Family Employment Program (FEP) Study of Utah

A Snapshot In Time - 2006: Wave 1

January 2007

Norma Harris, PhD - Principal Investigator
Mary Beth Vogel-Ferguson - Project Director

Social Research Institute
College of Social Work - University of Utah

Family Employment Program (FEP) Study of Utah
A Snapshot In Time - 2006: Wave 1

Principal Investigator:
Norma Harris, Ph.D.
nharris@socwk.utah.edu

Project Director:
Mary Beth Vogel-Ferguson
mvogel@socwk.utah.edu

Lead Research Assistant and Interviewer:
Aanika Edwards

Project Interviewers:
Cassie Beck
Stacie Bowman
Erin Clark
Christy Clegg
Kris Doty
Christina Gringeri
Jamie Johnson
Lydia Lloyd
Natalie Olsen
Aubrie Ramos
Abigail Van Noy
Kristen Wood

DWS Steering Committee:
Karla Aguirre
Sarah Brenna
Rick Little
Suzette Martellaro
Cathie Pappas
Helen Thatcher
Theresa Wheatley

Data Entry:
Silvia Bozhilova
Jeremy Patton
Ryan Stevenson

Submitted to the Department of Workforce Services:
January, 2007

Family Employment Program (FEP) Study of Utah
A Snapshot In Time - 2006: Wave 1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In Fall 2005, the Social Research Institute (SRI) of the University of Utah's College of Social Work partnered with Utah's Department of Workforce Services (DWS) to conduct a study of FEP participants. This longitudinal study was to focus on FEP customers beginning their experience with cash assistance and follow them for two years. The purpose would be to 1) provide information regarding basic demographics, attitudes, employment supports and barriers, and experiences with DWS; 2) investigate differences between the general FEP population and other groups such as the long term recipients; and 3) monitor outcomes for this group over time.

Study participants were randomly selected from a statewide pool of current FEP recipients who met four criteria. Participants needed to 1) have received between 2 and 9 months of cash assistance in Utah since Jan.1997, 2) be in a FEP category requiring participation, 3) have an open cash assistance case and 4) reside in Utah. A total of 1778 FEP participants were eligible for the study and 1148 were interviewed, a 65% response rate. Interviews were conducted from January 2006 to mid September 2006 and were done face-to-face, (usually in the respondent's residence) by trained interviewers, generally social work students.

The findings of Wave 1 provide a foundation for following study participants over time. Basic demographic profiles, family background and current family composition, respondent characteristics and attitudes toward employment and parenting, access to and use of employment supports, experiences with DWS personnel and services, and employment history and current work experience were all covered in the survey.

Comparisons were made, where possible with results from a study of former FEP participants (N = 1053) who reached Utah's 36 month time limit for cash assistance. The Wave 1 respondents were more diverse, with fewer employment barriers. Specific issues such as lower education levels, physical and mental health problems, needs of a dependent family member, and access to employment supports were more common among those who reach the time limit.

Based on the interests of DWS leaders, early study findings and previous research, five specific variables were used for within group comparisons including: gender, age, work history, public assistance (PA) history and region. All produced significant differences between the groups in different areas. Most striking was the effect of a history of connection with PA programs on the respondents current life and situation. These effects were noted in both the quantitative analysis comparing those who did and did not have a PA history, and the comments provided to open ended questions.

Respondents were almost equally split in their preference to either be employed outside the home or be a stay at home parent. Only about one fifth were undecided. Many respondents were extremely embarrassed and resisted identifying themselves as "welfare recipients." Study participants resisted the negative stereotypes by either naming themselves as the exception to the norm, or expressing a new understanding of the population whose ranks they had joined.

KEY FINDINGS

1. While the study was designed to learn more about "new" recipients of cash assistance, 647 (56.6%) respondents had received cash assistance pre-1997 under AFDC, and/or had been on another person's assistance case as a dependent child.

2. Those with a history of connections to public assistance were found to be significantly different than those who had no public assistance history in many areas relative to family history, exposure to violence, access to resources, and levels of education and work history. These differences proved to both assist and hinder the move toward self-sufficiency.

3. In general, service delivery focused on and was best suited for one narrow group of clients primarily those with lower education levels and limited work history.

4. The percentage of respondents consistently expressing a preference to be employed outside the home (39.5%) was nearly as high as those who preferred to be a stay at home parent (42.0%). Respondents consistently spoke of this preference (to stay at home with children or work outside the home) as serving the best interest of the child.

5. Overall, about half of the respondents would not leave a child in any child care setting outside of family or close friends they know and trust. This was especially true for parents of young children unable to talk and thus be able to tell a parent if something was happening to them. Attitudes toward child care settings and use of child care in general were strongly tied to the respondents' past experiences of abuse.

6. The study population was much more diverse than those who have reached the time limit. Key factors may be reviewed in the future to help identify those most likely to need ongoing assistance and those most capable of moving toward self-sufficiency.

7. Study respondents carry many of the extremely negative social stereotypes of "welfare moms." The depth of shame around needing assistance was expressed in a variety of ways and was a significant barrier to engagement in DWS activities as well as in the study itself. Study participants often resisted the negative stereotypes by either naming themselves as the exception to the norm, or expressing a new understanding of the population whose ranks they had joined.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Increase use of diversion or other short term programs that assist customers with immediate, short term needs. Promote and implement additional preventative measures so customers will be able to retain important employment supports such as housing and transportation during short term crisis period.

2. Work with DWS personnel at all levels to increase the understanding of differences between customers with and without a history of exposure to public assistance programs. Expand understanding of the implications of generational poverty for customers. Investigate how this greater understanding can, within program guidelines, lead to the development of more effective and appropriate employment plans.

3. Attention to child care concerns needs to be part of program development for future child care resources with possible expansion of funding available to family members. Better education regarding child care options and attention to barriers to child care use such as customers equating "child care" with "day care" and fears of leaving children with anyone outside of family.

4. Consider diversifying programs to meet needs of customers with more extensive work and education history to assist in moving them toward their next step and provide employment counselors with a wider range of resources to meet the diverse needs of the current case load. Customers who do not qualify for some services but perhaps others often need linkage to options beyond DWS. Expand access to resources available beyond what DWS has to offer.

5. Evaluate job performance measures for employment counselors to insure usage of a wider variety of DWS programs based on customer need, not only participation rates. Find ways to measure additional employment counselor activities such as appropriate use of diversion programs, connecting appropriate customers with services such as SSI completion, vocational rehabilitation, educational assistance outside the agency. Encourage creativity in problem solving by combining the needs of the hard to serve with agency requirements to fulfill participation rates.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FAMILY EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM (FEP) STUDY OF UTAH
A SNAPSHOT IN TIME - 2006: WAVE 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Study Background

President Bill Clinton's often quoted 1992 election promise to "end welfare as we know it" resulted in significant changes to cash assistance programs in the United States. While society in general seemed to have very clear opinions concerning the composition of the "welfare" population, it was less clear to agency management who serve the participants in cash assistance programs. The passing of the 10 year anniversary of the implementation of the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) policy in Utah marks the time for learning more about the those who comprise the welfare population today.

When TANF policy was initially implemented, legislators focused on those who would first reach the lifetime limit for reception of cash assistance benefits as administered through the Family Employment Program (FEP), Utah's single parent cash assistance program. This program would significantly impact recipients and their families. For this reason, research conducted for Utah's Department of Workforce Services (DWS) by the Social Research Institute (SRI) of the University of Utah's College of Social Work from1997 through 2005, focused primarily on those who exited the cash assistance program due to reaching the 36 month lifetime limit. A great deal was learned about this population.

The first group of long term respondents sampled was unique. Many had received some (or many) months of cash assistance under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program. While Utah had implemented universal participation several years before the 1996 reforms, benefits had never been time limited. Although customers were given extensive information regarding the changes in the cash assistance program (especially regarding time limits), many were caught off guard when, in January 1997, the check was *not* in the mail! Most recipients struggled, combining part time employment with cash assistance, food stamps and medicaid benefits to make ends meet.

Respondents in the long term sample experienced a higher concentration of personal barriers such as mental and physical health issues, lack of education, a poor work history and a lack of skills. Hidden barriers such as domestic violence, learning disabilities and a criminal background often thwarted efforts to become self-sufficient. Most respondents were living at or below the poverty line. Informal social support networks were identified as critical to ongoing progress. While information about the long term population influenced the development of more extensive initial and ongoing assessment processes, little was known about the make-up of new customers who were applying for cash assistance. This is not unique to Utah. There has been a nationally recognized need to learn more about welfare recipients in order to provide more appropriate services during the limited months of welfare support. This gap in current data led to the development of the study which is the focus of this report.

While some welfare research has focused only on learning about the recipients themselves, some have suggested that it is also important to learn about their experiences within the welfare system, and the supports which lead to employment and greater self-sufficiency. Elements such as social supports (Sansone, 1998), quality of life (Hollar, 2003) and the relationship with the caseworker (Anderson, 2001) are potentially as significant as commonly evaluated measures such as employment history and level of education. Three studies which attempted to address both the composition of the caseload and system issues include The Women's Employment Study (Danzinger, et. Al., 2000), the TANF Caseload Project (Kovac, et. Al., 2002) and Families on Colorado Works (Cuciti, et. Al., 2003) These studies were based on previous research with welfare participants and form an excellent foundation for similar research, allowing for cross state comparisons as data become available.

Local and National TANF Environment

The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) of 1996 expired in the Fall of 2002. For the next three years, continuing resolutions extended the TANF program with no change to policy or funding levels. Multiple versions of reauthorization proposals surfaced in the House of Representatives and the Senate but none were ever passed, frustrating the efforts of states to implement new programs. It was nearly impossible to develop long term plans without guidelines which would frame future program requirements.

By the Spring of 2005, TANF still had not been reauthorized. In an effort to anticipate future TANF program requirements and give direction to frontline workers, the DWS developed a new set of policies regarding cash assistance. These changes increased the focus on customer participation in approved activities. Utah's Family Employment Program (FEP) customers would be counted as "participating" when engaged in these federally approved activities for 34 hours or more per week. New program requirements became effective in August 2005.

As noted earlier, Utah had required universal participation for several years prior to the welfare reforms of 1996. Employment counselors were encouraged to develop employment plans that focused customer's self-sufficiency efforts. The shift in policy meant that employment counselors would, if at all possible, direct customers toward activities which "counted." Employment counselors began to feel the pressure to increase participation through their performance evaluations in which this element of case management was considered..

Between August 1996 and September 2001 the number of welfare recipients nationwide dropped by 52.3% (USDHHS, 2001). The caseload decline in Utah was slightly less at 47.3%, but clearly Utah was moving in the same direction. While the rate of caseload decline has slowed, the downward trend continues today. In January 2005 there were 6,578 families receiving cash assistance as part of the regular FEP caseload.[1] By January 2006 the number of FEP families had dropped by 20% to 5261 and by September 2006 the caseload had dropped another 31% to 3587. A strong economy could certainly explain some of the case reduction. Whatever the reason, there are fewer families using the cash assistance program. It is within this policy environment that the study outlined in this report was conducted.

[1] This figure excludes cases where the PI is not required to participate in plan as part of receiving cash assistance specified relatives, adult incapacitated, undocumented persons etc. (Janzen, 2006)

The Family Employment Program (FEP) Study of Utah

The DWS has expanded its research agenda to include an exploration of the general FEP population in Utah. Consistent with the long term study, DWS invested in this research to better understand the composition, needs, and attitudes of its "customers." In the Fall of 2005, the Social Research Institute of the University of Utah's College of Social Work partnered with Utah's Department of Workforce Services to conduct a study of FEP participants.

The new longitudinal study was to focus on FEP customers who were beginning their experience with the cash assistance program. FEP recipients who participated in the first round of interviews would be invited to participate in the second and third rounds of data collection, regardless of their status with DWS. The goal of this type of study was to move beyond point-in-time data and learn about the experiences of FEP customers, tracking their experiences, especially relative to self-sufficiency related activities, through a variety of outcomes.

The key questions of this study were conceptualized and developed through a partnership of DWS management, front line workers and SRI researchers. Through this collaborative process, it was determined that the purpose of this longitudinal study would be to 1) provide information regarding basic demographics, attitudes, employment supports and barriers and DWS experiences of the general FEP population; 2) investigate differences between the general FEP population and other groups such as the long term recipients and those closed due to non-participation; and 3) monitor employment, FEP use, and other personal and family life events for the randomly selected group of FEP participants over time.

METHOD

Wave 1 of the FEP Study of Utah was conducted using the same protocol as from all previous FEP studies completed by the SRI for the DWS since 1997. These methods were based on extensive research by others who have conducted studies with similar populations (Mainieri, 2001). Throughout this report, findings from other SRI research studies will also be referenced. It can be assumed that all critical elements of the data collection process are identical. Consistency of research method is intentional. It is hoped that reducing changes in the data collection process will increase sample comparability.

Respondents

For the initial round of interviews, study participants were randomly selected from the statewide pool of current FEP recipients who met a set of four criteria. Participants needed to 1) have received between 2 and 9 months of cash assistance in Utah since January 1997, 2) be in a FEP category which required participation in an employment plan, 3) have an open cash assistance case at the time of the interview and 4) reside in the state of Utah. (The requirement for employment plan activity excluded some cases including refugees, specified relatives, and undocumented persons.) Participant selection occurred on a monthly basis between January and September of 2006. The initial goal was to sample 1100 FEP participants in hopes of obtaining a minimum of 700 completed interviews over the three interview span.

Data Collection

As part of the application for benefits, DWS customers agree to the possibility of being contacted for participation in research conducted by the University of Utah. Participation has always been completely voluntary. Research staff used unique client identifiers (not social security numbers) to choose a random sample and secure location information. Each potential respondent was sent a letter informing them of the study and inviting them to call a toll free number to schedule an appointment. Participants were also informed they would receive $20 in appreciation for their time. If a respondent had not contacted the researchers within about four days, three attempts were made to contact the person by phone. If no contact was made by phone, up to three home visits were made to determine the respondents interest in participating. If the respondent was no longer at the given address, research staff attempted to obtain new contact information from DWS. Multiple efforts were made to contact each person. If at any time a potential participant indicated they were not interested in participating, the name was removed from the list. All names of potential and actual respondents were kept strictly confidential. For comparison purposes, administrative data for non-respondents was also gathered.

Once a FEP participant indicated a willingness to participate, a date, time and location for the interview was arranged at the participant's convenience. Respondents decided where they wanted the interview to take place. All interviews were conducted in-person, and, in the majority of cases, were completed in the respondent's home or current residence. Participants were compensated for their time. At the conclusion of each interview, respondents were asked if they would be willing to be contacted again for a follow-up survey in about one year. If they agreed, additional contact information was obtained. Interviews averaged 90 minutes in length and were conducted by a team of fourteen interviewers between January 2006 and mid September 2006. Interviewers were primarily social work students and had extensive initial and ongoing training to improve consistency throughout the data collection process..

Interviewers were trained in techniques for gathering both quantitative and qualitative data. Ongoing training and quality reviews of data were used to improve consistency in the data collection process. Once the informed consent document was reviewed and signed, respondents simply answered questions and the interviewer recorded the information. If they were interested, respondents could follow along as the data were collected. Interview questions covered a wide variety of areas (See Appendix A) and respondents could refuse to answer any question at any time. Respondents were pursued in all areas of Utah. While rural areas were visited less frequently, every effort was made to follow a similar protocol throughout the state.

FINDINGS

Study Sample

Using the study criteria outlined above, a total of 1778 FEP participants were chosen and found to be eligible for the study. Of this group, 1148 FEP recipients were interviewed for the study resulting in a 65% response rate. Four respondents indicated they would not be interested in being contacted again. For purposes of the longitudinal sample, these four respondents were deleted from the ongoing analysis.

Non-Respondents

Of the 630 FEP recipients who did not participate, 431 (68.2%) indicated they were not interested, 191 (30.3%) never responded, and 8 (1.3%) could not be located. Administrative data were used to explore potential differences between respondents and non-respondents. Information regarding demographics and some factors potentially relevant to employment (including transportation, physical health, education level, and marital status) were obtained using the assessment screens completed by the employment counselors (See Appendix B). Data were only used if it had been updated within 12 months of the interview, otherwise it was reported as missing data. The profile of non-respondents was very similar to that of survey respondents in all areas evaluated. This factor reinforces the representativeness of the population and collected from FEP participants who participated in the study.

Between Group Comparisons: Wave 1 and Time Limit Samples

The current study sample focuses on relatively recent cash assistance recipients. Given the extensive data which have been collected from former FEP participants who have reached the 36 month time limit, it is possible to compare many client characteristics, attitudes and experiences between these long term FEP recipients and the current sample. Over time, it may be possible to identify characteristics which most typically lead to long term use of cash assistance. While data have been collected since 1999, only the most recent set containing 1053 respondents and collected between October 2003 and July 2005, will be used here and will be referred to as the "TL Study." Respondents in the time limit sample meet the following criteria: 1) former FEP participant who reached 36 months of cash assistance or came to the end of a benefit extension 2) had not received cash assistance for at least 2 months, 3) current resident of the State of Utah.

Within Group Comparisons: Region, Gender, Work History, Age Groups, Public Assistance (PA) History

The possibilities for comparisons between different groups within this large data base are almost limitless. Areas such as education, work history, physical and mental health issues, are often discussed as factors contributing to various outcomes among welfare recipients. Since these data have been gathered primarily for use by DWS management, agency policy makers were asked to identify groupings which would be most helpful. Given this focus, analysis of study data will also include comparisons between DWS regions, participant gender, and employment history (defined by whether the respondent has worked more or less than half the time since age 16). Differences in these areas will be noted throughout this report and are summarized in Appendix C. Table 1 provides a profile of the sample by region. The distribution of the sample in both the current study and the TL sample is very similar to distribution of FEP cases within the state as a whole.

Table 1: Regional Distribution:

	Central	Northern	Mntnland	Eastern	Western	Total
Wave 1	545 (47.6%)	351 (30.7%)	128 (11.2%)	50 (4.4%)	70 (6.1%)	1144
TL Sample	535 (50.8%)	295 (28.0%)	88 (8.4%)	61 (5.8%)	74 (7.0%)	1053

During the interviewing process an unexpected issue surfaced which proved pertinent to the current research. First, while all respondents met the study criteria described above (including having received only 2 - 9 months of cash assistance in Utah after 1997) many respondents had other experiences with cash assistance and other public assistance programs. Because welfare reform is still only 10 years old, some respondents received cash assistance prior to TANF and the FEP. Second, the requirements of the previous programs were significantly different and influenced some respondents' views of the current programs. Researchers found that other respondents had been on a parent's cash assistance case as a dependent child and this previous exposure to public assistance programs, and specifically cash assistance, appeared to impact respondent's attitudes, experiences and expectations of current programs.

To conduct within group comparisons that consider the influences of welfare reform on the current study population, two additional variables were created. For one variable, respondents were divided into three age groups. The "Younger" age group includes respondents 26 years and younger. This group is too young to have ever experienced being the primary recipient on an AFDC case, but could have been a dependent child on another person's case.. The "Middle" age group includes respondents 27 to 36. Respondents in this group could have had their own AFDC prior to the 1997 changes and they could have been a dependent child on another person's case. The "Older" age group includes all respondents over 36 years of age. This group could have had their own AFDC case prior to 1997. There is no administrative data regarding their status as a dependent child on another person's case as DWS records only go back to 1988.

Table 2: Age Groups

Client Profile		**Wave 1 N = 1144**
"Younger" - 26 and younger	Too young to have had their own cash assistance case under AFDC; could have been on another's case as a dependent child	593 (51.8%)
"Middle" - 27 - 36	Could have been listed as a dependent on another case; could have received AFDC months of cash assistance or food stamps prior to 1997	329 (28.8%)
"Older" - 37 and older	Could have received AFDC months of cash assistance or food stamps prior to 1997	222 (19.4%)

The second variable which was created for within-group comparisons was based on the respondents' previous experience with public assistance (PA) programs. Both administrative data (focusing on food stamps and cash assistance) and self-report data were used to create this variable. From these data it was determined that 647 (56.6%) of the Wave 1 sample had previously used public assistance, either as a dependent child or as an adult. The remaining 497 (43.4%) had no such history either as documented in the administrative data or through self-report. This variable will be referred to as "PA history" when used for comparisons throughout this report.

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

The data gathered in this study present a snapshot in time of FEP participants and their immediate situation. This section presents a profile of study respondents, the respondents' household composition, children and overall financial picture. To put the current scenario in context, a brief report on family background and personal history is presented. These data compliment the foundational nature of the Wave 1 interview.

Respondent Profile

Table 3 displays the general demographic characteristics of study respondents. It is clear that the TL sample is generally older than the Wave 1 group. The TL sample also has a higher concentration of minorities.

Table 3: Respondent Demographics

Personal Characteristics		**Wave 1 N = 1144**	**TL Sample N = 1053**
Age		28.5 years range: 17 - 60	32.6 years range: 20 - 68
Gender	Female Male	94% 6%	96% 4%
Race/Ethnicity:	Hispanic White (non-Hispanic) Black (non-Hispanic) Native American Asian - Pacific Islander Other Mixed Race	161 (14.1%) 810 (70.8%) 46 (4.0%) 47 (4.1%) 34 (3.0%) 2 (0.2%) 41 (3.6%)	243 (23.1%) 652 (62.0%) 42 (4.0%) 42 (4.0%) 10 (0.9%) 7 (0.7%) 56 (5.3%)
Marital Status	Married Separated Dividing the "separated" group: Still working on it - Permanent Separation - Divorced Widowed Single - never married Other	101 (8.8%) 287 (25.1%) 43 (15.1%) 242 (84.9%) 267 (23.3%) 8 (0.7%) 480 (42.0%) 1 (0.1%)	
Relationship Status - single vs. couples			
Single Adult Household		**867 (75.8%)**	**787 (74.7%)**
Two Adult Household:		**277 (24.2%)**	**266 (25.3%)**
	Married Separated but working on it Domestic Partnership	101 (8%) 43 (3.8%) 133 (11.6%)	97 (9.2%) 34 (3.2%) 135 (12.8%)

Within the Wave 1 sample, gender differences are found in several areas. The average age for males is 37 years while only 28 years for females. In regard to race/ethnicity, 63.1% of males were white, while 71.5% of females report this category. Males are more likely to be married (15.2% for males and 8.4% for females) and if not married, less likely to be living with a partner (males 5.6%, females 13.7%). Of those who were not married or living with a partner, males were much less likely (7.5%) than females (25.5%) to be involved in a serious relationship.

When Utah's marital status results are compared to the nation as a whole, the percentage of single respondents is significantly lower in Utah. In this sample (and Utah's FEP statistics as reported to ACF) the divorced and separated status' are significantly higher (Office of Family Assistance, 2004). The "separated" group was divided into two groups - temporary and permanent separation. While a very few were unsure about the status of the separation, most were very clear whether it was temporary or permanent. Most of those who were permanently separated lacked divorced status simply because they can not afford the legal process.

Age distribution by region is very similar. Race distributions by region followed overall census patterns in Utah. Eastern region has fewer White respondents (68.0%) but the majority of minority respondents are Native American. Central and Northern regions have only slightly lower rates of minorities than the Eastern region but these groups are typically Hispanic.

Household Composition

The composition of the respondents' households varied greatly. The size of the household (excluding the respondent) in which respondents lived varied from 0 to 13, and averaged 3.1 persons. There were 462 (40.4%) respondents who did not live with anyone other than the children on their cash assistance case. There were 202 (17.7%) who lived with a spouse or partner. For those who lived with other adults, 139 (12.2%) lived with one parent (usually the mother) and 161 (14.1%) lived with both parents.

Children

While the FEP participants interviewed for the Wave 1 and TL studies were the primary adult on the case, it was important to note that children represent the largest single group of cash assistance recipients on the TANF program.

By definition, all FEP participants are required to have a child living in the home, or be in the third trimester of pregnancy. Table 4 presents data regarding child bearing. A total of 101 (9%) respondents were pregnant at the time of the interview and for just over a third of these respondents, it was considered a high risk pregnancy. Almost half of those who were pregnant, were in the third trimester. There were 14 respondents who were in the third trimester of pregnancy with their first child, and 5 respondents in the third trimester of pregnancy with no other child living in the home.

As shown in Table 5, the Wave 1 study represents the experiences of 1938 children, while the TL study represents 2479 children. In both groups, about a tenth of the children were living with both parents. For children not living with both parents, just over half in the Wave 1 study have contact with their other parent (usually the father). For children in the TL study it was only

41.5%. Only 1042 (53.8%) of the Wave 1 children's non-resident parent had a high school diploma or GED. Most children in both studies did have health insurance. When there was a lack of coverage, it was typically due to being in-between coverage, the child not being a U.S. citizen, or confusion over how to apply.

Table 4: Child Bearing

	Wave 1 N = 1144	**TL Study N = 1053**
Age became pregnant with first child	20 yrs (range 8 - 43)	19 yrs (range 11 - 36)
Respondent was a teen (under 20) when first child born	648 (56.6%)	698 (66.5%)
Respondent's mother was a teen when first child born	558 (50.2%)	563 (53.5%)
Client was married when first child was born	401 (35.0%)	312 (29.7%)
Currently Pregnant - (N = 1121)*	101 (9.0%)	44 (4%)
High risk pregnancy	35 (34.7%)	

*Male respondents with no current partner were excluded from this question

Table 5: Individual Children in Samples

Total Number of children in sample	**Wave 1 N = 1938**	**TL N = 2479**
Child has health, mental health, learning, behavior or other special needs that limit their regular activities	307 (15.8%)	
Child has problems so severe it effect's parents ability to secure and retain employment or go to school	145 (7.5%)	
"Other parent" of the child living in the home	179 (9.0%)	251 (10%)
Of children where father does not live in the home: Child has contact with other parent	1081 (55.8%)	1028 (41.5%)
Other parent has high school diploma or GED	1042 (53.8%)	
Primary form of health insurance for children Government/Medicaid CHIP Private None	 1740 (90%) 18 (0.9%) 141 (7%) 27 (1.4%)	 [CHIP or Medicaid - 2343 (94.5%)] 85 (3%) 53 (2%)

There are some important differences between the children in the two studies (See Table 6 below). Some variations can be attributed to the four year difference in the average age of the respondents in each study. Nearly three quarters of the Wave 1 respondents have a child under age

6. This qualifies the family for food stamps (depending on income), even if the cash assistance is closed. In both samples, about one quarter of the respondents have at least one child with a health, mental health, learning, behavior problem or other special need that limit the child's regular activities. For nearly half of those in the Wave 1 study, the problem has been so significant it impacts the ability of the respondent to secure/retain employment or attend school or training.

Table 6: Children

	Wave 1 N = 1144	**TL N = 1053**
Average # of children total	2.1	3.2
Average # of children on cash assistance case	1.7	2.4
Youngest child under 6 No child under 6 No child in home - client in third trimester	848 (74.1%) 277 (24.2%) 19 (1.7%)	579 (55.0%) 472 (44.9%) 1 (0.1%)
Client has at least one child with health, mental health, learning, behavior or other special needs that limit the child's regular activities	253 (22%)	284 (28%)
Child/ren's need such a problem client can't get job or has lost job; or can't attend school	122 (10.7%)	
Clients with child under 18 not in home	189 (16.5%)	
Total number of children under 18 not in the home	298	
Reason each child not in the home: Left to established own household Couldn't afford to care for child Couldn't manage child's behavior Child removed by state agency Child chose or went to live with other parent Needed better environment for child Child adopted out Child deceased Other:	 7 (2%) 17 (6%) 6 (2%) 33 (11%) 59 (20%) 62 (21%) 48 (16%) 31 (10%) 32 (10%)	

Financial Profile

It is not uncommon for current or former cash assistance recipients to piece together several sources of income to make ends meet. Table 7 reports the most common resources, both frequency and amount. Respondents were asked to report all sources of *regular* income received in the previous month. "Regular" income excluded one time payments or income that was sporadic or unreliable. Only the portion of spouse or partner income which was contributed to the respondent's household was included here. Child support for Wave 1 respondents included only

Table 7: The Financial Picture

	Wave 1 - N = 1144	TL - N = 1053
Earned Income	322 (28.1%) avg: $400.00 Range: $5 - $1600	398 (37.8%) avg: $920.00 range: $20 - $4620
Spouse/partner Income	144 (28.5%) avg: $400.00 Range: $20 - $2400	204 (19.4%) avg: $587.5 range: $20 - $4200
Child support	44 (3.8%) avg: $200.00 range: $5 - $1700	296 (28.1%) avg: $200.00 range: $6 - $800
Housing Assistance Public Housing Section 8 Transitional Other	197 (17.2%) avg: $538.00 range: $142 - $1053 83 (42.1%) 90 (45.7%) 5 (2.5%) 19 (9.6%)	410 (38.9%) avg: $600.00 range: $62 - $1250
Utility Allowance	82 (7.2%) avg: $53.50 range: $2 - $400	
Unemployment compensation	3 (0.3%) avg: $515.52 range: $380 - $1000	15 (1.4%) avg: $452.00 range: $96 - $1080
Workers compensation	1 (0.1%) avg: $500.00 range: $500	2 (0.2%) avg: $380.00 range: $300 - $460
SSI/SSDI	43 (3.8%) avg: $554.00 range: $30 - $1812	120 (11.4%) avg: $562.00 range: $75 - $1700
Cash Assistance	1139 (99.6%) avg: $380.00 range: $10 - $804	
General Assistance		17 (1.6%) avg: $261.00 range: $78 - $470
Educational assistance (per semester)	178 (15.6%) avg: $1050.00 range: $20 - $10,000	44 (4.2%) avg: $1800.00 range: $55 - $9000
Food stamps	1044 (91.3%) avg: $278.00 range: $10 - $860	894 (84.9%) avg: $293.50 range: $10 - 786
Child care assistance	236 (20.6%) avg: $400.00 range: $74 - $2000	92 (8.7%) avg: $545.50 range $100 - $1800
Tribal dividends	8 (0.7%) avg: $175.00 range: $125 - $350	9 (0.9%) avg: $125.00 range: $100 - $500
Other	79 (6.9%) avg: $400.00 range: $20 - $2400	81 (7.7%) avg: $250.00 range: $15 - $1700

money which went directly to the respondent, not through ORS. Most respondents who reported "other" income, received regular help from family or their church in paying rent.

The list of monthly income sources provides a picture of the total financial resources accessed by current and former FEP families. After combining all income as reported in Table 7 above (excluding educational assistance), the median income for the current FEP family was $964 per month. It was significantly higher in the Eastern and Western regions than in the other three. The median income for the TL families was significantly lower, only $826 per month. There was also a much larger range in the TL study income as compared to the Wave 1 sample. The TL cases ranged from $0 to $4823 per month, while the open cases only ranged from $280 - $4285. There are several significant differences between sources of support between the Wave 1 and TL study respondents. Both groups develop a web of financial supports but, as Table 7 shows, the composition clearly changed over time for those who reached the time limit.

Personal History - Family Background

Learning more about a respondent's personal history helps put the present scenario in context and sets the foundation upon which future efforts are built. A majority of respondents in both studies grew up in a two parent home. The Older respondents, those with no welfare history, and those living in the Western region were more likely to grow up in a two parent home. Over a quarter of each sample grew up in a single parent home with their mother. Most of those who

Table 8: Family Background

Family Environment	**Wave 1 N = 1144**	**TL N = 1053**
Living Situation Growing up:		
Two parent home	743 (64.9%)	644 (61.2%)
Single parent home with mom	303 (26.5%)	292 (27.7%)
Single parent home with dad	35 (3.1%)	34 (3.2%)
Foster care	18 (1.3%)	16 (1.5%)
Other	45 (3.9%)	67 (6.4%)
Father's Education Level:		
Less than High school	176 (15.4%)	281 (26.7%)
High School Diploma or GED	365 (31.9%)	[HS/GED or more:
Post High School Education	389 (34.0%)	586 (55.7%)]*
Don't know	131 (11.5%)	186 (17.7%)
Father had learning disability or reading/writing problems	95 (8.3%)	
Mother's Education Level:		
Less than High school	229 (20.1%)	332 (31.5%)
High School Diploma or GED	478 (41.8%)	[HS/GED or more:
Post High School Education	368 (32.1%)	664 (63.1%)]*
Don't know	60 (5.2%)	57 (5.4%)
Mother had learning disability or reading/writing problems	83 (7.3%)	

* Measured only to level of High School Diploma/GED in TL Study

indicated “other” living situations were raised by grandparents or other family members. Those who grew up in a single parent home or in an “other” setting were significantly more likely to have a history of accessing PA. Parental education was also different between study groups. The parents of those in the Wave 1 group had higher levels of education than those in the TL group. Those whose parents had lower levels of education were also more likely to have used PA.

Respondents were also asked to recall experiences they had growing up and their family’s use of outside resources including public assistance, community sources, church or religious organizations, friends/neighbors, and family. There were 506 (44.2%) respondents who had no memory of receiving any type of outside assistance. For those who did receive help, the most common source of help was family. The receipt of outside resources was less likely to be reported by respondents with a high employment history, by males and those in the Older group.

The experience of homelessness as a child was relatively low but more often experienced by those in the Younger group and, as would be expected, those with a PA history. Those with a PA history were also significantly more likely to have witnessed the abuse of others and been physically, sexually and emotionally abused as a child. Those in the Middle age group and females were most likely to have been sexually abused as children.

Table 9: Resource and Abuse History

Positive responses to:	**Wave 1 N = 1144**	**TL N= 1053**
Respondent grew up with family receiving.....:		
Public Benefits (food stamps, medicaid, etc.)	307 (27.8%)	
Help from community resources	246 (22.1%)	
Help from a church or religious organization	237 (21.2%)	
Help from friends/neighbors	211 (18.9%)	
Help from family members	438 (39.0%)	
Were you ever homeless when you were a child?	128 (11.2%)	144 (13.7%)
Did you ever see the abuse of someone else as child?	532 (46.7%)	537 (51.0%)
Were you ever physically abused before you were 18?	485 (42.5%)	451 (42.8%)
Were you ever sexually abused before you were 18?	470 (41.4%)	444(42.2%)
Were you ever emotionally abused before you were 18?	612 (53.5%)	580 (55.1%)

RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS

In addition to basic demographics, history and current family situation, respondents presented a set of personal characteristics which significantly impact a persons ability to obtain and maintain employment (Danziger et. al., 2000; Taylor, 2004). Most of these factors would typically be evaluated in an assessment of the individual when preparing to engage in work activities. Characteristics evaluated here include: education, physical health, mental health, abuse experiences and a criminal record.

Education

Education is almost universally accepted as a significant contributor to self-sufficiency. Table 10 provides the basic breakdown of education history and current involvement for both study samples. TL respondents were more likely to have lower levels of education and thus lower levels of GED/High School Diploma (HSD) completion. In the Wave 1 sample, those in the Central region had the lowest level of HSD/GED completion (65.5%) while those in the Eastern Region had the highest (84.0%). Those in the Younger age group, those with a PA history and

Table 10: Education

Education	**Wave 1 N = 1144**	**TL N = 1053**
Highest grade completed through high school:		
Eighth grade or less	38 (3.3%)	94 (8.9%)
Ninth - 11th grade completed	491 (42.9%)	445 (42.3%)
12th grade	615 (53.8%)	514 (48.8%)
Educational breakdown by activities completed:		
No certificates or degrees of any type	311 (27.2%)	
No high school diploma or GED	343 (30.0%)	404 (38.4%)
High school diploma/GED	801 (70.0%)	649 (61.6%)
Vocational/trade school diploma or certificate	276 (24.1%)	
Some College	288 (25.2%)	113 (12.7%)
Associates Degree	58 (5.1%)	49 (4.7%)
Bachelor's degree	26 (2.3%)	20 (1.9%)
Other	4 (0.3%)	
Average age of completion of high school diploma/GED	18.7	
Type of program earned high school diploma/GED		
Regular public/private high school	532 (66.8%)	
Home school	5 (0.6%)	
Alternative high school	58 (7.3%)	
Adult basic education	92 (11.6%)	
Job Corps	8 (1.0%)	
Television or correspondence	1 (0.1%)	
College	75 (9.4%)	
Other	25 (3.1%)	
Currently in school	298 (26.0%)	61 (12%)
Part time	120 (40.4%)	
Full time	177 (59.6%)	
Of this, percent of each studying: HS/GED	97 (32.6%)	19 (31%)
Certificate	95 (31.9%)	19 (31%)
Associate Degree	61 (20.5%)	12 (20%)
Bachelor Degree	35 (11.7%)	11 (18%)
Other	10 (3.4%)	---

those with a low work history were all less likely to have a HSD or GED. Nearly two- thirds of the Wave 1 sample received their GED or High School diploma in the traditional school setting.

Approximately one quarter of the Wave 1 sample was in school at the time of the interview, more than double the enrollment of the TL sample. Those currently in school were more likely to be female and in the Younger group. Nearly a quarter of the sample had received some sort of certificate or trade school diploma. Of the 276 respondents with certificates, 58 had a CNA, 56 had a clerical or business certificate, and 27 had a Cosmetology certificate.

There were 288 (25.2%) respondents who had gone to college and received some credits but never finished a degree. When asked why they had not received a degree, 81 (28.1%) reported they were still in school. Other reasons for not completing school included pregnancy or health problems associated with pregnancy and children's needs (55), financial problems (42) needing to return to work (31), and other physical health issues (27). In general, respondents were not happy with being unable to finish school and spoke of how that would have been much better had they been able to complete their program.

Of the 844 respondents who were not in school, 152 (12.0%) were not interested in going to school in the near future. Those who were not in school but were interested in attending, were asked to give the primary reasons they were unable to go at this time. Table 11 lists these reasons. The most common reason for not going to school was lack of finances (25.5%). Other common

Table 11: Not in School But Interested

	Wave 1 N = 1144
Average age last time in school	21.6
Not currently in school but interested in going	N = 844 692 (82.0%)
Main reasons why unable to go to school right now:	
No need - have enough education	-0-
Need to work/no time for school	163 (14.5%)
Need/want to be home with kids	100 (8.9%)
Learning problems	7 (0.6%)
Physical health problems	96 (8.5%)
Mental health problems	42 (3.7%)
Domestic violence	2 (0.2%)
Drug/alcohol abuse	2 (0.2%)
Lack of child care	113 (10.0%)
Transportation problems	67 (5.9%)
Family demands	68 (5.9%)
Lack of support from DWS	24 (2.1%)
English language barrier	3 (0.3%)
Worried I won't be successful	16 (1.4%)
Need money / can't afford it	287 (25.5%)
Other	134 (12.2%)

issues were the need to work (14.5%), lack of child care (10.0%) and needing/wanting to be home with children (8.9%). There were 34 respondents who indicated they were going to start school soon. There were also those who were interested in going to school but had no idea how to become enrolled. They were confused about how to do it, what to study and where to go to get help with the process.

There were 343 Wave 1 respondents who had no high school diploma or GED. Nearly everyone in this group felt it would be good for them to pursue their education. Some had gone into training programs which did not require a basic degree and more than half of those who had done this, had completed the program. These programs included training as a CNA, Cosmetology, flagger, CDL, and other similar type certificates.

Table 12: Those with No High School Diploma or GED

	Wave 1 N = 343
For those without a GED or high school diploma those who think it would be good to have one	333 (97.1%)
Have been in a training/education program that does not require a GED or High school diploma	69 (20.2%)
Completed the program	46 (65.7%)

Education Challenges: As noted earlier, educational attainment has been directly related to success in the work place. When difficulties with learning are an issue, this educational

Table 13: Education Challenges

	Wave 1 N = 1144
In past year lack of education has been problem in getting job	286 (25.0%)
Current difficulty reading or writing	
Reading	54 (4.7%)
Writing	23 (2.0%)
Both reading and writing	75 (6.6%)
Has been diagnosed with a learning disability	169 (14.8%)
Reading/writing problems and learning disabilities in combination:	
Both a reading/writing problem and learning disability	66 (5.8%)
Either reading/writing problem or a learning disability	189 (16.5%)
Neither a reading/writing problem and learning disability	889 (77.7%)
Not diagnosed with a learning disability but believe they have one:	114 (11.7%)
In past year was learning disability or problem reading or writing such a problem couldn't take job etc.	62 (5.4%)

attainment can be more challenging. There were 152 (13.3%) respondents who indicated problems with either reading, writing or both. There were also 169 (14.8%) who indicated having been diagnosed with a learning disability. Common disabilities included dyslexia (42), ADHD (32), and ADD (32). After eliminating overlap between two groups, there were 255 (22.3%) respondents who have some problem with any combination of reading, writing or learning issues.

In addition, 114 (11.7%) respondents indicated they felt they had a learning disability even though they had not been diagnosed with one. When asked to say why they believed they might have a learning disability common descriptions included inability to concentrate or focus (27), difficulties with memory and comprehension (24), and reading problems (23). While many more respondents indicated there were learning or reading/writing problems, only 62 (5.4%) reported these issues interfered with their ability to obtain/retain employment or attend school or training.

Physical Health

Table 14: Physical Health

	Wave 1 N = 1144	**TL N = 1053**
Overall health in general:		
Excellent	137 (12.0%)	66 (6.3%)
Very Good	200 (17.5%)	150 (14.2%)
Good	498 (43.5%)	384 (36.5%)
Fair	197 (17.2%)	274 (26.0%)
Poor	112 (9.8%)	179 (17.0%)
Presence of chronic health conditions	509 (44.5%)	
Types of chronic health issues (N = 509)		
Arthritis/bone Pain	71 (13.9%)	
Asthma/emphysema	85 (16.7%)	
Back Problem; “Bad Back”	154 (30.3%)	
Cancer	25 (4.9%)	
Diabetes; “Sugar”	39 (7.6%)	
Fatigue/tired	33 (6.5%)	
Fibre myalgia	18 (3.5%)	
Headaches	61 (12.0%)	
Heart Condition	26 (5.1%)	
Hepatitis/cirrhosis (Liver Problems)	18 (3.5%)	
High Blood Pressure	30 (5.9%)	
Nerves/anxiety/stress	28 (5.5%)	
Obesity	20 (3.9%)	
Seizures	9 (1.8%)	
Ulcers; “Stomach Problems”	35 (6.9%)	
Thyroid Problems	23 (4.5%)	
Other (Specify):	249 (49.4%)	
Physical health problem: couldn’t take a job, go to school, etc.:		
In past year	629 (55.0%)	
In past month	317 (50.4%)	

Physical well-being is difficult to measure as each person's experience of illness and pain is different. The general health question is based on the General Health index used both nationally and by the State of Utah to evaluate overall health. Utah's Department of Health Annual report - 2005 states that 7.0% of Utah females age 18 - 34 (70.3% of the study population) report fair to poor health, and only 9.7% overall (Utah Dept. Of Health, 2005). As reported in Table 14 above, in the Wave 1 sample 309 (27%) respondents reported fair to poor health, and in the TL sample this rose to 453 (43.0%). The results for both groups of FEP recipients are very high compared to State of Utah norms. Within group differences show that the Older group and males were significantly more likely to have fair or poor health.

While some of the health problems were directly related to temporary conditions such as recovery from child birth or coming to the end of a high risk pregnancy, 509 (44.5%) respondents indicated the presence of a chronic health problem. Considering both the temporary and chronic issues, more than half the respondents (54%) indicated that physical health had been a barrier to obtaining and retaining employment at some time in the last year. For more than half of this group, it had also been a problem in the past month.

Mental Health

Mental health is a very broad category which can be influenced by many of the factors listed throughout this report. In this section overall mental health, specific diagnoses, self-

Table 15: Mental Health Issues

		Wave 1 N = 1144	**TL N = 1053**
Mental health overall	Excellent	189 (16.5%)	91 (8.6%)
	Very Good	239 (20.9%)	189 (17.9%)
	Good	390 (34.1%)	360 (34.2%)
	Fair	214 (18.7%)	269 (25.5%)
	Poor	111 (9.7%)	143 (13.6%)
Has been diagnosed with mental health issue		569 (49.7%)	
Ever received mental health treatment		691 (60.4%)	
Currently receive mental health treatment:		**N = 691** 387 (56.0%)	257 (24.4%)
	Counseling	274 (70.8%)	
	Medication	296 (42.8%)	
Not receiving now but believe I need treatment now		N = 755 150 (19.9%)	N = 796 179 (22.5%)
Mental health such a problem can not take a job, had to stop working or could not go to education / training:			
	In past year	337 (29.5%)	
	In past month	180 (15.7%)	

esteem/self-efficacy, and alcohol and other drug issues will be addressed.

Mental Health Overall: Mental health was also measured using the General Health Index question with a mental health focus. As noted in Table 15 above, in the Wave 1 sample, 325 (28.4%) respondents reported only fair to poor health. The same was true of 412 (39.1%) of those in the TL study. Fair to poor mental health was much more likely to be found in the Older group. More than half (60.4%) of the Wave 1 sample had received mental health treatment at some time in their life. There were 387 in treatment at the time of the interview and another 150 respondents who were not in treatment, but felt they needed it. There were 337 (29.5%) respondents who reported mental health problems so severe in the past year that they had been unable to work or go to school. This was also true for 180 (15.6%) respondents in the past month.

Mental Health Diagnosis: Respondents who had been diagnosed with a mental health issue were asked to describe the diagnosis. Table 16 reports these diagnoses. In addition to those noted in Table 16, other frequently reported diagnoses included Obsessive Compulsive Disorder (25) and Borderline Personality Disorder (19). To evaluate for the current presence of the more prevalent mental health issues, respondents completed screening tests for Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), Depression and Anxiety. These screens are produced by the World Health Organization and have been used in multiple studies of this population and found to be valid and reliable (CIDI - 12 month SF).

These results present a range of the potential prevalence of each of the mental health issues. While the diagnosis and screening data vary widely, all results are higher than found in the general population.

Table 16: Mental Health Diagnosis

	PTSD	Depression	Anxiety	Bi-Polar
Previously diagnosed	63 (5.5%)	420 (36.7%)	193 (16.8%)	111 (9.7%)
Screened positive	237 (20.7%)	541 (47.3%)	307 (26.8%)	
Diagnosed and screened negative	23 (2.0%)	142 (12.2%)	89 (7.8%)	
Diagnosed and screened positive	30 (3.5%)	278 (24.3%)	104 (9.1%)	
Not diagnosed and screened positive	197 (17.2%)	263 (23.0%)	203 (17.7%)	
Not diagnosed and screened negative	884 (77.3%)	461 (40.3%)	748 (65.4%)	

Self-Esteem/Self-Efficacy: The Rosenburg Self-Esteem (Rosenburg, 1965) and Pearlin Self-Efficacy (Pearlin, 1978) scales were used to evaluate the respondents' sense of self and perceived control they have over the events in their lives. The individual scores have little meaning as a first time measure but will certainly be re-used at the two and three year interviews. However, comparisons can be made within the sample. The Older group had significantly higher results than the two other groups. There were no other differences between groups.

Table 17: Self-Esteem/Self-Efficacy

	Wave 1 N = 1144
Self-Esteem Scale	21.2 Range 10 - 40
Pearlin Mastery Scale	14.7 Range 7 - 28

Another important characteristic relative to self-sufficiency is FEP participants' personal goals. Two questions which have been tested with other groups of low-income women were used to gather data regarding these goals. Respondents were asked to complete two statements to learn of possible goals or desires they had for the coming year (Lee, et.Al. 2004). The statements, "Next year I expect to be....." and "Next year I want to avoid being...." were answered with a wide variety of options.

These questions were added primarily to set a baseline for revaluation over the years, learning about an individual's ability to accomplish tasks or to be in the places they hoped to be. While answers these questions have not been fully analyzed, a preliminary review shows that a majority of respondents indicated working as one of their expectations for themselves in the next year. There were also significant numbers who expected to have (or hoped for) significant improvements with current physical and mental health problems. As far as things to be avoided, a great number of respondents were most hopeful to be off cash assistance.

Alcohol and Other drug Dependency: Measurement of alcohol or other drug dependency was completed in two ways. Respondents were able to self-report if alcohol or other drug use had been a barrier to employment or schooling in the past year. Also, respondents were screened with validated tools to evaluate alcohol and other drug dependency (CIDI -12 month SF). Several interviews were conducted in treatment centers promoting self-disclosure of alcohol or other drug issues.

Evaluating responses by groups revealed significantly higher rates of positive screens for alcohol dependency in the Younger group. Drug dependency was found to be significantly higher in those with no PA history.

Table 18: Alcohol and Other Drug Dependency

	Wave 1 N = 1144
Alcohol dependence indicated positive by screen	63 (5.5%)
Use of alcohol reported as barrier in past year	21 (1.9%)
Drug dependence indicated positive by screen	96 (8.4%)
Use of drugs reported as barrier in past year	51 (4.6%)

Abuse Experiences

Experiences of abuse surfaced in many areas within the interviews. The results here are from specific questions regarding issues of domestic violence and other experiences of violence as an adult. Domestic violence questions were not asked when the partner was present, either in the room or nearby. The TALE questions were added to potentially match with DWS assessment data.

The commonly cited Conflict Tactic Scale was used to measure domestic violence (Strauss, 1979). Five questions from the physical assault and sexual coercion sub-scales were used to measure severe domestic violence. Respondents in the Wave 1 sample were less likely to have experienced severe domestic violence in their lifetime but more likely to have had this experience in the past year. This is consistent with the number of Wave 1 respondents who reported recent domestic violence as a factor leading to obtaining cash assistance. The experience of severe domestic violence *ever* was most prevalent in the Middle age group, but domestic violence in the past 12 months was most prevalent in the Younger group. It may be surprising to some that the prevalence of domestic violence was nearly identical in males and females and in those with and without a PA history.

Table 19: Domestic Violence

	Wave 1 N = 1104	**TL N = 999**
Severe domestic violence - ever	676 (59.1%)	720 (72.0%)
Severe domestic violence - in past year	293 (25.6%)	143 (14.3%)
Severe domestic violence - current issue	21 (1.8%)	30 (3.0%)
TALE Questions: Past year - 0 Yes 1 Yes 2 Yes 3 Yes 4 Yes	 450 (40.8%) 203 (18.4%) 179 (16.2%) 140 (12.7%) 132 (12.0%)	
In past year, current or past romantic partner such a problem couldn't take job, job search, go to school, etc.	234 (21.2%)	

Questions beyond domestic violence involved both witnessing and experiencing various forms of violence in other relationships. Respondents from the Western region were more likely to have seen the abuse of another as an adult (62.9%), while this was least likely to be reported in Mountainland (41.4%). In this set of questions, females did report significantly higher levels of physical, sexual and emotional abuse after age 18 than did males. One reason for this might be that the abuse history questions were asked near the beginning of the interview and the domestic violence questions were asked near the end when more rapport had been established. It was also the case that respondents would report domestic violence activities which equated to physical abuse but the respondent had not identified it as such. Respondents sometimes had to be affirmed in the fact that sexual abuse *can* occur within the context of marriage.

Table 20: Other Abuse/Violence History

Positive responses to:	**Wave 1 N = 1144**	**TL N = 1053**
Did you ever see the abuse of someone else as an adult?	566 (49.7%)	627 (59.5%)
Were you ever physically abused after you were 18?	528 (46.4%)	650 (61.7%)
Were you ever sexually abused after you were 18?	234 (20.6%)	278 (26.5%)
Were you ever emotionally abused after you were 18?	690 (60.6%)	732 (69.5%)

Criminal Record

Respondents were simply asked if a criminal record had affected their ability to obtain or retain employment or go to school in the past year, and if so, had this happened in the past month. There were 122 (10.7%) respondents who reported that a criminal record had interfered with employment or schooling in the past year. A criminal record had been a problem for about half of these respondents in the past month.

Simply having a criminal record was only part of the impact of legal issues in general. Several respondents reported losing jobs due to court dates or being picked up on outstanding warrants for minor offenses. These legal issues extend to court involvement for children involved with the courts or court dates revolving around issues with DCFS. In addition to the emotional strain of dealing with court issues, dates are set regardless of an individual's work schedule, or appointments with DWS, creating choices with two undesirable outcomes.

EMPLOYMENT SUPPORTS

The focus on employment within the TANF program has prompted the increase in supports which are needed to move, typically single parents, toward paid work. Resources generally come from a variety of sources including family, friends, religious organizations and other local community agencies. In this section data will be presented regarding the primary resources which contribute to successful moves toward employment. These resources include: Child care, housing, telephone, transportation, health care, other community resources and social supports.

Child Care

In learning about participants in a program which requires both the presence of a child and parental engagement in activities outside the home, child care is clearly a significant issue. The results from general questions regarding use of child care are presented in Table 21. Additional questions were developed in conjunction with DWS's Office of Child Care Director, Lynette Rasmussen. The results of these more detailed questions are found in Appendix D and will be discussed in more detail at a later date.

Child care was not a current issue for 103 households as there were no children under age 13 in the home. Of the remaining 1041 households, only 496 (47.6%) had at least one child cared for by someone other than a parent on a *regular* basis. The term "regular" was used to focus on child care used when the parent was working, in school or training, job searching etc., not simply running errands. These 496 household represented 786 children currently receiving care. Most children (54.3%) were being cared for by a relative. The next most common setting was a day care center (26.1%).

Of the 496 families with a child in regular child care, only 241 were receiving child care assistance. When asked to give the primary reason they were not receiving assistance, 90 (35.2%) respondents said there was no need for financial help. Typically, this meant a family member was willing to care for the child/ren for free. Of the 38 respondents who applied for child care but were told they were not eligible, most reported they lacked participation hours in activities which "counted." The "other" reasons were varied. Some did not want to use the type of child care setting their case worker would support, others were having problems with the child care system itself and were unsure why they were not receiving assistance.

Table 21: Current and Recent Child Care

	Wave 1 N = 1041
Families with child in child care on regular basis:	496 (47.6%)
Number of children total in childcare:	786
Families currently receiving child care assistance	241 (48.5%)
Primary reason not receiving assistance:	
No Need	90 (35.2%)
Did not know assistance was available	23 (9.0%)
Was told I was not eligible	38 (14.8%)
Person I want to do it is not eligible	18 (7.0%)
In process of applying - not received yet	39 (15.3%)
Other	48 (18.8%)
Child care in past year	
In past year had child/ren in child care	212
Received child care assistance	85 (39.9%)
Why no child care assistance:	
No Need	56 (44.1%)
Did not know assistance was available	14 (11.0%)
Was told I was not eligible	22 (17.3%)
Person I want to do it is not eligible	15 (11.8%)
Other	20 (15.7%)

The 545 respondents who did not have a child in regular child care were asked if their child/ren had been in child care during the past year. As shown above, 212 respondents indicated regular use of child care in the past year. Only about 40% of this group had received state child care assistance. The reasons for not receiving assistance were similar to those listed above. There were some respondents who were unaware of the availability of state child care assistance. When asked what source of information regarding this resource would be more helpful, direct mailings and information from the DWS worker (See Table 22) were the most often stated.

Table 22: Child Care Information

	Wave 1 N = 1144
More information would encourage use of child care assistance	73
Sources of information that would be helpful:	
TV	6 (8.2%)
Radio	2 (2.7%)
Print media	11 (15.1%)
Direct mail	41 (56.2%)
Internet	9 (12.3%)
DWS worker	41 (56.2%)

As reported in Table 23, 446 (43.1%) respondents indicated that child care issues had, in the past year, prohibited employment or education to some degree. Affordability, reliability and availability at specific times were the most common problems. Fears about safety of children within a facility or concern about potential child abuse were also significant barriers. Most people generally find child care through knowing a specific person they trust to watch their children. Only 133 (12.8%) respondents reported help from the state as being the primary way child care was typically found. Just over half (54.9%) of the respondents had heard of Child Care Resource and Referral, less than half of these people had ever used the resource to find child care.

Respondents were asked one open ended question regarding child care, "What factors most influence your child care decisions?" This question elicited some of the strongest opinions expressed in the interview. First, respondents often interpreted the question as referring to "day care centers," verses child care in general. Some respondents based their response on personal experience in daycare as a child, working in a daycare or traumatic news stories regarding day care abuses. These experiences led to diminished trust in daycare centers due to perceptions of improper care, wide spread sickness and overcrowding. As some respondents said:

- "I know what it was like for me and my brothers and sisters to be in daycare. I am aware of what is out there and I want to avoid using daycare centers"
- "If I had the chance to stay at home with my children, I would prefer that. Having worked in daycare, I know what goes on, like the ratio of children to care giver and the frustrations of some of the young workers. I would not choose to use a daycare center for my children"
- "Because my sister used to leave her daughter at daycare....and her baby got a bruise on her face so I don't trust anyone".

Table 23: Child Care Problems

	Wave 1 N = 1036
Past 12 months child care or lack of child care was such a problem respondent lost job, couldn't take job or go to school or training	446 (43.1%)
Respondents who indicated this as primary problem:	
Costs too much	181 (40.6%)
Couldn't find care for times needed	151 (33.6%)
Care too far from work or home	38 (8.5%)
Caregiver unavailable or unreliable	110 (24.7%)
Worry about child abuse	45 (10.1%)
Worry about unsafe location/environment of facility	67 (15.0%)
Child disabled - no qualified caregiver available	20 (4.5%)
No infant care available	25 (5.6%)
No after school care or care for school age kids	2 (0.4%)
Poor quality - Kids or client are unhappy with place	14 (3.1%)
Child sick too often and caregiver will not take sick	16 (3.6%)
Child's behavior makes keeping care difficult	16 (3.6%)
Child care not authorized soon enough	9 (2.0%)
Payment late and lost provider	1 (0.2%)
Other problems with child care process at DWS	39 (8.7%)
Place wanted kids to go was full	4 (0.9%)
Previous over payment made help not possible	1 (0.2%)
Language barrier	- 0 -
Other	51 (11.4%)
How child care is generally found:	
Through the state	133 (12.8%)
Private agency	3 (0.3%)
Referral from a friend or relative	168 (16.1%)
From the phone book or a sign on the street	76 (7.3%)
Just from knowing specific person I trust	635 (60.9%)
Other	27 (2.6%)
Respondent has heard of Child Care Resource and Referral	572 (54.9%)
If yes, respondent has used it to find child care	253 (24.4%)

The most common factors considered in making child care decisions included attention to a safe and clean environment (338) and trusting the person and place (241). There was also significant interest in the activities, interaction and learning the child would experience (280). There were 198 comments indicating family members were the best, or only option the respondent would chose for child care. Fear of physical and/or sexual abuse of their child was an underlying theme in a great number of comments. This was not surprising, given the high percentage of respondents who had been victimized as children. As one woman said, "I would only trust women family members because of what happened to me when I was little." Several spoke of refusing to leave a child with anyone until the child could talk and tell the parent if anything "bad" happened.

Housing

A secure living situation is an important part of creating a stable family situation, and moving toward self-sufficiency. Nearly one third of the Wave 1 respondents have experienced homelessness as an adult. This was more likely to have occurred for those with a PA history. Table 24 reports several important aspects of the respondent's current housing situation. As expected, a majority of respondents (53.0%) rent. Of these renters, only 186 (30.6%) receive housing assistance.

After rent, respondents in the Young group were next most likely to live with family whether paying rent or not. Those in the Older group, again after rent, were more likely to own their own home. For the Wave 1 sample, the average length of time in their current residence was 20 months. When age groups were reviewed it was noted that the average length of time was about 12 months for the Young group, 18 months for the Middle group and 36 months for the Older group.

Table 24: Housing

Living Situation	**Wave 1 N = 1144**	**TL Study N = 1053**
Have been homeless as an adult	368 (32.2%)	450 (42.7%)
Current living situation:		
Rent	608 (53%)	801 (76.1%)
Own	77 (6.7%)	44 (4.2%)
Living with friends	38 (3.3%)	38 (3.6%)
Living with extended family - rent free	165 (14.4%)	150 (14.2%)
Living with extended family - pay rent	222 (19.4%)	***
Live in shelter	7 (0.6%)	6 (0.6%)
Other	27 (2.4%)	14 (1.3%)
Average length of time at current residence	20 months	24 months
Housing situation: problem in past year for getting or keeping a job or being able to attend education or training	187 (16.3%)	

*** - In TL study no distinction was made between renting own place or paying rent to family member

As noted above, only 187 (16.3%) respondents indicted that, in the past year, their housing situation had been such a problem that they couldn't work, had to stop work or couldn't go to education or training. Respondents were asked to describe the problem which affected their ability to work. While there were many factors contributing to the disturbance, the problem boiled down to needing to move from one living situation and needing to find a place to live for themselves and their children. Some were fleeing domestic violence, others broke up with a partner or left family members who were providing housing. Some were evicted and had no where to go; others moved to get away from gangs and violence. Without stable housing it was nearly impossible to keep employment and focus on anything other than finding a place to live.

In the focus groups, employment counselors revealed a degree of frustration around why people chose to live where they did. Based on this, respondents were asked to describe what factors they considered when looking for a place to live. The responses to this question were broad and varied from immediate needs of safety, security and stability to preferences of apartment layout, amenities and floor coverings. Some respondents preferred an area where they were close to family and other supports, while others chose to leave the current situation they were in and "create a new life." The seven most common responses were: safety, cleanliness, good schools, cost, enough space and close to stores, work etc, and proximity to family.

Health Care Coverage

Given the high frequency of physical and mental health issues, it is clear that health care coverage is an important employment support. A majority (57.8%) of respondents have had some lapse in health care coverage in the past year and 45.3% have needed medical care during that time and did not receive it because they could not afford it.

Most respondents felt the health care coverage met their needs. Those who did not feel this way, generally spoke of the need for dental and vision care. There were people who had not been able to take jobs due to poor eyesight and being unable to afford glasses. The frustration over lack of dental care was even stronger. Issues such as ongoing infections due to a bad tooth, dental pain and lack of self-esteem due to severely misaligned teeth, or rotted and missing teeth. Respondents often spoke of the connection between proper dental care and overall physical health, and the impact poor dental health can have on employment.

Table 25: Health Care Coverage

	N = 1144
Anytime in past year not covered by health insurance	651 (57.8%)
Past year needed medical care but couldn't get it because couldn't afford it	518 (45.3%)
Currently applying for social security	101 (8.8%)
Primary form of health insurance right now:	
Medicaid	1022 (89.3%)
Private	62 (5.4%)
None	60 (5.2%)
Coverage meets health care needs	845 (78.3%)
Had difficulty in past year accessing health care	126 (11.6%)
Main reason for having no insurance: (N = 60)	
Lost medicaid or medical assistance eligibility	36 (60.0%)
Could not afford to pay the premiums	5 (8.3%)
Current employer doesn't offer health plans	2 (3.3%)
Not eligible for health plan at work place	2 (3.3%)
Healthy, don't need health coverage	2 (3.3%)
Other (specify)	13 (21.7%)

Respondents were also asked if they had any difficulty accessing health care. The most commonly stated issue was the lack of doctors who accept medicaid or were open to accepting new patients (48). The next most common complaints included the inability to pay for medications or co-pays (15), transportation problems to and from doctor (14). Several also mentioned lack of basic information about doctors and the medicaid program to help them understand the benefits.

Telephone

Access to a telephone is important in being available for employment. Most (92.0%) respondents have regular access to a phone, typically their own cell or home phone. Yet, phone service, especially on pay ahead cell phones, was not always available or reliable. While a high percentage of respondents had regular access to a phone at the time of the interview, 163 (14.2%) reported that access to a phone had been such a problem in the past year that they had unable to obtain or retain employment due to this problem.

Table 26: Telephone Access

	Wave 1 N = 1144	**TL N = 1053**
Access to a telephone for making and receiving calls:		
Yes, regular access	1053 (92.0%)	878 (83.4%)
Some limited access	62 (5.4%)	72 (6.8%)
No very little or no access	29 (2.5%)	103 (9.8%)
Primary phone	**N = 1116**	**N = 950**
Own home phone	372 (33.3%)	487 (51.3%)
Own cell phone	602 (53.9%)	322 (33.9%)
Family member's phone	106 (9.5%)	98 (10.35)
Friend or neighbor's phone	21 (1.9%)	34 (3.6%)
Other	15 (1.3%)	9 (0.9%)
Access to a telephone was such a problem couldn't take a job, job search etc.:		
In past year	163 (14.2%)	
In past month	52 (31.9%)	

Transportation

Regular transportation is a significant work support, especially in areas where public transportation is not readily available or where child care is a significant distance from one's home. Over 30% of the sample did not have a Driver's Licence and just over 35% did not have regular use of a car. As Table 27 indicates, transportation for those closed TL was generally a greater problem than for the Wave 1 sample. Again, while nearly 65% of Wave 1 respondents had regular use of a car at the time of the interview, transportation problems had hindered 484 (42.3%) in the effort to obtain and/or retain a job or attend schooling in the past year. For almost half of those respondents, it had also been a problem in the past month.

Table 27: Transportation

	Wave 1 N = 1144	TL N = 1053
Has current driver's license	796 (69.6%)	669 (63.5%)
Has regular use of a car	741 (64.8%)	613 (58.2%)
	N = 741	**N = 613**
Condition of current vehicle		
Excellent	163 (22.0%)	82 (13.4%)
Good	289 (39.0%)	235 (38.3%)
Fair	202 (27.3%)	196 (31.9%)
Poor	87 (11.7%)	101 (16.4%)
Bus route in the area		
Yes	936 (81.8%)	838 (79.6%)
No	162 (14.2%)	167 (15.9%)
Don't Know	46 (4.0%)	48 (4.6%)
	N = 936	**N = 838**
Those who use the bus where available	343 (36.5%)	395 (47.1%)
Main source of transportation		
Own car	647 (56.6%)	522 (49.6%)
Spouse/significant other	23 (2.0%)	30 (2.8%)
Family	198 (17.3%)	148 (14.1%)
Friends	52 (4.5%)	51 (4.8%)
Public transportation	168 (14.7%)	227 (21.6%)
On foot	44 (3.8%)	60 (5.7%)
Other	10 (0.9%)	7 (0.7%)
No source	2 (0.2%)	8 (0.8%)
Transportation such a problem couldn't take a job, job search etc.:		
In past year	484 (42.3%)	
In past month	230 (47.5%)	

Community Resources

Community resources filled significant gaps for those struggling to make ends meet. Respondents were asked to indicate if, in the past 3 months, they had used a variety of resources to supplement their other income sources. Table 28 lists a variety of other community resources which could be accessed. It was not surprising that more TL respondents had accessed food banks since cash closure as fewer of these same respondents reported receiving food stamps. Questions regarding services such as WIC and Free School Lunch were not asked of everyone but only respondents with children of appropriate age for these services.

Table 28: Additional Community Resources

	Wave 1 N = 1144	TL N = 1053
EITC		
Those who have heard of this program	743 (64.9%)	
Used this program	527 (71.4%)	
Never filed taxes	42 (3.7%)	
WIC - (asked of families with a child under 5 or respondent was pregnant)	**N = 831** 508 (61.1%)	**N = 504** 261 (51.8%)
Free/reduced cost school meals - (asked of families with school age children)	**N = 484** 386 (79.8%)	
Food bank/food pantry	268 (23.4%)	420 (39.9%)
Thrift store	455 (39.8%)	498 (47.3%)
Homeless shelter	27 (2.4%)	32 (3.0%)
Help from a church/religious organization	277 (24.2%)	282 (26.8%)
Drug or alcohol treatment	77 (6.7%)	90 (8.5%)
Mental health services (self or dependent child)	340 (29.7%)	332 (31.5%)

One additional resource which has become very important in seeking employment and accessing job listings and other such information is access to a computer. Just over two thirds of the sample indicated they do have regular access to a computer (See Table 29). The computer used most frequently is typically in the home. More than 85% indicated that the computer accessed most often does have internet access.

Table 29: Access to a Computer

	Wave 1 N = 1144
Has regular access to a computer	755 (66.3%)
Where is computer used most often located	
Home	477 (62.6%)
Work	21 (2.8%)
School	41 (5.4%)
Family member/friend's place	125 (16.4%)
Library	63 (8.3%)
DWS	23 (3.0%)
Other	12 (1.6%)
Computer has internet access	649 (85.3%)

Social Supports

Study respondents were generally pleased with the level of support received, overall, from friends, family and others. The term "support" was defined to include emotional support, help with daily activities, as well as possible financial support (Kalil, et. Al, 2001). Those with no PA history and those in the Younger age group were most satisfied with the level of support received.

Table 30: Social Supports

	Wave 1 N = 1144	TL N = 1053
Rate satisfaction: Overall level of support from others:		
Very satisfied	420 (36.7%)	
Satisfied	587 (51.4%)	
Unsatisfied	110 (9.6%)	
Very unsatisfied	26 (2.3%)	
Closest personal supports come from:		
Spouse/partner	287 (25.1%)	244 (22.3%)
Parents	657 (57.0%)	[All
Children	282 (24.7%)	Family:
Other family	423 (37.0%)	752 (71.4%)]
Friends	268 (23.4%)	227 (21.6%)
Other	79 (6.9%)	95 (9.0%)
Don't have any supports	19 (1.7%)	61 (5.8%)
Religion		
Buddhist	8 (0.7%)	---
Catholic	139 (12.2%)	168 (16.0%)
Christian	129 (11.3%)	74 (7.0%)
Jehovah's Witness	8 (0.7%)	6 (6.0%)
LDS	476 (41.7%)	418 (39.7%)
Pagan/Wiccan	9 (0.7%)	5 (0.5%)
Protestant	85 (7.4%)	62 (5.9%)
Other	15 (1.2%)	16 (1.6%)
None	270 (23.6%)	302 (28.7%)
How often attended religious services in past month:		
Never	658 (57.6%)	
1 - 3 times	293 (25.6%)	
4 times	157 (13.7%)	
More than 4 times	35 (3.1%)	
How often attended community meetings in past month:		
Never	958 (83.7%)	
1 - 4 times	162 (14.2%)	
More than 4 times	24 (2.1%)	
In past year: Exchanged services with family or friends?		
Yes	648 (56.6%)	
No	496 (43.4%)	

Social support can come in the form of exchanges or "bartering" of services. More than half the respondents reported exchanging services with family or friends to meet their needs. Those with a PA history, those in the Older group, and those with lower work history, were less likely to have used this method to meet their needs. When asked to describe the types of services bartered, child care was by far the service most often provided to and received from others.

Involvement with religious institutions and/or other community groups was another area of support explored. Less than half the respondents attended any kind of religious service in the past month and even fewer (about 16%) attended any kind of community activity in the past month. When asked about connections to others, just over one-third had no neighbor close by whom they could: have a friendly chat with, ask a small favor of, or visit with inside the person's home.

This lack of community connection did not necessarily mean respondents were on their own. When asked about assistance received from family and friends in the past year, many named several areas of assistance. Also, respondents had been helpful to family members and friends in many different areas. This mutual support was often referred to when understanding why someone needed assistance. In some cases, this support from family or friends had been the only resource keeping them from needing help in the past. Losing that support was a primary factor in needing to seek assistance.

Table 31: Services Provided to and Received From Family and Friends

	receive help with (X) from..... (in past year)		**provide help with (X) to.... (in past year)**	
	family	**friends**	**family**	**friends**
Transportation	835 (73.0%)	662 (57.9%)	637 (55.7%)	646 (56.5%)
Home (apartment) repairs	372 (32.5%)	255 (22.3%)	350 (30.6%)	229 (20.0%)
Food/groceries/meals	657 (57.4%)	347 (30.3%)	602 (52.6%)	454 (39.7%)
Help with paying bills	621 (54.3%)	208 (18.2%)	300 (26.2%)	155 (13.5%)
Child care (other than working)	772 (67.5%)	410 (35.9%)	571 (49.9%)	493 (43.1%)
Help with finding a job	376 (32.9%)	336 (29.4%)	257 (22.5%)	345 (30.2%)
Finding or providing a place to live	643 (56.2%)	276 (24.1%)	236 (20.6%)	263 (23.0%)
Clothing	535 (46.8%)	309 (27.0%)	354 (30.9%)	347 (30.3%)
Extra cash	613 (53.6%)	245 (21.4%)	286 (25.0%)	232 (20.3%)
Medical/dental expenses	167 (14.6%)	30 (2.6%)	60 (5.2%)	22 (1.9%)
Emotional support	970 (84.8%)	937 (81.9%)	1033 (90.3%)	1010 (88.3%)

The giving and receiving of emotional support was the most common. As noted in the "bartering" section, exchanges of child care were also very common, as was transportation and, to a lesser degree, food/groceries or meals.

EXPERIENCES WITH DWS

The previous pages have provided in depth descriptions of FEP participants receiving cash assistance. The next sections provide findings regarding these respondents' experiences with several aspects of DWS. The following presentation will include data regarding the respondents' initial self-sufficiency efforts, first encounter with DWS and knowledge of FEP policy, their experiences with DWS workers and finally, engagement with the personalized employment plan.

Self-sufficiency Efforts

To learn more about self-sufficiency efforts prior to receiving cash assistance, Wave 1 respondents were also asked to indicate the methods they had used to "make ends meet" in the six months prior to their reception of cash assistance. Table 32 outlines this data, revealing the many different ways people had tried to make it on their own before asking for help. On average there were 5.5 positive responses to the various ways to make ends meet. Those who marked "Other" were asked to describe their additional efforts. There were 75 people who pawned or otherwise sold their personal possessions, another 19 sold plasma, and 29 did odd jobs.

Table 32: Efforts to Make Ends Meet

	Wave 1 N = 1144	**TL N = 1053**
Had a job	702 (61.4%)	382 (36.3%)
Cut back on necessities	893 (78.1%)	773 (73.4%)
Money from families/friends	727 (63.6%)	630 (59.8%)
Got money from boy/girl friend or partner	400 (35.0%)	292 (27.7%)
Cut back on extras	962 (84.2%)	867 (82.3%)
Delayed/stopped paying bills	722 (63.1%)	737 (70.0%)
Child support from other parent	165 (14.4%)	91 (8.6%)
Benefits from another program (outside DWS)	240 (21.0%)	197 (18.7%)
Got help from charity	222 (19.4%)	289 (27.4%)
Cheaper housing/moved in w/others	481 (42.1%)	240 (22.8%)
Went to a shelter	59 (5.2%)	28 (2.7%)
Put child/ren in someone else's care	102 (8.9%)	77 (7.3%)
Spent down savings	395 (34.6%)	
Sold Food stamps	32 (2.8%)	32 (3.0%)
Participate in illegal activity	33 (2.9%)	29 (2.8%)
Other	170 (14.9%)	188 (17.9%)

A similar question was used with the TL sample. This group was asked to indicate the types of things they had done to make ends meet *after* their case assistance had closed. As can be seen in Table 32, those in the TL sample were significantly less likely to have used employment to make ends meet. They were also less likely to have received money from a partner and more likely to have delayed or stopped paying some bills and received help from charity.

Entrance into DWS

Respondents were asked to think about when they *first* applied for cash assistance - whether in Utah or another state. Data regarding this experience are reported in Table 33. Most respondents heard about the assistance program from family or friends. Those who indicated first hearing about the programs from "other" sources, listed many different social service agencies, hospitals, and various shelters as their source of information. Some had been recipients of other services such as food stamps or Medicaid in the past and simply applied for additional benefits when the need arose. The average age of first receipt of assistance was 23 but ranged from 15 to 60 years. While respondents reported receiving an average of 6.5 months of cash assistance in Utah, DWS records show an average of 5.8 months since FEP months started counting in January 1997. This difference is likely due to respondents including months received prior to 1997.

For about two thirds of the respondents, the current episode of cash assistance was their first. In a broad, open ended type question, respondents were asked to describe what happened that they needed to apply for cash assistance, both the very first time they applied for cash and the most recent time (if more than one episode). Each story was unique and much more complicated than could be expressed in a simple summary. Still, the stories could be divided into three broad categories. The reasons for applying for cash assistance generally had to do with a change in or loss of 1) financial support from family, 2) financial support from a spouse or partner or 3) the respondents own loss of ability to provide for him or herself and children.

As might be expected, those who had a loss of support from family were more likely to be in the Younger group. They were also more likely to be female and have a reduced work history. Respondents in this group often spoke of parents being unable or unwilling to continue supporting them due to friction or financial problems in the family. For example one respondent said:

> • "I didn't have a job or noth'in. I wasn't getting support from my father and I still don't. My parents were supporting me before getting cash assistance. My mom and dad told me to apply for assistance. They give me money when they can, but really can't afford to."

Loss of support from a spouse or partner was quite varied. Respondents in this group were more likely to be female, with no PA history and in the Older group. This group generally consisted of those who had been deserted by a long term spouse or a partner who had been providing support. Some respondents left these types of situations on their own due to domestic violence. In other cases the spouse had been deported, jailed or had become disabled and was no longer able to support the family.

> • "My husband pretty much left me with 3 children and no money. He had been the one providing for us for the last year. He didn't really have money to pay child support at the time since he was in job transition. I sold my stuff for money, but ran out of things to sell."

Table 33: Entrance into Cash Assistance

	Wave 1 N = 1144
Average age of first receipt (median) of cash assistance	23.0 years (range: 15 - 60)
Episodes on cash assistance	
One	722 (63.1%)
More than one	422 (36.9%)
Who first told you about DWS resources?	
Mother	215 (18.8%)
Sister	76 (6.6%)
Other family	136 (11.9%)
Friends	222 (19.4%)
I just knew myself	327 (28.6%)
Don't Know	12 (1.0%)
Other	156 (13.6%)
Average number of months of cash assistance in Utah:	
Self report	6.5 (Range: 1 - 180)
From DWS records dating back to January 1997	5.8 (Range: 2 - 12)
Percentage of respondents who reported months:	
Higher than DWS records	208 (18.2%)
Lower than DWS records	599 (52.5%)
The same as DWS records	334 (29.2%)
Cash assistance in another state:	
Self - report: received cash assistance in another state	154 (13.5%)
Self - report: average number of months received	12.1
PACMIS: out - of - state TANF months	24 (2.1%)
PACMIS: Average number of months received	5.25
Those who remember being told there is a limit to the number of months for reception of cash assistance:	902 (79.1%)
Average number of months for time limit on cash	33 months
Number reporting under 36 months	190 (21.0%)
Number reporting exactly 36 months	596 (65.9%)
Number reporting over 36 months	21 (2.3%)
Don't know	97 (10.7%)

The third group was the largest and most diverse. In these cases the respondent had been the one providing support but something happened that he/she was no longer able to earn enough to care for the family. This included issues such as physical and mental health problems, losing a job, employment ending, or the person deciding to go back to school. Respondents in this group were more likely to be in the Older group, and male. As one person said:

• "I was fired from my job for not being able to see and doctors won't help me get the treatment I need. I am unable to drive legally now as my license has been taken away due to lack of vision. Eye sight can be restored with proper medical treatment, so I'm not applying for SSI as I want to go back to work after my eyes are fixed."

While the situations leading to the need for cash assistance were very diverse, the feelings about needing assistance reveal clear trends. Respondents were asked, "That very first time when you applied for cash assistance, how would you describe your *feelings* about your situation?" A few respondents focused on their personal situation leading up to applying for assistance but most interpreted the question to mean "feelings about needing to ask for help." Respondents answers varied from excited to devastated. By far, the most common feelings reported were shame, embarrassment, and worthlessness (425). As some commented:

• "I hated it. I was completely and thoroughly embarrassed and still am. I go out of town to spend my food stamps. I have worked my whole life and it is embarrassing."
• "I didn't like it at all. I came to the U.S. to live a dream; I never thought I'd need help."
• "I was struggling and felt really bad, like I wasn't going to be able to take care of my baby. I was in a situation I never thought I would have to be in."

Many respondents had comments which reflect well established stereotypes of PA recipients. One person said, "I was in despair – I grew up thinking that people on welfare were less, my family looked down on people on welfare; ashamed – I felt judged by my family." Another said, "I just couldn't believe it, I came from a good family, but through my mistakes I ended up needing it. I felt like there was something wrong with me, like a welfare mom." Others came from family situations which viewed public assistance as a "way out" of their situation, a move toward a form of independence. As one respondent said, "I felt good about it. I was happy to be able to get out and do it on my own. My Aunt said ' you can spread your wings' like I could do it on my own."

Those who had not grown up connected with PA often were scared, confused and worried that they would not receive the help they needed (143). Others had mixed feelings of fear and embarrassment, worried but grateful for the help when they needed it (83). There were also a small number (73) who said they had no feelings or felt "fine." Often this was because they knew it was a temporary situation and would be over soon. As one woman said, "I felt at peace with it. I knew I was doing the best I could and only needed it until I was done with school."

Interaction with DWS Employees

Respondents were asked to reflect on their experiences with both their employment counselor and their eligibility worker (or whomever the respondent has connected with for eligibility services). There were 162 (14.2%) respondents who could not identify any person with whom they had connected for eligibility services. While it might be assumed that more would be found in the Central region due to eligibility services being provided from a central location, the percentage of unknown workers was no higher in Central region than in the others.

The majority of respondents in Wave 1 reported a good to excellent relationship with their employment counselor. The employment counselor - FEP participant relationship was strongest

in the Mountainland and Eastern regions. This same question regarding the relationship between the employment counselor and the respondent has been asked in several other studies over the past five years. Data in Table 34 reveals that while results vary somewhat according to case closure type, results from the Wave 1 study extend the trend of improvements in these relationships.

Table 34: Relationship With Employment Counselor

	Dynamics of Leaving Welfare 2002*			NP Study* 2004	TL Study 2003-2005	Wave 1 2006
	Closed Work N = 29	Closed-Other N = 52	Closed TL N = 260	N = 292	N = 1004	N = 1144
Excellent	12 (41.4%)	15 (28.8%)	66 (25%)	21 (7%)	306 (30.5%)	410 (35.8%)
Very Good	7 (24.1%)	3 (5.8%)	40 (15%)	35 (12%)	197 (19.6%)	232 (20.3%)
Good	4 (13.8%)	10 (19.2%)	48 (19%)	81 (28%)	218 (21.7%)	261 (22.8%)
Fair	3 (10.3%)	11 (21.2%)	40 (15%)	69 (24%)	148 (14.7%)	134 (11.7%)
Poor	3 (10.3%)	13 (25.0%)	66 (25%)	86 (30%)	135 (13.4%)	99 (8.7%)

* - Full study results can be found at: http://www.socwk.utah.edu/sri/dwsreport.asp

When discussing possible study questions in DWS focus groups, workers asked that there be a distinction made between customer experiences with employment counselors and eligibility workers. Focus group participants also wanted questions that better described aspects of the relationship that were helpful. Table 35 presents the basic relationship question but asks respondents to specifically focus on DWS employees in specific roles.

Overall, the relationship with the employment counselor was more positive than with the eligibility worker. The responses to the questions regarding client treatment and interactions seem to be reflective of the different roles the workers play within the agency. The number of actual contacts with one worker versus another can also greatly influence this experience.

Table 35: Interaction with DWS Employees

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
Rate relationship with employment counselor (worker unknown: 8 - 0.7%)	410 (35.8%)	232 (20.3%)	261 (22.8%)	134 (11.7%)	99 (8.7%)
Rate relationship with eligibility worker (worker unknown: 162 - 14.2%)	150 (13.1%)	121 (10.6%)	314 (24.7%)	208 (10.2%)	189 (16.5%)

Table 36 provides a summary of respondents' experiences with several aspects of their encounters with employment counselors and eligibility workers. Employment counselors were most often perceived as treating customers with dignity and respect and taking time to explain program

rules. On the other hand about one quarter of respondents felt their employment counselor really only cared about getting forms completed and overwhelmed the respondent with too much to do.

The strongest positive area for eligibility workers was also being perceived as treating the customer with dignity and respect. On the other hand nearly half the respondents (45%) felt the eligibility worker only cared about getting forms completed.

Table 36: Specific Aspects of Relationships with DWS Employees

	Wave 1 - N = 1144			
Employment Counselor	**Strongly Agree - 1**	**Agree - 2**	**Disagree - 3**	**Strongly Disagree - 4**
..treats me with dignity and respect.	572 (50.4%)	435 (38.3%)	88 (7.8%)	40 (3.5%)
..takes the time to explain program rules.	505 (44.1%)	496 (43.4%)	104 (9.1%)	27 (2.4%)
..only cares about getting the forms filled out.	74 (6.5%)	224 (19.6%)	574 (50.2%)	262 (22.9%)
..asks too many personal questions that are none of his/her business.	51 (4.5%)	122 (10.7%)	683 (59.7%)	277 (24.2%)
..only wants what's good for me and my kids	381 (33.3%)	555 (48.5%)	154 (13.5%)	38 (3.3%)
...overwhelms me with so many things to do I am likely to fail.	96 (8.4%)	221 (19.3%)	584 (51.0%)	232 (20.3%)
...acts more like an ally (friend) than an enemy.	305 (26.7%)	592 (51.7%)	193 (16.9%)	42 (3.7%)
..did not give me a chance to explain what brought me here and what I need.	54 (4.7%)	186 (16.3%)	600 (52.4%)	294 (25.7%)
Eligibility Worker (N = 979)	**Strongly Agree**	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
..treats me with dignity and respect.	181 (18.4%)	593 (60.4%)	142 (14.5%)	66 (6.7%)
..takes the time to explain program rules.	167 (17.0%)	507 (51.7%)	236 (24.1%)	71 (7.2%)
..only cares about getting the forms filled out.	116 (11.8%)	325 (33.2%)	445 (45.5%)	93 (9.5%)
..asks too many personal questions that are none of his/her business.	27 (2.8%)	93 (9.5%)	693 (70.6%)	168 (17.1%)
..overwhelms me with so many things to do I am likely to fail.	52 (5.3%)	161 (16.4%)	621 (63.4%)	146 (14.9%)

Employment Plan Experiences

As noted earlier, universal participation has been part of receiving cash assistance in Utah since before TANF and FEP came into being. Most respondents in this study reported knowing what was on their employment plan and were confident they would be able to complete all the activities on the plan.

For those who did not feel able to complete all the activities on the plan, some of the most common reasons were: physical/mental health issues (29.3%), plan had too much/overwhelming (25.4%), didn't believe plan was right for them (17.3%), lack of child care (16.3%), and transportation issues (16.3%).

There were also 128 (11.1%) respondents who asked to have something on their plan but were told the activity did not qualify. Most of these activities were related to support for schooling. The problems focused on the type of schooling desired, the level of education (such as a bachelors), or the desire to do school full-time and not combine with work.

Since Fall 2005, FEP participants were required to participate 34 hours a week in approved activities. When asked, "Do you remember being told you would have to do a certain number of hours in certain activities as part of your plan?," most (83%) did remember being told this. When asked how many hours they were told they had to do, responses ranged from 0 to 50 hours, with an average of 29.6 hours. Just over one-fifth of the respondents did name 34 hours as the number they remember. Nearly two-thirds of respondents felt that requiring 34 hours a week in participation was reasonable.

Table 37: Experience with Employment Plan

	Wave 1 N = 1144			
	Yes	**No**	**Unsure**	**No plan**
Do you know what is currently on your employment plan?	1032 (90.2%)	55 (4.8%)	55 (4.8%)	2 (0.2%)
Was there anything you asked to have on the plan that could NOT be on the plan?	128 (11.1%)	1014 (88.9%)	---	---
Do you remember being told you would have to do a certain number of hours in certain activities as part of plan (N = 1022) How many hours? [237 - 20.7% - remembered being told exactly 34 hours]	848 (83.0%) Ave. 29.6 Range: 0 - 50	152 (14.9%)	22 (2.2%)	---
Do you think you will be able to complete all the activities on your plan?	821 (72.3%)	196 (17.3%)	119 (10.5%)	
Did you think you were going to have to do the types of activities on your plan as part of receiving assistance?	543 (47.6%)	498 (43.6%)	100 (8.8%)	
Is requiring 34 hours a week participation reasonable?	746 (65.3%)	397 (34.7%)		
Overall, everything at DWS explained clearly	923 (80.7%)	221 (19.3%)		

Respondents were also asked if they realized they would have to do the types of things required of them when they did apply for assistance. The response to this questions was split quite evenly.

There were 498 (43.6%) who did not realize they would have to do these things. These respondents were asked what they *thought they would have to do* in order to get benefits. There were 144 (28.9%) respondents who simply had no idea what would be expected, and another 89 (17.9%) who didn't think they would have to do anything. Those who believed the latter were typically those who had been on cash assistance years ago and had not had to do such activities to receive assistance. Another group included those who had never had any personal experience with public assistance and had previously believed welfare recipients "got something for nothing." Other respondents thought they would have to do job search, meet with counselors, turn in paperwork and go to school.

Improving a customer's sense of ownership of the plan has been emphasized to employment counselors in the past few years. As noted in Table 38, nearly three-quarters of the respondents felt creation of the employment plan was a joint effort between themselves and their worker. Most respondents were able to discuss barriers to work and understood their plan, but they were not as confident their views had been taken into consideration when the employment plan was developed.

Table 38: Employment Plan Creation

	Self Only	**Emp. coun. only**	**Both together**	**Other**
Overall, who created the employment plan?	40 (3.5%)	251 (22.1%)	834 (73.4%)	11 (1.0%)
	Completely	**Mostly**	**Somewhat**	**Not at all**
To what degree are you able to discuss barriers to working with employment counselor?	660 (55.7%)	251 (21.9%)	199 (17.4%)	26 (2.3%)
To what degree were your views taken into consideration in making the employment plan?	451 (39.8%)	308 (27.2%)	273 (24.1%)	101 (8.9%)
To what degree do you understand your employment plan?	681 (60.2%)	257 (22.7%)	163 (14.4%)	31 (2.7%)

Respondents were asked a series of questions which reflected attitudes towards the concept of welfare in general and the role of mothers both as financial providers and as caregivers for their children. (See Appendix E) These questions, as well as comments added by respondents in many other places, reflect views of "welfare moms" similar to those found in general society.

To focus on role identity, respondents were asked both "Would you prefer to work outside the home" and "Would you prefer to be a stay at home parent." Surprisingly, respondents were split in their preference to either work outside the home or be a stay at home parent. When asked their *preference*, 39.5% of respondents consistently said they would prefer to work outside the home than be a stay at home parent. On the other hand only 42.0% consistently said they would prefer to stay at home. Another 18.5% gave a mixed response, meaning, they indicated a preference for both. Women, those with no PA history, those in the Younger group, those from Mountainland and Western region and those with less work history were all significantly more likely to want to be stay at home parents.

Additional DWS Services and Overall Experience

Two additional questions surfaced by the focus groups were used in the Wave 1 study. The first question asked respondents to identify any additional services they felt DWS should offer. It was originally thought this question would simply surface additional services respondents would like to have as part of the "one stop." The respondents answers provided this information and much more. There were 233 (20.4%) who could not think of anything else. Another 287 (25.1%) could think of nothing more but noted this was because they felt DWS already offered so much. As one person said, "I think they do a good job at everything. Nothing else they can provide." A few respondents didn't feel qualified to answer the question because they did not know what was currently offered.

Some respondents mentioned specific services they would like DWS to offer. The most common request was for educational supports and training (88). Some asked for help with housing(77) and help with employment placement and job training (67). Child care assistance was suggested by 52 respondents, and 47 mentioned transportation needs.

In addition, some respondents understood this question as asking, not just for suggestions for specific services, but for ideas on how the policies, procedures and all DWS programs could be better administered. Of course this open interpretation led to quite a variety of responses. There were 45 who asked that employment counselors be more customer friendly and understanding and 31 who requested increases in the cash assistance amount. The comments below represent a variety of other suggestions offered in response to this question. DWS should offer....

- "A wider variety of supporting programs. Need to know their jobs better so they can tell people accurately what they can and can't support them in."
- "I think that DWS should teach their employees to be more understanding of people's situation and more actively trying to help their individual clients address their problems."
- "It is set really for people with less education. They don't know how to help people like me. They need a wider variety of job types. The workshops are all for people beginning their work career. I have much more experience."
- "I don't know all that they do offer. But I do know the different parts of DWS need to teach each other better. Medicaid, cash and ORS etc...."
- "I think they should offer people comprehension services. So people can understand their rights and the process there. The letters I get from them are always 10 days old. This limits my ability to fulfill the obligations they ask for or to respond to their requests."
- "It would be nice if child care had it's own credit card. They should give you a voucher to do child care rather then have it on the same card as my financial."

In one final, broad question which came from the focus group sessions, respondents were asked, "In addition to the food stamps, medicaid and cash assistance type benefits, *what else* do you feel you have *gained* from being connected to DWS?" Again, responses to this question were very diverse. There were 308 who said they had received "nothing more" than the benefits offered and 71 respondents reported only, "headaches," "stress," and "frustration." But there were also many who had been helped in a variety of other ways. Additional benefits included education/schooling (183), community projects or resources other then medicaid, food stamps and cash (77), physical or mental health therapy/counseling (71).

There were also those who had some insight into areas of growth that might not always be associated with public assistance programs. There were respondents who spoke of increased motivation, self-esteem, confidence, stability and support (67), much of that coming from their employment counselor. Comments from some respondents were:

- "My first employment counselor helped me because he was understanding of my condition and gave me extra help to navigate the system. He explained the system clearly."
- "They gave me courage to know that I can get a job and I can do it on my own if I put my mind to it."
- "More respect for those people down there, the DWS people went out of their way to help me with what I needed."
- "All the people down there are nice. They are interested in how I am doing. Really supportive of me and care."
- "They helped me in many ways, it saved my life. I would have died."

There were also insights gained about public assistance programs in general, ideas that perhaps shattered myths they had long believed. This knowledge was recognized as a "gain" in their life.

- "Probably a broader perspective of the type of people who are on welfare, there are the stereotypes and the people who you would never guess are on it. These people are using it to get ahead and provide better for their children."
- "Learned that there are more people like me out there going through the same things I am."
- "I've gained a better knowledge of what it's like to be poor. I understand the program better; I used to think people get trapped in the system, but they help people more than I thought."
- "By doing an unpaid internship I realized it was okay for me to go out to work and leave my kids home."

While the kinds of "gains" listed here may not be recordable in counting participation hours, these are certainly benefits to the individuals who were able to grow personally from a difficult experience. This kind of growth is typically facilitated by encountering workers who model the same positive and growth oriented direction these respondents have found.

EMPLOYMENT

Employment History

Nearly all respondents in both studies have been employed at some point in their lives. Wave 1 respondents were asked to estimate how much of the time they had been employed at a paying job. Nearly half (47.5%) indicated they had been employed most of the time since they were 16 years old. Employment history is a factor often associated with future employment potential. The "amount of time" employed since the respondent was 16 was collapsed into a two response variable (See Table 39) and used as one of the five "within group" comparison variables and called "Employment History."

Another way to look at more recent employment history involved dividing the sample into three groups: 1) the currently employed 2) the unemployed who *have* worked in the past year, and 3) the unemployed who *have not* worked in the past year. There were 333 (29.1%) currently employed respondents, 581 (50.8%) not currently unemployed, but had worked in the past year and 229 (20.0%) respondents who had not worked in more than one year.

Table 39: Employment History

	Wave 1 N = 1144	TL N = 1053
Respondent has been employed for pay at some time	1125 (98.3%)	1039 (98.7%)
Amount of time employed at a paying job:		
Hardly at all	82 (7.2%)	
About 1/4 of the time	118 (10.3%)	
About ½ the time	196 (17.1%)	
About 3/4 of the time	188 (16.4%)	
Most of the time	541 (47.3%)	
Amount of time employed condensed to other variable:		
Worked ¾ of the time or more	729 (63.7%)	
Worked ½ the time or less	415 (36.3%)	
Unemployed now, but was employed in past year	581 (50.8%)	
Average number of months employed in past year:	5 months	
Respondent unemployed for more than 1 year	229 (20.0%)	

Current Employment Status

Data in Table 40 for the three Wave 1 employment groups indicates those currently employed are generally working less hours, for less pay, and have fewer benefits than those who have worked in the past year but are currently unemployed. The currently employed did feel they had more opportunity for advancement to a higher level that paid more. While learning about possible jobs from friends and relatives was most common, more of the currently employed heard about their job from DWS. The currently employed were more likely to find supervisors and co-workers supportive of employment. (For comparisons between the currently employed in the Wave 1 and TL studies see Appendix F.)

All respondents were asked if they had been job searching in the past month. About half of those who were currently employed were job searching. Of those who had a job and were not looking for another, most (79.6%) were satisfied with their current job. In the other two groups, the most common reason for not job searching in the past month was physical health. There were also significant portions of both these groups who indicated that being in school was the priority. There were 76 respondents who were both employed and going to school.

Employment skills are not limited to work history and education background, especially in the service industry and customer service type jobs. Businesses which partner with DWS to hire PA recipients sometimes complain that their workers lack "soft skills." These include attributes such as being on time, coming to work every day and taking direction from a supervisor. Those who were currently employed were asked about these skills. Results displayed in Table 41 indicate most of the currently employed had no difficulty with the interpersonal skills but almost one third had been late to work by more than 5 minutes and 125 (37.5%) had missed a day of work in the past month, for any reason. While no explanation was requested, many respondents explained that these events usually occurred because of issues with children such as sickness or day care falling through. As a single parent there is often no one else to turn to in such situations.

Table 40: Employment Comparisons - Three Groups

Employment	Current Employment N = 333	Employment in past year N = 580	Employment more than 1 yr ago N = 208
Average hours worked per week (median):	30.0	35	40
Hours per week breakdown:			
10 hours a week or less	31 (9.3%)	29 (5.0%)	8 (3.8%)
11 - 20 hours	77 (23.1%)	91 (15.7%)	28 (13.5%)
21 - 30	85 (25.5%)	125 (21.5%)	39 (18.8%)
31 - 40	121 (36.6%)	240 (41.3%)	86 (41.3%)
more than 40	17 (5.1%)	96 (16.5%)	47 (22.6%)
Average length of time at job - (median)	1.5 months	4 months	8 months
Time at job breakdown: Less than 3 months	197 (59.3%)	180 (31.0%)	31 (14.8%)
3 - 6 months	74 (22.3%)	200 (34.4%)	61 (29.2%)
7 - 12 months	24 (7.2%)	97 (16.7%)	49 (23.4%)
More than 12 months	37 (11.1%)	104 (17.9%)	68 (32.5%)
Average hourly income	$8.15	$8.99	$8.43
Job is temporary or seasonal	71 (21.3%)	163 (28.1%)	49 (23.6%)
Shift or time of day usually worked:			
Day time (9 - 5)	168 (50.5%)	322 (55.4%)	119 (56.9%)
Afternoon shift (12 - 8)	24 (7.2%)	40 (6.9%)	15 (7.2%)
Evening shift (4 - 12)	69 (20.7%)	106 (18.2%)	35 (16.7%)
Night shift (12 - 8)	18 (5.4%)	34 (5.9%)	10 (4.8%)
Rotating shift (regular changes)	7 (2.1%)	9 (1.5%)	6 (2.9%)
Split shift	9 (2.7%)	24 (4.1%)	9 (4.3%)
Irregular schedule	29 (8.7%)	33 (5.7%)	11 (5.3%)
Weekends only	7 (2.1%)	6 (1.0%)	- 0 -
Other	2 (0.6%)	7 (1.2%)	4 (2.0%)
Main source of transportation to work:			
Own car	213 (64.0%)	307 (52.9%)	116 (55.5%)
Family or friends	54 (16.2%)	120 (20.7%)	38 (18.2%)
Public transportation	22 (6.6%)	50 (8.6%)	21 (10.0%)
On foot	14 (4.2%)	50 (8.6%)	15 (7.2%)
Work from home	19 (5.7%)	8 (3.8%)	29 (5.0%)
Other	11 (3.3%)	23 (4.0%)	11 (5.2%)
60% live within 20 minutes of work including child care drop offs; 77% live within 30 minutes			
Degree of opportunity for advancement to a higher position that pays more:			
A great deal of opportunity	86 (25.8%)	98 (16.9%)	34 (16.3%)
Some opportunity	88 (26.4%)	137 (23.7%)	37 (17.7%)
A little opportunity	68 (20.45)	137 (23.7%)	54 (25.8%)
No opportunity	88 (26.4%)	207 (35.8%)	84 (40.2%)

Employment (Con't)	**Current Employment N = 333**	**Employment in past year N = 580**	**Employment more than 1 yr ago N = 208**
How client found out about job:			
A friend /A relative	126 (37.8%)	242 (41.8%)	84 (40.2%)
Help wanted notice in paper or in window	37 (11.1%)	76 (13.1%)	26 (12.4%)
DWS or other government agency	46 (13.8%)	39 (6.7%)	15 (7.2%)
Job placement/career counseling in school	4 (1.2%)	3 (0.5%)	4 (1.9%)
Inside contact at the job site	30 (9.0%)	50 (8.6%)	18 (8.6%)
Walk in to job site to submit application	51 (15.3%)	98 (16.9%)	39 (18.7%)
Staffing agency (Temp. Service)	18 (5.4%)	45 (7.8%)	11 (5.3%)
Other:	23 (6.9%)	26 (4.5%)	12 (5.7%)
Benefits available at job site:			
Paid sick days	103 (30.9%)	236 (44.3%)	72 (40.0%)
Paid vacation	131 (39.3%)	284 (52.6%)	87 (46.8%)
Paid holidays	129 (39.7%)	271 (50.0%)	91 (48.1%)
Health insurance	157 (47.1%)	317 (56.4%)	103 (54.5%)
Retirement program	100 (30.0%)	191 (38.0%)	67 (37.6%)
(About 10% of respondents were unaware of benefits)			
Feel/felt supported in their job by supervisor:			
A lot	237 (71.2%)	287 (49.5%)	100 (47.8%)
A little	17 (5.1%)	170 (29.3%)	68 (32.5%)
Not at All	60 (18.0%)	109 (18.8%)	31 (14.8%)
No such person	19 (5.7%)	14 (2.4%)	10 (4.8%)
Feel/felt supported in their job by co-workers:			
A lot	197 (59.3%)	292 (50.4%)	99 (47.4%)
A little	80 (24.1%)	171 (29.5%)	69 (33.0%)
Not at All	8 (2.4%)	60 (10.4%)	21 (10.0%)
No such person	47 (14.2%)	56 (9.7%)	20 (9.6%)
Feel/felt supported in their job by partner:			
A lot	112 (33.7%)	189 (32.5%)	79 (37.8%)
A little	13 (3.9%)	67 (11.5%)	41 (19.6%)
Not at All	9 (2.7%)	69 (11.9%)	25 (12.0%)
No such person	198 (59.6%)	256 (44.1%)	64 (30.6%)
Respondent HAS NOT job searched in past month	168 (50.3%)	287 (49.4%)	135 (59.0%)
Main reasons WHY not looked for work:	**N = 168**	**N = 287**	**N = 135**
Satisfied with current job	133 (79.6%)	---	---
In school or other training	23 (13.7%)	76 (27.2%)	40 (29.6%)
Physical or mental health issue	---	138 (47.4%)	63 (46.7%)
Family responsibilities	---	49 (17.1%)	23 (17.0%)
Other	---	59 (20.6%)	30 (22.2%)

Table 41: Employment Attitudes

	Currently Employed N = 333
In the past month, number who have....	
Been late to work by more than 5 minutes	107 (32.1%)
Lost temper for example with rude customers	12 (3.6%)
Failed to correct problem at work	13 (3.9%)
Had problems getting along with a supervisor	14 (4.2%)
Left work earlier than scheduled w/o permission	6 (1.8%)
Missed a day of work for any reason	125 (37.5%)

Causes of Unemployment

Table 42: Unemployed: Why not currently employed

	Unemployed but worked in past year N = 580	Unemployed more than 1 yr N = 208	Never worked N = 20
Reason why not currently working or never working:			
Need more education	25 (4.3%)	14 (6.7%)	5 (25.0%)
Need more work experience	15 (2.6%)	10 (4.8%)	1 (5.0%)
No jobs available	42 (7.2%)	9 (4.3%)	1 (5.0%)
Criminal record	9 (1.6%)	1 (0.5%)	- 0 -
Transportation problems	51 (8.8%)	22 (10.5%)	- 0 -
Paying for or finding child care	85 (14.7%)	33 (15.7%)	4 (20.0%)
Prefer/need to stay home with children	73 (12.6%)	33 (15.7%)	7 (35.0%)
Pregnancy	114 (19.7%)	26 (12.4%)	2 (10.0%)
Own ill health; disability	141 (24.3%)	54 (25.8%)	2 (10.0%)
Depressed/overwhelmed, mental health	70 (12.1%)	30 (14.4%)	1 (5.0%)
Own drinking/other drug problem	8 (1.4%)	1 (0.5%)	1 (5.0%)
Other family responsibilities	71 (12.2%)	24 (11.5%)	1 (5.0%)
In school or other training	109 (18.8%)	46 (21.9%)	3 (15.0%)
Wages too low	16 (2.8%)	1 (0.5%)	- 0 -
Jobs don't offer health benefits	4 (0.7%)	- 0 -	- 0 -
Husband/partner objected	–N/A--	--N/A--	1 (5.0%)
Language barrier	--N/A--	-N/A---	1 (5.0%)
Can not legally work	2 (0.3%)	1 (0.5%)	- 0 -
Other (Specify):	120 (20.7%)	28 (13.4%)	9 (45.0%)
MOST IMPORTANT reason for not currently working or never working:			
Personal health/disability	112 (19.3%)	53 (25.4%)	2 (10.05)
In school or training	89 (15.3%)	34 (16.3%)	3 (15.0%)
Pregnancy/maternity leave	76 (13.1%)	16 (7.7%)	1 (5.0%)
Paying for or finding child care	39 (6.7%)	15 (7.2%)	3 (15.0%)
Other	69 (11.2%)	15 (7.2%)	6 (30.0%)

Those who were unemployed (whether for less than or more than a year) and those who had never worked, were asked to discuss the main reason why they were not currently working. As shown in Table 42 above, those who had never worked were a small and rather unique group. Of the 20 respondents who had never worked, only 2 were over age 23 and most were 18 or 19 years old. While several reasons were given for never working, the most common was simply someone else, parents or a partner, had been supporting them while they cared for the children. Most were very young, under 18 when they became pregnant with their first child and never entered the paid workforce.

For those who were employed in the past, the most common factors contributing to the lack of current employment were physical health issues, schooling and other family responsibilities. Physical

Table 43: Reasons For Leaving Most Recent Job

	Unemployed but worked in past year N = 580	**Unemployed more than 1 yr N = 208**
Why did you leave your most recent job:		
Did not like schedule/shift	17 (2.9%)	5 (2.4%)
Wanted to work more hours	12 (2.1%)	4 (1.9%)
Wanted to work fewer hours	3 (0.5%)	1 (0.5%)
Did not like work/working - too stressful	38 (6.6%)	11 (5.3%)
Benefits not good enough	3 (0.5%)	1 (0.5%)
Salary not good enough	30 (5.2%)	12 (5.8%)
Problems with co-workers	14 (2.4%)	6 (2.9%)
Problems with boss	42 (3.7%)	16 (7.7%)
Maternity leave or pregnancy	109 (18.9%)	31 (14.9%)
Respondent injured on the job	5 (0.9%)	4 (1.9%)
Respondnet's other health/mental problems	147 (25.5%)	53 (25.5%)
Other family member's health problem	29 (5.0%)	7 (3.4%)
Other family or personal problems	40 (6.9%)	12 (5.8%)
Child care problem or couldn't afford care	36 (6.3%)	10 (4.8%)
Wanted to spend more time with children	9 (1.6%)	9 (4.3%)
Transportation problem	20 (3.5%)	2 (1.0%)
Wanted to work closer to home	2 (0.3%)	2 (1.0%)
Respondent moved	51 (8.8%)	27 (13.0%)
Another opportunity took another job	- 0 -	1 (0.5%)
Returned to school or training	32 (5.5%)	6 (2.9%)
Did not need to work	- 0 -	4 (1.9%)
Temporary/short-term assignment ended	53 (9.2%)	27 (13.0%)
Fired	88 (15.3%)	22 (10.6%)
Laid off	26 (4.5%)	13 (6.3%)
Other (specify)	69 (12.0%)	25 (12.0%)
MOST IMPORTANT reason left most recent job:		
Maternity leave/pregnancy	64 (11.1%)	17 (8.2%)
Respondent's physical health issues	108 (18.8%)	34 (16.4%)
Moved	38 (6.6%)	19 (9.2%)
Temporary/short term job ended	44 (7.7%)	23 (11.1%)
Fired	83 (14.4%)	20 (9.7%)

health issues were significantly greater for those unemployed for more than a year. Many of those who were employed in the past year, but not currently, reported they were simply on maternity leave and receiving help until they could go back to work after having their baby. The cash assistance was simply a support to financially bridge the maternity leave period. There were also some respondents in both groups who were receiving mental health or drug treatment, were involved with legal issues, or were preparing to move toward school in the near future.

Table 43 presents the various reasons given for why respondents left their most recent job. Many of the reasons respondent's gave for lack of current employment were similar to the reasons given for why the person lost their last job. Physical health issues and maternity leave were again common issues. Moving also led to job loss. "Other" reasons given for recent job loss included partners who refused to allow them to go to work, court involvement, and drug use.

While the reasons for leaving the most recent job are very diverse there was a theme which often paralleled the specific reason given for job loss. This was the impact of being a single parent without a significant support system. Respondents often lost jobs because of problems that two parent families, or respondents with a larger support system are able to navigate. Even something as simple as a child home sick from school and unable to go to day care can lead to job loss. Respondents with no back up provision for such situations are more vulnerable to job loss for what might seem like simple issues.

While some respondents were working short term jobs which ended, others were fired. Those who reported being fired were asked to identify the issue behind the firing. Reasons for being fired paralleled the previous list including health issues, pregnancy, partner's interference, needing time off for family issues and court dates.

Self - Reported Employment Barriers

Throughout the interview respondents were asked about individual issues and the contribution each had made to difficulties in securing or retaining employment or attending schooling or training. At the end of the interview respondents were asked to reflect on the greatest employment barriers of the past year. Table 44 reflects these data. After all barriers were noted, respondents were asked to indicate, from their perspective, what had been the greatest barrier in the past year. The final column in Table 44 indicates the frequency with which the barrier is chosen as the greatest barrier.

It is clear that the greatest single barrier, and the barrier most often chosen as the greatest barrier, was "physical health issues." Another common barrier frequently chosen as the greatest barrier was "going to school." There are a group of barriers which are not necessarily as frequently mentioned, but when they are mentioned are more often the greatest barrier to employment. These barriers include: needs of a dependent child, choosing to stay home with children, a criminal record and drug and alcohol abuse. When present, these issues are more often viewed as real barriers which prevent working. These are distinguished from barriers which impact employment but are not significant enough to prevent work.

Looking at barriers in combination is another way to view the cumulative effect of multiple barriers to employment. When looking at the average number of barriers, there were no significant

difference between the regions or PA history. Males, those with more employment history and respondents in the Older group reported a significantly lower number of barriers.

Table 44: Self - Report Barriers

N = 1144	Barrier	BIGGEST barrier	Frequency as greatest barrier
Needs of a dependent child	143 (12.5%)	55 (4.8%)	38.5%
Need of dependent family members	82 (7.2%)	15 (1.3%)	18.3%
Lack of child care	393 (34.4%)	114 (10.0%)	29.0%
Lack of education/training	293 (25.6%)	61 (5.3%)	20.8%
Alcohol or other drug issues	69 (6.0%)	23 (2.0%)	33.3%
Physical health issues	568 (49.7%)	249 (21.8%)	43.8%
Mental health issues	335 (29.3%)	102 (8.9%)	30.4%
Transportation problems	426 (37.2%)	85 (7.4%)	20.0%
Language barrier	18 (1.6%)	5 (0.4%)	11.1%
Lack of job skills	126 (11.0%)	25 (2.2%)	19.9%
Housing problems	134 (11.7%)	19 (1.7%)	14.2%
Problems reading or writing	36 (3.1%)	3 (0.3%)	8.3%
Criminal record	97 (8.5%)	32 (2.8%)	33.0%
Spouse or partner objects to me working	128 (11.2%)	25 (2.2%)	19.5%
Wages too low	107 (9.4%)	12 (1.0%)	11.2%
Caring for an infant	204 (17.8%)	43 (3.8%)	21.0%
Going to school	211 (18.4%)	94 (8.2%)	44.5%
Choose to stay home / care for children	167 (14.%)	62 (5.4%)	37.3%
Undocumented - can't legally work	4 (0.3%)	1 (0.1%)	25.0%
Lack of good jobs available	94 (8.2%)	17 (1.5%)	18.1%
Access to a telephone	163 (14.2%)	4 (0.4%)	2.4%
No barriers	5 (0.4%)	5 (0.4%)	---
Other:	336 (29.4%)	97 (8.5%)	28.9%

DISCUSSION

The scope of the findings presented above reflects the exploratory nature of this study. The Wave 1 instrument was designed to investigate areas which have been related to employment success, and to introduce new areas which have received little attention. As a longitudinal study, findings from Wave 1 serve as a baseline for second and third wave interviews. This discussion presents ideas for consideration and issues to explore as the next stage of interviewing begins and the DWS continues to adapt and change in light of TANF reauthorization.

The "New" Cash Assistance Recipient

After more than five years of gathering data regarding the lives and experiences of FEP participants who came to the end of their cash assistance, the goal of this study was to learn about those who were new to "the system." After completing Wave 1, it has become clear that this goal was not accomplished in the way it was envisioned, it has become something new. This research has made it clear that the current FEP recipients, while equal in the actual number of FEP months received, are very diverse in their past experiences and exposure to public assistance programs. This exposure made a difference.

From the beginning, there were some respondents who seemed much more aware of what was available to them through DWS and others who were completely lost. There were a few respondents who identified cash assistance as their ticket to independence, but many others who saw it as a shameful secret. As noted in the findings above, 647 (56.6%) respondents had either received cash assistance or food stamps during the AFDC era, or had been on another persons case as a dependent child. Clearly, identifying characteristics common to one group does not mean that every person in the group is identical. While each person is unique, there are trends which can raise ones attention to particular issues or concerns when a trait is identified. In examining PA use, it was discovered that past experiences with PA had both positive and negative consequences.

On the plus side, those with past exposure to public assistance programs knew more than others about basic resources and how to piece together various forms of assistance. The simple knowledge of what might be available made the process less intimidating. Those who had grown up in families receiving assistance understood it to be a more "normal" part of making ends meet, and were less intimidated by the process when the need arose. In the book Bridges Out of Poverty, readers are challenged to take a test entitled: "Could You Survive in Poverty?" Respondents with this background have skills which assist them in navigating crises in a way that others can not. While respondents with a PA history brought strengths to their current situation, the findings also revealed significant challenges often associated with this background.

Respondents with a PA history have, in general, been exposed to higher levels of violence both in family and romantic relationships. Respondents in this group were more likely to have grown up in a single parent home, had parents with lower levels of education, and had more episodes of homelessness as a child. This lack of access to basic resources and parental modeling contributed to lower graduation rates and lower levels of employment. While society seems to understand that growing up in poverty is not good for children, there is very little carryover in understanding that when these same children grow up, their "tool bag" for moving toward self-sufficiency may not be as well equipped. This finding does not imply that those with a PA history

should not be required to move forward, it is just important to understand that their starting point may be different, effecting their developmental trajectory.

Those with no PA history struggled with connecting to public assistance in different ways. For respondents with no former connections to cash assistance, there was enormous stigma in needing to ask for help. For respondents without a PA history the experience was often completely foreign, humiliating and very terrifying. Referrals from a doctor in the hospital or a domestic violence shelter worker or a mental health therapist were the more common ways these respondents learned about assistance. Those with no PA history often spoke of gaining a new appreciation of those "welfare moms." As one woman finally admitted, "I guess I can't talk about *those* welfare moms any more since I am one of them!"

While the simple distinction of whether or not someone has a history of PA use is not the whole picture, it helps break apart the pieces that contribute to a customer's success in moving toward self-sufficiency. It suggests areas for assessment that go beyond the resources of the moment, to core internal understandings of the world and how things work. This will be an important variable to track through the next 2 stages of this study.

Identifying the Starting Point

Each person comes to DWS from a different starting point. The 18 year old with a new born and no GED is at a different place than the 35 year old stay at home mother of 3 whose husband has just left her. It would seem that no matter where a person starts, the goal would be to assist in the stabilization of the immediate situation and help the customer move forward from where they are at. While this might make sense in theory, TANF policy as reauthorized in 2006 makes this more difficult, but not impossible.

Some customers come to DWS with an extensive work history, good education and perhaps even as a homeowner. Yet in a time of crisis, these secure situations can become very unstable. The diversion program was originally designed to provide a "lump sum" of assistance to customers who needed immediate help to avert a longer term crisis, such as losing a home or car. The use of diversions has been reduced to almost zero in the past few years. What has contributed to this underutilization of this valuable resource?

Some customers may have been answering this question when commenting on their perception of "one size fits all" services. Some feel that DWS is geared primarily to provide only basic services to those just entering employment or education. Some respondents were frustrated that workers could not help them move forward because, it seemed, they were already too far along. It could be beneficial to both the agency and the customer to help springboard those who are in temporary crisis back into self-sufficiency rather than tie them up in program requirements and involvement in activities that are not moving them forward. As attention to participation rates is always an issue, the fact that diverted cases do not count against the participation rate is a plus.

Another factor which might contribute to the decline in the use of diversions is the lack of "credit" workers are given for moving appropriate customers in this direction. Employment counselors, like all employees, are highly aware of job performance criteria. In the focus groups conducted before the study it was very clear employment counselors viewed improving

participation rates as the primary measure of their success. This meant making sure customers were engaging in activities that "count." While agency administrators were still interested in doing what was best for the customer, increasing participation rates was key. If the agency is interested in increasing use of diversions as a tool for helping customers remain self-sufficient, and not have to use benefits long-term, workers must see this reflected in the measures by which they are measured.

Wave 2 - The Next Steps for Moving Forward

As noted earlier, the primary purpose of Wave 1 was to set a foundation for the next two waves as we follow recent FEP participants over two years. To assist in the development of the tools for completing this research, attention will be given to the few other longitudinal studies of public assistance recipients. There are also quite a number of studies which have already identified and labeled various groups of current and former recipients. There are short-term recipients, cyclers, leavers, long-term recipients and the hard-to-serve. Given the nature of this research and the size of the sample, there will be ample opportunity to explore the experiences of all these groups.

Experience with FEP participants in the Wave 1 study will also significantly impact the direction of the next 2 phases of research. Already, the attention which needs to be given to a PA history is clear. Learning more about the individuals goals and personal identity relative to what they are able (or allowed) to do is important. Recall that 39.8% of respondents indicated a desire to work outside the home while 42.0% preferred to be a stay at home parent. It will be valuable to learn if those who are able to pursue *their* desired path feel, in the end, more successful than those who are required to go a different way. Study participants will be given the opportunity to reflect on the year since they were last interviewed and identify, from their perspectives, successes, struggles and unfinished business. Attempts will be made to learn how prior or ongoing connections with DWS have assisted in moving customers forward or perhaps created more obstacles to progress.

It will also be important that significant changes in agency policy will be incorporated into the research process. Neither the lives of respondents nor the agency itself will remain the same through the course of this project. Adaptation and change are the norm for both the agency and the study participants. For now, the respondents of Wave 1 have spoken. It is time to move forward.

REFERENCES

CIDI - 12 month SF. World Health Organization's Composite International Diagnostic Interview: Version - v1.0 November 1998. Downloadable surveys at: http://www3.who.int/cidi/cidisf.htm

Danziger, S. K., Kalil, A., and Anderson, N. J. (2000). Human capital, physical health, and mental health of welfare recipients: Co-occurrence and correlates. *Journal of Social Issues*, Dec2000, Vol. 56 Issue 4.

Hays, R., & Sherbourne, C. (1995). User's Manual for Medical Outcomes Survey (MOS) Core Measures of Health Related Quality of Life, RAND Corporation, MR-162-RC. Retrieved at: http://www.rand.org.health.surveys/mos.descrip.html

Hollar, D. (2003). A holistic theoretical Model for examining welfare reform: Quality of life. *Public Administration Review*. January/February. Vol. 63, No. 1.

Janzen, F. (October 2006). Utah Department of Workforce Services: Family Employment Program Report: January 2006.

Kalil, A., Born, C., Kunz, J. & Caudill, P. (2001). Life stressors, social support, and depressive symptoms among first-time welfare recipients. *American Journal of Community Psychology*. Vol. 29, No. 2.

Kovac, M., Dion, R., Markesich, J., Pavetti, D. (2002). Survey design for TANF caseload project: Summary report and recommendations. Mathematica Research, Inc.

Lee, S. & Oyserman, D. (2006). Expecting to work, fearing homelessness: The possible selves of low-income women. (Under Review).

Mainieri, T. & Danziger, S. (2001). Designing Surveys of Welfare Populations. Presented March 15-16, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Office of Family Assistance. (2004) Table 22: TANF - Active Cases: Marital Status. Retrieved: 11/21/2006 at http://wwwacf.hhs.gov/programs/ofa/character/FY2004/tab22.htm

Payne, R. DeVol, P. & Dreussi Smith, T. (2001) *Bridges out of poverty: Strategies for professionals and communities*. Aha! Process Inc., Highlands, TX.

Pearlin, L. & Schooler, C. (1978). The structure of coping. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, Vol. 19, No. 1 pp. 2-21.

Richburg, L. & Freedman, S. (April 2004). A Profile of Families Cycling On and Off Welfare. ASPE Research Brief. MDCR.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). Society and the adolescent self-image. Prinston, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Sansone, F. (1998). Social support's contribution to reduced welfare dependency: Program outcomes of long term welfare recipients. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*. Vol. 25 issue 4, pp. 105 - 126.

Strauss, M.A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) Scales. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41*, pp. 75 - 88.

Taylor, M.J. & Barusch, A.(2004). Personal, family and multiple barriers to employment. *Social Work.* Apr2004. Vol. 49 Issue 2,

Utah Department of Health: 2005 Utah Health Status Study. Retrieved 11/20/2006 from: http://health.utah.gov/opha/publications/2005hss/ovr/2005HSS_Ovr_GeneralHealth.pdf

U. S. Department of Health and Human Services: Administration for Children and Families (2001). Percent Change in AFDC/TANF Families and Recipients Statistics Table. Retrieved 11/10/06 from: http://www.acf.hhs.gov/news/stats/afdc.htm

Women's Employment Study (2004). Principal Investigators: Sheldon H. Danziger, Mary E. Corcoran, Sandra K. Danziger, Kristine Ann Siefert, and Richard M. Tolman. University of Michigan, Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: STUDY SUMMARY

DEMOGRAPHICS

HOUSING AND HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

CHILDREN

EMPLOYMENT (CURRENT AND HISTORY)

CHILD CARE

INCOME

USE OF COMMUNITY RESOURCES

EDUCATION

FAMILY BACKGROUND

CASH ASSISTANCE

EXPERIENCE WITH DWS WORKERS

EXPERIENCE OF EMPLOYMENT PLAN

SOCIAL SUPPORTS

SELF-ESTEEM [Rosenburg] / SELF-EFFICACY [Pearlin]

TELEPHONE

TRANSPORTATION

PERSONAL HEALTH

ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG USE

MENTAL HEALTH

PTSD SCREEN

DEPRESSION SCREEN

ANXIETY SCREEN

ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT

Appendix B: NON-RESPONDENTS

Characteristics		Non-Respondents N = 630	Respondents N = 1144
Age		28.0 yrs (18 - 59)	28.5 yrs (17 - 60)
Sex	Female	92%	94%
	Male	8%	6%
Average number of children on the case		1.7	1.7
Average age of oldest child		5.6 yrs	5.8 yrs
Average age of youngest child		3.7 yrs	3.8 yrs
Education level	Missing data	2.1%	
	No degree	34.5%	30%
	GED	12.0%	[GED and/or HSD
	HS diploma	46.0%	combined - 62%]
	Associates	3.4%	5.1%
	Bachelors	1.8%	2.3%
	Master's Degree	0.3%	
Marital status	Missing data	3.4%	
	Common Law marriage	0.2%	
	Divorced	21.7%	21.0%
	Legally separated	1.5%	
	Living together as married	0.6%	11.6%
	Married	7.1%	8.8%
	Never married	44.2%	34.5%
	Separated less than a year	15.9%	[Combined
	Separated more than a year	4.7%	Separated: 20.2%]
	Widowed	0.8%	0.6%
Access to a vehicle	Missing Data	4.9%	
	Yes	68.6%	64.8%
	No	26.5%	25.2%
Physical health	Missing Data	5.5%	
	Good to Excellent	66.5%	73.0%
	Fair to Poor	28.0%	27.0%

Regional distribution of non respondents:

Regions	Central	Northern	Mountainland	Eastern	Western
Non-Respondents	51.5%	27.0%	10.4%	2.8%	8.4%
Respondents	47.6%	30.7%	11.2%	4.4%	6.1%

Appendix C: WITHIN GROUP COMPARISONS

Gender

	Female N = 1078	**Male N = 66**
Average age ($p<.000$)	28.0 yrs	37.3 yrs
Worked more than ½ the time since age 16 ($p<.000$)	672 (62.3%)	57 (86.4%)
Race: White (non-Hispanic)	769 (71.5%)	41 (63.1%)
Married	91 (8.4%)	10 (15.2%)
If not married or temporarily separated, living with a partner	130 (13.7%)	3 (5.6%)
Family received outside help while client was growing up ($p<.005$)	602 (56.4%)	25 (38.5%)
Sexually abused before age 18 ($p<.002$)	455 (42.5%)	15 (22.7%)
Currently in school ($p<.003$)	291 (27.0%)	7 (10.6%)
Has fair to poor physical health ($p<.000$)	272 (25.3%)	36 (54.5%)
Physically abused after age 18 ($p<.000$)	516 (48.1%)	12 (18.2%)
Sexually abused after age 18 ($p<.000$)	233 (21.8%)	1 (1.5%)
Emotionally abused after age 18 ($p<.004$)	661 (61.6%)	29 (43.9%)
Consistently indicated preference to be stay at home parent ($p<.000$)	431 (43.4%)	11 (18.0%)

Regions

	Central N = 545	North N = 351	Mntland N = 128	Eastern N = 50	Western N = 70
History of welfare use ($p<.001$)	310 (56.9%)	205 (58.4%)	53 (41.4%)	36 (72.0%)	43 (61.4%)
Grew up in two parent home ($p<.000$)	338 (62.0%)	224 (63.8%)	92 (71.9%)	33 (66.0%)	56 (80.0%)
Median Income in past month ($p<.007$)	$914.00	$984.00	$949.00	$1187.50	$1200.00
Has HSD or GED ($p<.002$)	357 (65.5%)	246 (70.1%)	101 (78.9%)	42 (84.0%)	55 (78.6%)
Has seen the abuse of someone else as an adult ($p<.014$)	285 (52.7%)	162 (46.2%)	52 (41.4%)	22 (44.9%)	44 (62.9%)
Physically abused after age 18 ($p<.006$)	272 (50.1%)	142 (40.7%)	49 (38.6%)	25 (51.0%)	40 (57.1%)
Consistently indicated preference to be stay at home parent ($p<.001$)	189 (38.6%)	123 (37.5%)	64 (55.2%)	24 (49.0%)	42 (60.0%)

Employment History

	Has not worked more than 1/2 the time N = 415	Has worked more than 1/2 the time N = 729
Family received outside help while client was growing up ($p<.000$)	257 (62.2%)	370 (51.4%)
Homeless as a child ($p<.014$)	59 (14.2%)	69 (9.5%)
Saw the abuse of someone else as a child ($p<.016$)	212 (51.5%)	320 (44.1%)
Physically abused before age 18 ($p<.003$)	200 (48.2%)	285 (39.2%)
Emotionally abused before age 18 ($p<.024$)	240 (58.0%)	372 (51.0%)
Has high school diploma or GED ($p<.000$)	246 (59.3%)	555 (76.1%)
Has been diagnosed with a learning disability ($p<.016$)	75 (18.2%)	94 (12.9%)
Bartered services to meet needs ($p<.013$)	215 (51.8%)	433 (59.4%)
Consistently indicated preference to be stay at home parent ($p<.040$)	175 (46.1%)	267 (39.7%)

Age Groups

	Younger (18 - 26) N = 593	Middle (27 - 36) N = 329	Older (37 - 60) N = 222
Grew up in a two parent home ($p<.000$)	352 (59.4%)	219 (66.6%)	172 (77.5%)
Family received outside help while client was growing up ($p<.000$)	387 (65.5%)	153 (47.4%)	87 (39.7%)
Homeless as a child ($p<.048$)	78 (13.2%)	34 (10.3%)	16 (7.2%)
Sexually abused before age 18 ($p<.000$)	229 (38.9%)	163 (49.8%)	78 (35.3%)
Has HSD or GED ($p<.000$)	368 (62.1%)	264 (80.2%)	169 (76.1%)
Currently in school ($p<.007$)	176 (29.7%)	79 (24.0%)	43 (19.4%)
Has fair to poor physical health ($p<.000$)	104 (17.5%)	94 (28.6%)	111 (50.0%)
Has fair to poor mental health ($p<.000$)	131 (22.1%)	95 (29.0%)	99 (42.6%)
Alcohol dependency positive screen ($p<.014$)	43 (7.3%)	15 (4.6%)	5 (2.3%)
Severe domestic violence - ever ($p<.000$)	315 (53.1%)	219 (66.6%)	142 (64.0%)
Severe domestic violence - past 12 mo. ($p<.011$)	168 (28.3%)	85 (25.8%)	40 (18.0%)
Satisfied or very satisfied with social supports ($p<.045$)	541 (91.3%)	278 (84.7%)	188 (74.7%)
Bartered services to meet needs ($p<.016$)	344 (58.0%)	197 (59.9%)	107 (48.2%)
Consistently indicated preference to be stay at home parent ($p<.005$)	250 (45.4%)	132 (43.7%)	60 (30.0%)

Public Assistance (PA) History

	With PA history N = 647	Without PA history N = 497
Have worked more than ½ the time since 16 (p<.000)	380 (58.7%)	349 (70.2%)
Grow up in two parent home (p<.000)	365 (56.4%)	378 (76.15)
Respondent's mom was teenager when first child born (p<.000)	360 (57.3%)	201 (41.0%)
Average age client first became pregnant (p<.000)	19.2 years	20.9 years
Married when had first child (p<.000)	180 (28.1%)	221 (45.0%)
Homeless as a child (p<.000)	93 (14.4%)	35 (7.0%)
Homeless as an adult (p<.029)	225 (34.9%)	143 (28.8%)
Dad had high school diploma or more education (p<.000)	368 (56.9%)	386 (77.7%)
Mom had high school diploma or more education (p<.000)	442 (68.5%)	404 (81.3%)
Family received outside help while client was growing up (p<.000)	450 (70.2%)	177 (36.0%)
Homeless as a child (p<.000)	93 (14.4%)	35 (7.0%)
Saw the abuse of someone else as a child (p<.000)	340 (53.0%)	192 (38.6%)
Physically abused before age 18 (p<.000)	308 (47.7%)	177 (35.7%)
Sexually abused before age 18 (p<.000)	293 (45.6%)	177 (35.8%)
Emotionally abused before age 18 (p<.000)	379 (58.6%)	233 (47.0%)
Has high school diploma or GED (p<.000)	400 (61.8%)	401 (80.7%)
Drug dependency positive screen (p<.027)	44 (6.8%)	52 (10.5%)
Satisfied or very satisfied with social supports (p<.002)	559 (86.5%)	448 (90.2%)
Bartered services to meet needs (p<.010)	345 (53.3%)	303 (61.0%)
Consistently indicated preference to be stay at home parent (p<.007)	226 (38.1%)	216 (47.0%)

Appendix D: ADDITIONAL CHILD CARE DATA

(103 homes had no child under age 13)

	Wave 1 N = 1041
Families with child in child care on regular basis:	496 (47.6%)
Number of children total in childcare:	786
Number of children in:	
After school program: Average hours per week:	10 10.1
Day care center: Average hours per week:	205 28.5
Nursery/preschool Average hours per week:	9 14.4
Head Start: Average hours per week:	6 27.3
Licensed care provider's home: Average hours per week:	56 30.0
A relative: Average hours per week:	427 23.9
Older sibling in home: Average hours per week:	11 23.2
Child cares for self: Average hours per week:	4 14.0
Other (most of these are friends): Average hours per week:	86 20.5
Rating of child care setting - Fair to poor Day care Nursery/Preschool part day Licensed care provider's home A relative	31 15 2 3 11

Preference for child care settings:

Questions: *Thinking in general*, when regular child care is needed, what form of child care **would you prefer to use** for child age....

N = 1049	**Under 3 months**	**3 months to 3 years**	**4 - 5 year old**	**6 - 9 year old**	**10 - 12 year old**
Licenced provider's home	42 (4.0%)	96 (8.4%)	59 (5.6%)	55 (5.2%)	34 (3.2%)
Family member/relative	577 (55.1%)	599 (57.1%)	233 (22.2%)	292 (27.8%)	276 (26.3%)
Day care center	33 (3.1%)	146 (13.9%)	187 (17.8%)	151 (14.4%)	52 (5.0%)
Preschool		14 (1.3%)	474 (45.2%)	24 (2.3%)	3 (0.3%)
Friend / Neighbor	15 (1.4%)	29 (2.8%)	25 (2.4%)	69 (6.6%)	85 (8.1%)
After school program			18 (1.7%)	375 (35.7%)	357 (34.0%)
Refuse to leave child	290 (27.7%)	53 (5.1%)	11 (1.0%)	10 (1.0%)	9 (0.9%)
Don't know/no opinion	1 (0.1%)	2 (0.2%)		6 (0.6%)	15 (1.4%)
Child can stay home alone				2 (0.2%)	132 (12.6%)
Specific person I trust	90 (8.6%)	110 (10.5%)	39 (1.7%)	63 (6.0%)	85 (8.1%)
Other			3 (0.3%)	2 (0.2%)	1 (0.1%)

Appendix E: ATTITUDES TOWARDS PUBLIC ASSISTANCE VS EMPLOYMENT

	Strongly Agree - 1	Agree - 2	Disagree - 3	Strongly Disagree - 4
My children would benefit from having me employed outside the home.	278 (25.8%)	528 (48.9%)	228 (21.1%)	45 (3.9%)
I would rather have a job outside the home than be a stay at home mom.	192 (17.9%)	377 (35.2%)	338 (31.6%)	164 (15.3%)
It is good to require people on welfare to find a job.	380 (35.3%)	637 (59.1%)	54 (5.0%)	6 (0.6%)
When children are young, mothers should not work outside the home.	155 (14.5%)	494 (46.3%)	391 (36.6%)	27 (2.5%)
Welfare makes people work less than they would if there wasn't a welfare system.	98 (9.3%)	423 (40.1%)	460 (43.6%)	73 (6.9%)
Single moms can bring up a child as well as married couples.	337 (31.4%)	495 (46.1%)	199 (18.5%)	42 (3.9%)
A woman who gets a job to help support her children is being a responsible parent.	450 (41.7%)	603 (55.9%)	24 (2.2%)	2 (0.2%)
I feel confident that I can manage my own finances and resources.	312 (28.9%)	613 (56.8%)	136 (12.6%)	19 (1.8%)
I would prefer to stay home and raise my children rather than work outside the home. .	187 (17.6%)	403 (38.0%)	416 (39.2%)	54 (5.1%)
My circumstances are different than most others on welfare.	151 (14.8%)	433 (42.6%)	416 (40.9%)	17 (1.7%)

Appendix F: CURRENT EMPLOYMENT: WAVE 1 AND TL STUDY COMPARISONS

Current Employment	**Wave 1 N = 1044**	**TL N = 1053**
Currently employed (part or full time)	333 (29.1%)	400 (38.0%)
Average Hours per week - (median)	30.0	30.9
Hours per week breakdown:		
10 hours a week or less	31 (9.3%)	23 (5.5%)
11 - 20 hours	77 (23.1%)	75 (18.8%)
21 - 30	85 (25.5%)	95 (23.9%)
31 - 40	121 (36.6%)	181 (45.5%)
more than 40	17 (5.1%)	24 (6.0%)
Average length of time at job - (median)	1.5 months	
Time at job breakdown:		
Less than 3 months	197 (59.3%)	169 (42.5%)
3 - 6 months	74 (22.3%)	135 (36.4%)
7 - 12 months	24 (7.2%)	43 (10.8%)
More than 12 months	37 (11.1%)	41 (10.3%)
Average hourly income	$8.15 Range: $0 .60 - $50	$7.79 Range: $1 - $25