | 2.5000 |
| | 4.00 | 7 | | | 2.7143 |
| | Sig. | | .399 | .455 | .102 |

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 10.023.

b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

# Crosstabs

**Case Processing Summary**

| | Cases | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Employment Status * Level of Formal Education Completed by Participants | 279 | 100.0% | 0 | .0% | 279 | 100.0% |

**Employment Status * Level of Formal Education Completed by Participants Crosstabulation**

% within Level of Formal Education Completed by Participants

| | | Level of Formal Education Completed by Participants | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | No school at all | Elementary School | High School | Still a college student | College or Technical Institute graduate | Total |
| Employment Status | Currently unemployed | 5.8% | 18.4% | 14.3% | 50.0% | 10.0% | 10.0% |
| | Currently employed | 92.9% | 81.6% | 85.7% | 50.0% | 90.0% | 89.2% |
| | Beyond employment ag | 1.3% | | | | | .7% |
| Total | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Chi-Square Tests**

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 12.310[a] | 8 | .138 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 11.412 | 8 | .179 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 4.026 | 1 | .045 |
| N of Valid Cases | 279 | | |

[a] 9 cells (60.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .01.

**Symmetric Measures**

| | | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Nominal by Nominal | Phi | .210 | .138 |
| | Cramer's V | .149 | .138 |
| N of Valid Cases | | 279 | |

[a] Not assuming the null hypothesis.

[b] Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.