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Chapter 1

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

When former President Clinton signed the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA), which is commonly referred to as welfare reform, the law affected cash assistance clients throughout the nation. Welfare changed from an entitlement program to a program that mandates participation in work or work related activities. Each adult recipient of cash assistance is expected to gain employment for the purpose of familial support in the near future. That future was clearly spelled out in 1998 when Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF) cited a five year time limit for the receipt of cash assistance. California’s version of the TANF program called California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) was enacted in 1998. The component Welfare to Work (WTW) is the state’s effort to address the various barriers to employment such as mental health, substance abuse, and domestic violence that seriously hinder a person’s ability to get and maintain viable employment.

Background of the Problem

There has been much discussion among concerned researchers about the impact of mandatory maximum time limits for the receipt of cash assistance. The federal government issues a TANF block grant for state welfare assistance programs. A five year time limit is imposed by each state although the time can be shortened according to the welfare assistance program developed by each state. Past research has shown time limits successful with dramatic declines in welfare caseloads and instances of
employment. However, critics of time limits purport that time limits are statistically insignificant when measuring employment rates (Kim, 2000) and force people into jobs that do not support self-sufficiency (Riemer, 1997). Further research shows that policies regarding time limits had an impact on the decline in caseloads in the 1990’s, but cannot explain the majority (Danielson & Klerman, 2008). Herbst studied the effect of time limits as it relates to macro economy in 2008. The author found that time limits were particularly sensitive to economic fluctuations. In other words, with the support of strong economy welfare policy like time limits is reinforced (Herbst, 2008). Without a strong economy to support increased employment opportunities, then the Work First Approach (Daguerre, 2008) to welfare reform is met with obstacles to helping families become self-sufficient in five years. In the 2008 article that examined the evolution of TANF since the beginning, Daguerre loosely defined the Work First Approach as the theory associated with time limited cash benefits given in exchange for work and promotes punitive means for non compliant cash recipients.

Considering that responsibility has been devolved to states to impose time limits at or less than five years and variables such as ethnicity (Brock, 2009; Cherlin, Frogner, Ribar & Moffitt, 2009), substance abuse (Henderson, Dohan & Schmidt, 2006), disability (Parish, Rose & Andrews, 2010) and “chronic disconnect” from unemployment (Turner, Danziger & Seefeldt, 2006) have been studied. Some researchers have found that time limits have been imposed among certain states with an air of inequality (Brock, 2009) and inadequate attention (Turner et al, 2006) to the challenges that affect families’ ability to leave welfare assistance entirely.
It was argued by Brock (2009) that mandatory “minimum” time limits should be required for cash assistance before reauthorizing TANF to reduce the likelihood of ethnic bias in development of welfare policy among states. Research regarding the impact of time limits found inadequate treatment was provided for mental health and substance abuse barriers to employment (Cook, Mock, Jonikas, Burke-Miller, Carter, Taylor et al, 2009). Further studies have found that time limits did not have a significant effect on positive financial outcomes of past welfare recipients (Kim, 2000; Morris & Hendra, 2009). In an optimal scenario where biases in policy were minimized and barriers to employment are treated adequately coupled with a vital fiscal economy, then time limits should reflect a significant impact on welfare families’ ability to leave welfare for self sufficient financial means.

Statement of Research Problem

Is the service delivery model of welfare to work services in Sacramento County effective? The problem is that adults can only participate in the WTW program if they are also eligible for CalWORKs cash assistance. In this dual-eligibility model of service delivery clients are excluded from WTW job readiness activities and services after exhausting 60 months of cash assistance. Not only will the family be sanctioned the adult portion of the cash grant, the family also loses direct access to services that aid in removing barriers to employment. This brings about the issue of allowing a family to go deeper into poverty with no provision for continued supportive services. It seems to nullify the initial 5 year investment in the family when the adult has not secured stable, sustainable employment becoming more dependent on social services.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose is to do a descriptive study of timed out welfare to work participants to find out if the services delivered in Sacramento County are effective or not. Secondarily the results can be used to show that qualified staff in proper assessment and referral is needed to make the program more effective.

Major questions asked in this study are: 1) Are past welfare to work participant incomes reflective of 5 years participation in a program designed to address employment barriers; 2) Are post-CalWORKS clients still in need of cash assistance and social services after timing out; 3) Did former welfare to work participants have an understanding of the program rules and regulations to meet maximum benefit of services within 5 years?

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework used in this study is the Empowerment Theory. The Empowerment Theory or model “is based on the assumption that the capacity of people to improve their lives is determined by their ability to control their environment, connect with needed resources, negotiate problematic situations, and change existing social situations that limit human functioning” (Gibson, 1993). The reason why this framework is important to the researcher and is necessary to this research is the apparent lack of client knowledge of programs. Welfare to work participants have the ability to control their environments despite low-income statuses. The implications of not know this can be detrimental to the present and future wellbeing of the impacted families.
The welfare to work program has provisions embedded in it to address barriers to employment that are not being adequately accessed by needy clients. Clients of public assistance are in a position to make informed, empowered decisions about how they will navigate the welfare program to the maximum benefit for their families. This can happen only if they are aware and are encouraged to ponder the options for welfare to work participation. Furthermore, welfare reform has changed from entitlement based on income eligibility to a participation program. It is evident by program design that leaders of welfare households should be collaborating with caseworkers to connect with resources, problems solve life challenges and affect change in their current situations.

Definition of Terms

Welfare Reform

This term will be used throughout this paper to describe Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF). The TANF program requires eligible adults to participate in work readiness programs as a condition of maintaining cash assistance benefits. Although “welfare” is descriptive of various social programs, this researcher will utilize the term in specific reference to the income assistance and work responsibility program studied in this research.

Welfare to Work (WTW)

The term will be used to reference the work requirement portion of welfare reform. Since the implementation of Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA), adult caregivers are required to participate in employment or activities that address barriers to employment to remain eligible for cash
benefits. Job readiness classes, mental health and substance abuse treatment are a few of the activities that are considered WTW activities and will be discussed in further detail in this paper.

Time Limits

One of the major changes that distinguishes TANF from the former Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) is the implementation of a federally mandated maximum time limit of 60 months for families to receive cash assistance. Despite federal time limits for funding cash assistance families, each state has the power to increase or decrease the maximum time limits. For states that increase time limits the financial responsibility falls on that state to fund the families beyond five years.

Participants

This term will be utilized to describe people who participate in the Welfare to Work portion of the cash assistance program. Due to certain circumstances, some people are exempt from the required work responsibilities. Therefore, this term will be used to describe only those who are expected to engage in work related activities.

California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs)

This is the specific welfare cash assistance program developed by the state of California to address federal welfare reform of 1996. California implemented this program in 1998 and allows families to received cash assistance for the maximum federal time limit of 60 months. Children are continually aided although the adult caregiver has met the five year time limit. Most families that are eligible for CalWORKs are also
eligible for federal Food Stamps, MediCal and are required to participate in the Welfare to Work program to maintain eligibility.

Assumptions

Assumptions that the reader should take in reference to this study is that each subject met their welfare to work lifetime limit in Sacramento County and continue to live in the area. Another assumption for this study is that the caseworkers who serviced the study respondents all have equal knowledge and skill and delivered services in the same manner.

Justifications

This research will benefit the profession of social work in two ways. The study deals with people who have major economic challenges. It is important for social workers to know the impacts of the program on the community responsible for the main income source of so many. Secondly, the study will reflect the needs of social workers in the policy formation, implementation and execution of income based, time limited assistance.

Limitations

This study is not seeking to prove that welfare reform is the cause of past welfare recipients low income status. Neither is the study seeking to show that time limits are the cause for employment barriers not being addressed causing families to remain deeply rooted in poverty.

This research is limited to a sample of thirty individuals in Sacramento County who have exhausted 60 months of welfare cash assistance eligibility. The ethnic
diversity of the county’s population is not reflected in the sample studied due to the snowball sampling method used to gather subjects. This could explain the similar characteristics among those surveyed. It is knowledge for a portion of the subjects that this researcher is employed with the Department of Human Assistance and that may have affected the responses to certain survey questions. This study does not take into account the effects of policy changes that occurred during the subjects’ five years of cash assistance eligibility. Due to the small sample size used and simplistic method of gathering subjects the study results should not be used to generalize other populations.

Summary

This chapter discussed some brief history of welfare reform and CalWORKS’ efforts to get people off of welfare and back to work by providing supportive services and resources. The problem is whether the program is effective. Because social workers do not have as active a role as needed in the assessment and referral process, many clients fall through the cracks and barriers to employment are not being addressed properly. The following review of literature on the history of welfare reform, provisions for employment barriers and CalWORKS is included in chapter 2. Chapter 3 will give details regarding the descriptive study design used in this study. Chapter 4 will be a description of the analyzed data and study findings. Chapter 5 will be a discussion of the major findings in this research study, implications on the social work profession and recommendations for further research.
Chapter 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The previous chapter informed the reader on the background of the issues regarding welfare reform as it relates to this study. This chapter will be a review of relevant literature on welfare reform as well as studies that relate to the effectiveness of the program.

January 2006 marked the 10-year anniversary of welfare reform that drastically changed the way cash assistance has been distributed to low income families in the United States. Approximately 14 years later, Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) has continued to be reauthorized with the two most notable points unchanged, time limits and work participation. Aid to Families and Dependent Children (AFDC) was replaced with Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF) with the enactment of welfare reform. TANF emphasizes short term cash assistance provided for a maximum of 60 months as long as work or work-related activity participation rates are met. Time limits have been the topic of research studies regarding the program’s impacts on low income families during and after the 60 months have been exhausted (Brock, 2009; Bauer, Braun, & Olsen, 2000; Lindhorst & Mancoske, 2006). Additionally, welfare reform continues to include a component of work responsibility requiring participants to take part in employment or job readiness activities (Danziger, Corcoran, Danziger & Heflin, 2000). These reforms have impacted low-income families
in need of social services. Welfare reform has come to stress the concept that any job is a good job because it is the means of maintaining benefits (Lens, 2008).

Each state is responsible for developing their own welfare assistance program based upon the federal standards of time limits and work responsibility as components of the state program. States are given block federal grants to operate the welfare program at the local level. However, the 5 year lifetime limit is not static. States can lower the maximum time limit to less than 5 years; moreover, states can extend the limit beyond 60 months with the use of state funds (Brock, 2009).

This review of relevant literature will examine the current findings on welfare reform with regard to the impact of time limits on needy families and the calls for further reform prior to future reauthorization. The second section will look at the work responsibility portion of welfare reform, Welfare to Work (WTW), and the provisions for barriers to employment. The third section will discuss the history of California’s program for welfare services called California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs).

Brief History of Welfare Reform

The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) of 1996 spawned a change in US public assistance programs from income based entitlement to mandated participation in work or work related activities. (P.L. 104-193). Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) replaced Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) with the purpose of reducing the dependency on public assistance to a system that urges self-sufficiency in adults caring for children (Bauer, et
al., 2000). The values of personal responsibility and work opportunity are also core concepts within the reform that necessitate participation to increase the likelihood of reducing the need for public assistance (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, DHHS, 2006). There has been bipartisan approval regarding welfare reform since its enactment. Through three presidential administrations, Clinton, Bush (The White House, 2003) and Obama, TANF reauthorizations have been consistent.

Emergency Contingency Fund

The recent American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA), signed by President Obama, dedicated more funds to help needy families as well as unemployed, displaced workers. ARRA added an emergency fund for the TANF program, called the Emergency Contingency Fund (ECF), to increase the ability of states to provide social services to the increasing number of low income families. This $5 billion grant is available to states for the 2009-2010 fiscal year at the state’s request. The requesting state must meet the caseload increase requirement of exceeding the average monthly assistance caseload in a quarter based on the emergency fund base year of the state (H. R. 1-332, Sec. 2101). Essentially stated, if the state seeks to pull down the emergency funds it must prove for the quarter they are applying that there were case load excesses in the corresponding quarter of the prior fiscal year. States are also granted authority to use TANF funds carried over from prior years for the continued effort of providing benefits and services to needy families without regard to fiscal year limitations (H. R. 1-332, Sec. 2103). The Department of Health and Human Services reports that states have already expended $614 million as of December 2009 of the Emergency Contingency Fund.
monies available to help states with increases in TANF caseloads, basic operating costs, short-term benefits and subsidized employment opportunities (2010).

**Performance Measures**

With the enactment of welfare reform, there was devolution to states to ensure welfare assistance programs work. The Administration for Children, Youth and Families describes the shift in accountability to states and the federal responsibilities to be inclusive of ensuring program implementation and performance (1996). Program performance is highly monitored by the federal government in several ways:

1) Penalties;
2) Performance-based funding;
3) Data collection and reporting; and
4) Research and evaluation.

Each aspect promotes local welfare program performance and accountability across among states, territories and tribes (USDHHS, 1996).

The Office of Family Assistance oversees the TANF program and is responsible for administering the annual federal block grant to states for the implementation of local welfare assistance programs. The funds provided to states and territories are to be utilized to ensure cash benefits and services to families facing economical hardship. Through the use of block grant funds each state is therefore responsible for spending a certain amount of its own budget, called State Maintenance of Effort (MOE), to support families in ways that follow TANF guidelines (USDHHS, TANF Overview, 6/19/2010).
Time Limits

Although there are TANF guidelines regarding time limits, each state has flexibility in the implementation of the states program. There are certain exemptions allowed for families who would otherwise be required to participate in work activities such as disability (Parish, Rose & Andrews, 2010), domestic violence (Saunders, Holter, Pahl & Tolman, 2006), substance abuse (Zabkiewicz & Schmidt, 2009) and mental health (Lewis, Lee & Altenbernd, 2006). In reference to the 2001 study by DeAngelis, she asserts that individuals with physical, mental and other disabilities are part of the growing population of recipients who are at risk of ending up jobless. Because of the less visible disabilities such as depression, learning disabilities and chronic health problems, these clients do not qualify for Supplemental Security Income (SSI); try to navigate a complicated and stringent TANF work program; then become lost in the system (DeAngelis, 2001).

TANF funds are disallowed use to provide income assistance to families beyond 60 months but states are allowed to extend the cash benefits with the use of their own funds (Lindhorst & Mancoske, 2006; Bloom, Farrell, Fink & Adams-Ciardullo, 2002). According to the US Office of Planning and Research, most states apply the 60 month maximum and subsequently close the TANF case for all family members. California, New York, Connecticut and Rhode Island continue to benefit other family members after the adult exhausts 60 months of assistance. Washington and Pennsylvania continue benefits if the adult participates in the job readiness program or perform 30 hours of work or education per week, respectively. Lifetime limits are not imposed on TANF cases in
Vermont, Oregon, Nebraska, Massachusetts or Michigan. However each case is subject to closure or sanction based upon noncompliance within each state’s program rules (US Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, 2010).

States are also allowed to lower the 60 month maximum limit (Brock, 2009; US Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation). States with the lowest maximum lifetime limit for income assistance are Arkansas and Idaho. These states close the TANF case as a result of reaching the 2 years maximum. On the other hand, Indiana also imposes a 2-year lifetime limit but will only sanction the adult’s portion of the grant for reaching the maximum limit. Delaware allows for 36 month; Florida and Georgia both allow 48 months of cash assistance to needy families and subsequently close the TANF case for the full family (US Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, 2010). Time limits were a variable studied in Kim’s 2000 study on TANF parents work status. In that study due to varying time limits among states, time limits were found to be statistically insignificant, but suggested importance in evaluating how welfare parents fare in the labor market. In a later study conducted in 2002, Bloom, Farrell and Fink studied five states with differing time limits. They found that although each of the states provides exemptions or extensions from the time limits, of the 231,000 families studied 131, 000 suffered adverse affects of meeting the time limit. Moreover approximately 70% of those families realized a full family sanction or a welfare case closure due to meeting their maximum time limit for cash assistance.
Ethnicity and Welfare Reform

Two further studies noted for this paper focused on ethnicity and welfare reform as a measure of the implications of the policy on African-American and Hispanic families. (Brock, 2009; Cherlin, Frogner, Ribar & Moffitt, 2009).

Brock (2009) suggests that with the federal guidelines in place and states are charged to develop their own income assistance programs, devolution, there are varying ways of handling poor families transitioning from welfare to work. The author brings two recommendations to meet the needs of welfare families across the country equitably: 1) time limits should not be reauthorized until there are positive research results for at-risk families’ overall well-being; and 2) a federally mandated minimum lifetime limit on cash aid. The aforementioned study looks at the correlation between lower state lifetime limits and racial composition of that state. Information about time limits and racial diversity was gathered for all 50 states. Depending on which state the families reside after the lifetime limit for that state was met, some had cash assistance terminated for all otherwise eligible people in the home, even if there is another adult who had not utilized their available months. The results of the study showed states that have a higher population of African-Americans have implemented harsher rules, penalties and shorter time limits (Brock, 2009).

In the 2009 study of Hispanic and African-American families with TANF ties in Boston, San Antonio and Chicago, researchers Cherlin, Frogner, Ribar & Moffitt found that families were still living on incomes below poverty level and each group made gains at closing the gap between their incomes and the poverty line. However, African-
American families fared worse than the others did. In most cases, although income levels increased African-American were lowest. In the instances where families left poverty, it was African-American families who made close to no gains in crossing the poverty line (Cherlin, et al., 2009). These findings suggest that African-American families would remain at or below poverty whether participating in the TANF cash assistance program further suggesting that welfare reform is not wholly beneficial to this group. Although New York and California have large numbers of African-Americans, the rules in these states are not unusually strict; however, most states with more stringent rules for cash assisted families are in the southern region suggesting a perpetuation of disparity that has been a part of US history primarily in the South (Cherlin, et al., 2009).

*Time Limits and Economic Recession*

During the testimony to the Committee on Ways and Means in March 2010, the Assistant Secretary for Children and Families was clear in touting the 7 percent child poverty rate decline between the years 1993 and 2000, the 24 percent employment increase for single mothers with children under 3 years old and the TANF caseload decline of nearly half across the nation. Nevertheless, the recession that has had adverse affects US economy during the 2000’s could not support the previously well-reported gains in social economic welfare for the poor. Although the report to the Ways and Means Committee included an increase in child poverty and unemployment rates for single mothers, which is fitting considering the economic recession, it also noted that TANF has the lowest caseload count in a 40-year history of just below 2 million cases. In summary, recent declining TANF caseloads are overshadowed in the face of
increasing unemployment and poverty. The testimony suggested that it is not that people are not poor or unemployed, but they are not accessing vital social service resources so basic needs are not being met for families and children (USDHHS, 2010). This also brings up the question of the practicality of welfare reform’s time limits, especially in times of economic recession in the country.

With imposed time limits for assistance as a primary change in the program to assist needy families, some research has been done regarding the implications of a maximum 5-year limit on cash assistance. Lindhorst and Mancoske studied the social and economic impacts of time limits and sanctions of TANF families in 2006. They noted minimal studies being done in this area since federal law does not require states to measure the impact of sanctions on families after time limit sanctions. However, the studies that have been performed focused on income and employment (Lindhorst & Mancoske, 2006) which are common indicators of welfare reform success because the purpose of the reform is to assist in the increase of employment and income for families. Income and employment rates also have an ease in statistical measurability against the federal poverty level as variables for determining welfare reform success across the country.

Opinions are varied on the point of employment as it stands against welfare reform. Lens (2008) remarks on scholars and policy makers’ belief that sharp declines in welfare caseloads and increased employment rates for recipients of welfare in the late 1990’s and early 2000’s are indications of welfare reform success (USDHHS, 2005; Danziger et al., 2000). Welfare clients are required to work or participate in work related
activities, so far as to find and accept any job lest a penalty of sanctioning welfare cash benefits (Lens, 2008). Haskins found that by 2000, low income family earnings increased 136 percent and welfare income dropped by nearly half indicative of the large caseload decreases found after welfare reform (2006). This would suggest that with the help of the welfare system, individuals can find a job and with proper support, can maintain employment.

Further research suggests that although most would agree that welfare reform has achieved some gains with regard to employment rates overall, some still argue that job quality of welfare leavers is poor (Lim, Coulton & Lalich, 2009), low income families are working at or below poverty level (Danziger et al, 2000; Riemer, 1997), families still rely upon financial benefits and services such as Food Stamps and Medicaid (Fletcher, Winters & An-Ti, 2008), and time limits should not be reauthorized unless there are mandatory minimums at the local level (Brock, 2009).

Barsriers to Employment

Welfare as an entitlement program has changed since the reform of 1996 to that which supports client participation in obtaining and maintaining employment as the means to self-sufficiency. For individuals who have chronic detachment from work especially those who have defined barriers to employment the implications of time limits and mandatory work requirements can be a devastating blow to their families’ financial future.

Some studies suggest that barriers to employment such as disability (Parish et al., 2010) substance abuse (Henderson, Dohan & Schmidt, 2006), child care (Herbst, 2008),
domestic violence (Saunders et al., 2006) and mental health (Lewis et al., 2006; Zabkiewicz et al., 2009) have an effect on a person’s ability to get and maintain employment if the barriers are not addressed properly. Due to welfare reform’s provisions to address these barriers then it is safe to assume that recipients are expected to be employed after participating in work related activities such as AOD treatment, mental health treatment or counseling so that a person can be successfully re-entered into the workforce. But that is also making the assumption that the eligible individuals are being properly assessed and referred or are willing to access the provided services to prepare them for employment.

It would seem that within a maximum of 5 years of welfare assistance that a family would have the time to get their needs met. So why are there more families timing out who are still working below poverty level or wholly unemployed? The goal of welfare reform is to increase economic self-sufficiency, but if the multiple barriers to employment are not addressed it is increasingly difficult for families to transition from welfare to work within the time limit (Zabkiewicz & Schmidt, 2009). Perhaps through lack of client disclosure (Saunders et al., 2006) and worker difficulty with properly identifying and referring for services (Henderson, Dohan & Schmidt, 2006) along with increased caseloads and the pressures of getting the work participation rates at acceptable levels for the governing states, then people fall through the cracks left without adequate treatment and referral.
Mental Health and Substance Abuse

A study was conducted over a 12 month period in 2003 and 2004 focused on the prevalence of mental health and substance abuse issues among welfare mothers who are near the end of their welfare lifetime limits (Cook et al, 2009). The researchers sampled mothers during the final 24 months of eligibility. They concluded that there is a high number of untreated substance abuse and mental health disorders among the mothers studied. Of the 333 respondents, 53% had mental health disorders, 29% had substance abuse disorders and 21% had comorbidity of disorders. However prevalent these results, only 21% received mental health treatment and 41% received substance abuse. The focus of this study was not about the reasons why respondents did not receive needed services. However, it lends to the idea that barriers such as mental health and substance abuse disorders must be addressed because of the potential adverse affects on sustaining employment (Lewis et al., 2006) and the well being of families.

Employment can be used in the context of drug prevention methods according to Brown and Montoya’s 2009 study. Low income, chronic substance abusing women receiving welfare cash assistance were studied for 5 years as they transitioned from welfare to work. At the start of the study, only 10% of the women were employed and over time that number showed increase. The results of that study indicate that with an increase in work hours there was a decrease in drug use (Brown & Montoya, 2009). This study suggests that employment can be used as an aid to gaining freedom from drug addiction and abuse. There is great potential for disastrous results especially after the lifetime assistance limit is met for families that have substance abuse issues. Perhaps
reframing employment from mandatory program participation with consequences of income sanctioning, to an element of the overall plan to treat and support substance abuse recovery would be more beneficial to the families.

*Domestic Violence*

Although trainings are provided for the assessment of domestic violence, Saunders and colleagues (2006) studied five California counties that expected 3-19 hours of domestic violence training for staff. Of those welfare workers trained, they rated the training as moderately or very helpful. The study also found that the likelihood of work exemptions being offered and referrals to domestic violence services increased after training. For those clients who are experiencing domestic violence or other barriers sometimes an exemption from work requirements is not desired, but the study suggests that with training on the characteristics of domestic violence and appropriate screening tools then workers would be more likely to refer to clients to counseling services, make a safety plan, and file a CPS report (Saunders et al., 2006).

The 2006 study on welfare worker’s response to domestic violence reflected workers were too overwhelmed with casework to give individual attention to clients (Saunders et al.). In this study the client’s were not screened appropriately for domestic violence, not because of worker disregard but again because of tedious caseloads. It is also fitting to state based on this study’s findings that workers did not have time to explain vital details about how the welfare system can benefit them for working. Either way clients are not getting the service or vital information that they need to effectively navigate the complicated system of post-PRWORA welfare (Altman & Goldberg, 2008).
Minimal Program Knowledge

It has been stated in this review of literature that clients are confounded by the complex system of welfare reform, which is then complicated further by the child support system, the program that generally couples with welfare. Nam, Cancian & Meyer (2009) studied the impacts of program knowledge in a study about child support. The researchers found disparity in what program evaluators believe is adequate knowledge of the program and the accuracy of informal and formal means of clients gathering program information. Their study suggests that client’s information founded in personal experience or shared experience is less accurate that formal information sources like caseworkers. The knowledge gap referred to in this study imposes limitations to program outcomes. There is a lack of accurate understanding of certain rights and responsibilities that each client has as it relates to child support (Nam, Cancian & Meyer, 2009). The answer to the question of whether success can be found in welfare reform hinges heavily on the clients knowledge of the welfare system.

In sum, clients who are better informed fare better than those who not aware of the benefits they are entitled to (Herbst, 2008). Clients may find they are eligible for supportive services like childcare or mental health referral, but did not have a worker explain or ensure benefits were offered to them. Funds for transportation and childcare are made available when clients start work or work related activities but often the system is complicated to navigate (Herbst, 2008). Obtaining support services can be difficult to handle due to lack of response by workers. Again, the tedious caseloads are affecting workers and clients alike. Clients who wait for the worker, who otherwise may not be
clear on program rules themselves, find they are left to fall between the cracks of the welfare system and sometimes dealt punitive blows, income sanctions, for not participating in a fashion that is required.

Chronic Disconnection from Work

When working with a client who has a chronic disconnect from work, it may seem more difficult than ever to encourage or assist with placement in jobs (Lewis et al., 2006); even more so, clients who experience depression (Turner, Danziger & Seefeldt, 2006), which is difficult to assess without professional training, may encounter lack of compassion from workers. These workers may not understand the unwillingness or supposed unwillingness to comply with appointments, or work participation for periods at a time as depression symptoms (Turner et al, 2006). Again, mental challenges can be viewed as unwillingness, laziness, or disregard for the program rules driving an even further wedge between worker and client relations. Professionals working in the welfare to work program for the purpose of accurately assessing clients needs from the ecological point of view and referring to needed supportive services would be beneficial to the client and family. The families’ quality of life can be increased by factors other than money. However, upon current review of their cases, it may show that clients have been noncompliant with program rules, possibly sanctioned in their histories and not scheduled for any mental health or substance abuse treatment. Time is being spent processing noncompliance or scheduling and rescheduling activities other than mental health or substance abuse treatment. Clients are then forced into quick attachments to work that pay low wages and are generally short term or dead end jobs (Riemer, 1997).
CalWORKs

Brief History of California’s Program

California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) is the state’s program responsible for providing welfare cash assistance and services to low income eligible families. Federal TANF was implemented in California in 1996. In approximately one year the current CalWORKs program was implemented statewide January 1998. Just as federal welfare reform devolved responsibility to the states for flexibility in design of the reformed assistance program, California further devolved implementation particulars to its counties. This was to provide each of the 58 counties the ability to assess the needs of their respective populations and develop policies that reflect adherence to state and federal guidelines (CDSS, 2007). For the purpose of this literature review, the researcher will refer to state’s guidelines and to Sacramento when referring to county specific programs.

Eligibility Determination

Eligibility for CalWORKs is generally based upon deprivation of the children associated with the household. Deprivation of parental support, as the primary determinate for eligibility, can be met by absence, disability, underemployment and/or unemployment. Families that are in need of welfare assistance will apply at their local welfare office. Even though CalWORKs is a statewide program, families will need to apply and access benefits in the office that is in their county of residence. The welfare office will set up an intake interview appointment with the family to determine eligibility.
based upon deprivation and the amount of cash aid benefits the particular family is
provided (CDSS, 2007; DHA, 2008).

During the intake appointment applicants are expected to provide proof of
citizenship, age, and residence. Income and property resources are also verified as a
means of determining low income eligibility. Families are allowed one exempt
automobile, for instance, as basic needs. Any additional automobiles will have their
values assessed and counted toward total resources. Personal computers that were
considered luxury items are now considered common household items and are no longer
counted against a families resource limit for initial eligibility. If the family is determined
eligible for welfare cash assistance, then they will receive cash allotments on a monthly
basis. Future ineligibility is determined in a number of ways. A family could incur a
sanction of the monthly cash assistance amount due to reaching the maximum time limit
for the adult case member or noncompliance with the welfare to work program
requirements. When an adult is working a family could also be determined ineligible if
the parent earns more than the maximum income limit. (CDSS, 2007).

Eligible welfare families are also benefitted by other programs and services that
compliment cash assistance. Families are in most cases eligible for federal food stamps if
they initially meet the requirements for CalWORKs. Medical coverage, the MediCal in
program in California, is also a benefit that is generally qualified for if cash assistance
eligibility requirement are met. Child support services are also available to families in
the areas of establishing paternity and enforcing child support obligation to the
responsible parent. The local Child Support Agency (LCSA) requires caretakers to help
with establishing paternity if it has not been done so previously. Family planning services are available to help with prevention of unwanted pregnancies as well as making decisions about the desired family size and planning accordingly. Child Health and Disability Prevention (CHDP) is a program that provides regular check up for children under the age of 21 for prevention of disability or ill health. Social services are also made available to families to help with family issues ranging from mental health, drug abuse, legal problems, housing and child care difficulties. Social workers are available at client request. Welfare to work is also a benefit to becoming eligible for CalWORKs (CDSS, 2007).

*Welfare to Work*

The welfare to work program is designed to help adult caretakers with gaining the skills and strengths in the areas of job search, interview skills and resume building. Caseworkers will determine eligibility for welfare to work requirements. If the family is determined eligible, participation is mandatory as a condition of continuing cash assistance. Exemption from welfare to work requirements are often determined based upon the caretakers ability to work, disability or age of a child, and more importantly time left on aid. If the adult has exhausted the maximum time limit for cash assistance, eligibility to participate in welfare to work is denied. Families that desire to participate can do so voluntarily but the transportation and child care are issued at the agency’s discretion. Child care and transportation costs are also a benefit of participating in welfare to work to support the families’ efforts of becoming self sufficient (CDSS, 2007).
Participation requirements in the welfare to work program is based on the number of hours spent each week in employment or employment related activities. In single-parent household, 32 hours of participation is required per week and two-parent households require 35 hours per week. Once a family finds work and it is determined that the income earned is over what is allowed for income eligibility, the family is then entitled to continued transportation and child care support for up to 12 months to assist in the retention of employment (CDSS, 2007).

*Job Club*

Services that are related to the welfare to work program are each designed to address the barriers to attaining employment and helping with the long term goal of self-sufficiency through employment. Job Club is a program that helps families with job skills and resumes building. The program’s duration is a maximum of 12 weeks and is the place where participants are often assessed for further services if the employment goal is not reached (DHA, 2010).

*Community Work Experience*

Community Work Experience (CWEX) is the program that supports unpaid work experience to participants. Through this program, skills and interests are matched with employers who are willing to offer training in a real workplace setting. The number of required hours participating in the CWEX program depends upon the amount of cash assistance that is given to the family each month. Essentially the number of hours required is equivalent to the family working for the monthly cash assistance grant (DHA, 2010).
On the Job Training

On the Job Training (OJT) is a subsidized employment opportunity designed to benefit the participant with a paid work experience and a tax incentive for the employer. Participants are not placed in the positions but they have to apply and interview. Utilizing the skills acquired though the Job Club program, participants are expected to earn the employment opportunity (DHA, 2010).

Vocational Assessment Counseling

Vocational Assessment Counseling (VAC) is welfare to work program benefit that gives the participant the opportunity to discuss and map out a plan for long term education and employment goals. Participants are tested for aptitude and interests to assist in gaining direction for future goals. Recommendations from the counselors help participants and caseworkers with developing a plan for welfare to work. Taken into account are the number of months available before timing out of the employment services program, current educational level, interests and goals (DHA, 2010).

Mental Health and Substance Abuse Counseling

Mental health counseling is a benefit available to welfare to work participants who are dealing with often undiagnosed mental health challenges. Often mental health counselors assist participants with daily stressors associated raising a family with minimal resources that cloud the ability to work or retain employment. Participants are referred to medication services if necessary. Alcohol and other drug abuse treatment is an added benefit to the welfare to work participation. For families that are dealing with substance abuse issues, counselors are available to assist with referral to treatment and
continued counseling services to support the goal of removing substance abuse barriers from the participant’s path to self sufficiency. Required work participation hours completed in the course of mental health or substance abuse treatment can be decreased to less than 32-35 hours and consider full participation depending on the severity of each case (DHHS, 2006).

Education

Educational opportunities that will support the goal of self sufficiency through employment are also made available to participants at the expense of the welfare agency. Upon assessment through Job Club or VAC it may be determined that vocational, certificate, or general education is required for the participant to be competitive in local job market. Expenses associated with such programs to help participants meet minimum requirements for most jobs available in the area are covered by the welfare department (CDSS, 2007).

Each of the services available in the welfare to work program make specializing the program of each family unit for utmost benefit. Since families come to the welfare department with unique circumstances, it is possible to create a unique intervention in the welfare to work program.

Future CalWORKs Reforms

The information cited in the future reforms are adapted from the California Health and Human Services Agency website retrieved 6/12/2010. California Health and Human Service Agency reports reforms to CalWORKs rules beginning July 1, 2011 based on the Amended Budget for 2009-10. California has been faced with a significant budget crisis
in the 2000’s that has adversely affected the state’s general fund. With the reforms implemented in 2011, the state expects to save $600 million in general fund dollars. Cost-of-living grant increases that were allowed annually to CalWORKs recipients have been permanently eliminated under the new budget. For non-work-eligible adults, including undocumented individuals, certain felons and disabled, blind or aged people the reforms will be applied in distinctive manners depending on their voluntary participation in the welfare to work program.

Three reforms that change the way CalWORKs time limits and sanctions function are:

- Self-Sufficiency Reviews;
- Graduated Sanctions; and
- “Sit-out” Periods and Time Limits.

Self-Sufficiency Reviews (SSRs) will be the requirement for welfare to work participants who are not meeting the minimum work participation hours. Every six months the participants will be required to meet face-to-face with caseworker to determine what is needed to assist in meeting required participation rates. Failed attendance to the SSR will mean an automatic 50% decrease, or sanction, of cash aid in the following month. If the welfare to work participant is meeting the minimum required hours of participation, then the SSR will not be scheduled.
Graduated sanctions will be applicable to adults who are non-compliant with welfare to work rules. In the first step, the adult only portion of the grant will be sanctioned for three months. After an additional three months, or six months total, 25% of the child-only grant will be removed along with the adult portion of the grant. If the adult is still non-compliant or not meeting the required work hours after an additional 3 months, a cumulative of nine months, the final step is to reduce the child-only grant another fifty percent. The example given by CHHS reflects a grant of $694 being reduced to $277 in a graduated sanction for 9 months of non-compliance with work participation requirements.

Sit-out periods will be applied to the time adults are utilizing cash assistance benefits. Starting in 2011, adults will be eligible for 48 cumulative months and then the grant will be reduced the adults portion for 12 months. During that time, supportive services will still be offered to the families at the agency’s discretion to help with transportation and childcare costs. At the end of the 12 month sit-out period the adult portion of the grant will be returned for the remaining 12 months before the maximum time limit of 60 months is reached.

Under the current budget, the time clock for sanctioned adults would stop accumulating months for maximum time limits. Under the Amended Budget 2009-10, sanction months will be counted toward the cumulative months of cash assistance, meaning the time clock will continue to “tick”.
Summary

This review of relevant literature covered the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. This welfare reform implanted changes to welfare assistance programs across the country with impacts to low income families that have been argued both positive and negative. Time limits, mandatory work requirements and devolution to states have made welfare reform a stringent program that moved away from entitlement to participation in welfare cash assistance programs. Barriers to employment and the provisions developed through welfare reform to help clients overcome them were also discussed in this chapter. Lastly, California’s response to welfare reform, CalWORKs, was discussed including reforms to the state’s program to include sit-out periods and graduated sanctions. The next chapter will inform the reader of the methods utilized to conduct this study.
Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to describe data collection methods for this study, the research design and to denote the specific criteria met by subjects to be included in the study. This chapter will also explain the sampling procedure, the role of the researcher and steps taken for the protection of human subjects.

Study Design

This is a descriptive research project that seeks to study the Welfare to Work participants’ ability to achieve self-sufficiency after participating in the 5 year welfare assistance program. The quantitative method for collecting sample data was chosen because it is a succinct way for the data to be provided and analyzed. Although the questionnaire is comprised of predominately closed ended questions, there are several questions regarding income and expenses in which each respondent can report information that is more accurate. However, there are questions included in the survey that seek to determine the subjects’ feelings regarding their knowledge of the program and their perceptions of their former caseworker’s expertise in service delivery. Further details about the questionnaire will be addressed later in this chapter. The study will be conducted in two parts: 1) an analysis of the quantitative data collected from timed out welfare leavers in Sacramento County and: 2) a review of relevant literature from Chapter 2 to put into context this study’s results with those of prior studies on the same subject of current welfare reform.
Variables

The variables studied in this research are post-welfare income, living situation and reliance on income based social services to evaluate program effectiveness. Other variables in this descriptive analysis are attitudes of post-welfare participant’s knowledge of the program. Welfare to work activity engagement and attitudes about perceived case worker knowledge will be analyzed.

Subjects

The study will take place within Sacramento County surveying timed-out adults from the CalWORKs cash assistance program. The survey will be conducted at a location of the participants’ convenience but will also ensure the integrity of the study and the participant’s confidentiality. It is expected that all data collected will be obtained within county limits as to reduce hardship for the client or researcher during the data gathering process.

The population sample for this study is comprised of 30 adults who are former CalWORKs participants. The subjects will meet criteria for participation in this study by: 1) being currently timed-out or exhausted 60 months of CalWORKs participation and: 2) currently residing in Sacramento County. For the purposes of this study which will explore the effectiveness of Welfare-to-Work program in Sacramento County, it is relevant to include only those who have participated the full extent of program months and who currently maintain residence in the county. Inclusions also indicate persons who may continue to receive CalWORKs cash assistance for minor children, participate in the federal food stamps program, and/or receive Medical, i.e., subsidized medical care.
Excluded from the study are persons who have not completed the 60 months of participation regardless of their status on or off welfare. This study has an extensive inclusionary base as a means to reflect the broad ethnic make-up of Sacramento County and its equally diverse population of CalWORKs participants.

Instrumentation

The researcher conducted a survey of 30 individuals who participated in the CalWORKs Welfare to Work program for the maximum time limit of 60 months. The questionnaire utilized was developed by the researcher and consisted of 35 questions covering eight themes: 1) demographics; 2) living arrangements; 3) income; 4) expenses; 5) social services participation; 6) CalWORKs participation; 7) perceptions of Welfare to Work program; 8) perceptions of social services workers. The use of the questionnaire was to gather objective data that could be straightforwardly analyzed. A copy of the survey questionnaire can be found in Appendix B.

Data Gathering Procedures

Initial subjects involved in this study will be known to the researcher and asked to voluntarily participate in the project. To avoid any conflicts of interest due to the researcher’s employment with Sacramento County Department of Human Assistance, further subjects were discovered through reference from those already participating. Snowball sampling method was considered the best means of identifying subjects because of the difficulty in ensuring a non-hierarchical relationship with welfare services clients and the researcher.
The data will be analyzed utilizing statistical programming software, PASW. Descriptive analysis will be used to summarize the most important characteristics of the sample data.

Role of the Researcher

The role of the researcher is to analyze the quantitative data collected from the study. The researcher will describe relevant findings for the purposes of contributing to current research regarding welfare reform. Other responsibilities of the researcher are to ensure subjects meet inclusionary criteria as the sole surveyor and data collector. Throughout the study and thereafter it is the researcher’s role to ensure each subjects’ rights to privacy and safety remain protected.

Protection of Human Subjects

The researcher submitted a Request for Review by the Sacramento State Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects. The request was approved with minimal risk associated with it because the survey asks several questions related to income, expenses and perceptions of the Welfare to Work program, which may provoke some uncomfortable feelings. The researcher provided a list of counseling services along with the consent form in the event either respondent may need to use them. A copy of each can be found in Appendix A. The data will be reported in aggregate as a measure of ensuring confidentiality for the respondents’ when the study is made public.

Summary

This chapter discussed the methods used in this research study. The quantitative study design, including the 35 question survey was described as well as the variables
used to measure outcomes. Characteristics and exclusions of subjects desired for the project are also discussed along with the process for gathering the data and protecting confidentiality of human subjects. Chapter 4 will be a report of the data collected from the 30 respondents included in this study.
Chapter 4

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

The previous chapter 3 discussed the methodology of this study including the design, subjects and data gathering procedures. The purpose for this chapter is to present the reader with the results of the research study. The reader will be informed of the qualitative data collected and used by the researcher for analysis. Of the thirty-five closed ended questions, four of them were asked open ended to allow for greater accuracy in the areas of age, number of children in the respondents household, income level, and housing costs.

Data was analyzed according to the following themes: 1) Demographics of the respondents; 2) Current living situation; 3) Income; 4) Expenses; 5) Community services participation; 6) CalWORKs participation; 7) Perceptions of the welfare to work program; and 8) Client and worker relations. Aside from the demographic questions, the researcher will report the specific questions asked of the respondents. The data will be presented with the percentage and frequency of responses from each category.

In order to determine significant associations among certain variables Chi-Square tests were also conducted. A significance level of \( p < .05 \) was used to measure the strength of the relationships. Variables were cross-tabulated from the following sections of the survey: 1) CalWORKs Participation; 2) Perceptions of Welfare to Work Program; 3) Social Services Worker Relations; and 4) Demographics. To preserve the
confidentiality of all respondents the data will be reported in aggregate and in the presentation of major findings in the study.

Demographics

The thirty people surveyed in this research represent a sample of parents who have left welfare due to exhausting 60 months of participation in Sacramento County. The average age of the respondents is 39, ranging from 29 to 60 years old. Thirty-seven percent of the respondents (n = 11) were 38 and 42 years old. Seventeen percent (n = 5) identified themselves as male and eighty-three as female. Single, or never married people represented sixty-seven percent (n = 20) of the sample while twenty-three percent (n = 7) represent divorced respondents. Ten percent (n = 3) made up the number who identify as married.

African-Americans made up fifty-seven percent (n = 17) of the study sample representing the greatest number of respondents in this research. Hispanics made up twenty percent (n = 6); Caucasians made up thirteen percent (n = 4) and ten percent (n = 3) of the respondents identify themselves as Asian.

Predominately the level of education in this study is a high school diploma or GED, fifty-six percent (n = 17). Thirteen percent (n = 4) of the respondents reported some high school. Although it is unclear by this reporting how much high school education the respondents did receive. Twenty percent (n = 6) of the respondents reported some college education. Three percent (n = 1) responded in each of the categories of associates degree, bachelor degree, vocational certificate or training.
Twenty percent (n = 6) of the respondents report that no more than one child currently lives with them since timing off welfare. Forty-three percent (n = 13) report that two children live with them. Twenty percent (n = 6) report three children currently live with them. Thirteen percent (n = 4) state four children are in their household and three percent (n = 1) report five children currently in their home.

Living Situation Since Timing Off Welfare

Since timing-out of welfare, has either of your children started living with someone else?

Twenty-seven percent (n = 8) report that at least one of their children has taken residence with someone else. Seventy-three percent (n = 22) report that none of their children have gone to live with another home. Of the eight people who have reported children living somewhere else, it is worth noting that the question did not ask if the decision was made voluntarily or if there was child protective intervention within the family.

What is the number of adults in your home who earn money, including yourself?

Forty percent (n = 12) report that one adult in their home earns income either through a traditional job or other means such as self-employment. Thirty-three percent (n = 10) state that there are no adults currently earning income. Twenty-seven percent (n = 8) report that three or more adults are currently earning income where they live.

Are you currently homeless? (Including couch surfing or no stable address)

Ten percent (n = 3) responded that they are currently homeless. Although the researcher clarified the inclusions to homelessness on the survey, the respondents were
not asked to disclose if they living in a shelter or moving frequently from residences that they are not the primary renter, for instance. Ninety percent (n = 27) of the respondents reported not being homeless at this time.

**Income Sources After Welfare Discontinuance**

What is your current monthly income?

The mean average income is reported as $854, ranging from $0 to $3500 per month. However, the more frequent income level is $555 (n = 4). Twenty percent (n = 6) report $500 or less coming into their homes each month. Seventy-three percent (n = 22) are seeing $900 or less income per month for their families after timing-off of welfare. Families supported with $1000 to $3500 per month are twenty-three percent (n = 8).

What types of unearned income do you currently receive except CalWORKS?

Seven percent (n = 2) report receiving unearned income other than CalWORKS. Child support and disability payments are the only unearned income sources reported. The remaining ninety-three percent (n = 28) report no unearned income.

Are you receiving CalWORKS for your children even though you timed-out?

Seventy percent (n = 21) of the respondents report that even though their adult portion of the grant is sanctioned due to maximum eligibility limit being met, they are still receiving cash assistance based upon the child’s or children’s’ eligibility status. Thirty percent (n = 9) are not receiving CalWORKS cash assistance for their children.

What is your current employment status?

The greatest number, sixty percent (n = 18), of sample respondents report that they are currently unemployed. While forty percent (n = 12) are earning money,
seven percent (n = 2) have full time permanent employment. Twenty percent (n = 6) report self-employment income and the remaining thirteen percent (n = 4) are working variations of part time and temporary jobs.

Expenses

How much is your rent or mortgage per month?

Respondents report a range of housing cost from none to $1150 per month. The mean average of reported housing costs is $332. The broad range of housing costs among respondents could be explained by the number of respondents who may be utilizing subsidized housing or sharing housing costs with another family to reflect the housing cost savings. Note that along with the aforementioned, there were a number of people in the survey who identified as homeless in the survey which may account for the fifty-three percent (n = 16) of people who pay $200 or less per month for housing costs.

Do you currently purchase or are provided private health insurance?

The question of purchasing private healthcare resulted in ninety-three percent (n = 28) “no” responses. The seven percent (n = 2) who did respond “yes” could be accounted for by the earlier responses to income earned through employment, for instance.

Have you paid for child care since timing out?

Thirteen percent (n = 4) of the respondents report having paid for child care since timing out of the welfare to work program. The other eighty-seven percent (n = 26) have not paid for child care. Considering the high number of respondents who reported
unemployment coupled with the sporadic nature of part time and temporary could explain why child care has not been a considerable expense to the respondents.

**Social Services Participation**

Have you received government-subsidized healthcare since timing out (MediCal, CMISP and Medicare)?

While ninety-three percent (n = 28) of the respondents have utilized subsidized healthcare, more likely MediCal since many of the respondents still have children in their homes, only six percent (n = 2) have not benefitted from the various government assisted medical programs.

Since timing out have you received food stamps?

One hundred percent (n = 30) of the people in this study responded that they have received food stamps assistance since timing off welfare cash assistance. The food stamps program is funded by the federal government and has no time limit to the eligibility criteria. For those families that are earning employment income, the income eligibility requirements are less stringent than those of the cash assistance programs throughout the nation.

Have you participated in a subsidized child care program like Child Action since timing out?

Eighty-seven percent (n = 26) of the people surveyed stated that they have not utilized subsidized childcare services since timing off of welfare assistance. Thirteen percent (n = 4) have utilized these services. As stated earlier the number of people who are unemployed may be a major contributing factor to this set of results.
Since timing out have you lived in government subsidized housing like, Conventional Housing, Section 8, income restricted properties, etc.)?

Eighty-three percent (n = 25) of those people participating in this study report that they have not lived in subsidized housing since timing off of welfare. The remaining sixteen percent (n = 5) state that they have benefitted from subsidized housing. The data on housing costs suggests that more people would be benefitting from subsidized housing in this sample. It would be safe to assume that more people share housing with others to account for the lower reported rental expenses in this study.

CalWORKs Participation

How long since you timed out or used all 5 years of CalWORKs eligibility?

More than half of the participants in this study, particularly seventy percent (n = 21), have timed off welfare assistance within the last two years. The remaining thirty percent (n = 9) timed out from three to thirteen years ago. Considering the clock started for California welfare cash assistance recipients in January 1998, the maximum time anyone could be a welfare leaver is thirteen years by the end of 2010, the year of this study.

Which activities did you participate in while in the welfare to work program?

Ten percent (n = 3) reported that they did not participate in any welfare to work activities while receiving cash assistance, while the remaining ninety percent (n = 27) reflected participation in various activities including employment. Of the twenty seven survey respondents, the data reflects that sixty-three percent (n = 19) participated in Job Club, the job readiness program; twenty percent (n = 6) participated in Community Work
Experience, where knowledge and skills are matched to employers who are willing offer unpaid training and work experience for welfare to work participants; three percent (n = 1) participated in the On the Job Training program which matches recipients and employers for paid work experience; ten percent (n = 3) utilized the Vocational Assessment Counselor services designed to help the client determine goals and map out plans for education and employment.

Zero reported mental health counseling services as an activity during welfare to work eligibility. It would be useful to know of the individuals studied, how many had referrals to mental health services made for them and how many actually have a need for services but were overlooked for referral services. Thirty-three percent (n = 10) of the respondents engaged in education activities within 60 months of welfare to work eligibility. Seven Welfare to Work activities were utilized for this study. Employment was second to Job Club for participant engagement. Forty-seven percent (n = 14) report working during some point of their welfare assistance eligibility. This result would bring back the part time and temporary employment data from earlier. It is likely that clients have been working based upon this data but the jobs are not stable enough to relieve them of the welfare burden when referencing the employment status data.

If you worked within the 60 months of participation, how long were you employed before returning to CalWORKs?

Thirty-seven percent (n = 11) report not becoming employed while participating in the welfare to work program. However, sixty-three percent (n = 19) became employed. Of that sixty-three percent, thirty percent (n = 9) continued to receive cash
assistance while working and the remaining thirty-three percent (n = 10) came back to
cash assistance within one year. Again it draws attention to the short term, low-wage
employment data that has been mentioned throughout the data analysis, which appears to
be problematic for low-income families dealing with time limited income assistance.

Were you ever sanctioned for non-compliance during your welfare to work
participation?

Twenty percent (n = 6) respondents stated that they had been sanctioned for
welfare to work noncompliance. This study did not ask the length of time or the origins
of the sanction. It would be useful to know long the sanction was in effect, how the
sanction process takes place, what kind and how much notice does the client have with
regard to the sanction process.

Perceptions of the Welfare to Work Program

The WTW program trained me in job retention.

This question was asked of respondents to determine the general feelings of past
participants about whether the elements of the welfare to work program provided them
with the skills needed to get and retain employment. Forty percent (n = 12) were neutral
or agreed with the above statement. Fifty-seven percent (n = 17) disagreed or strongly
disagreed with that the welfare to work program helped with job retention skills. More
people tend to believe that the program did not help in the area of job retention based
upon the mode average and standard deviation of .952.

The WTW program helped me determine goals for employment and/or education.
Forty-three percent (n = 13) disagree with the statement that welfare to work helped them determine future goals of education planning and employment. Fifty-seven percent (n = 17) agreed or were neutral regarding welfare to work helping them with future education and employment goals. More people tend to disagree with this statement based upon the mode average of respondents’ answers and a standard deviation of .961.

The WTW program helped me with barriers to employment.

Thirty-three percent (n = 10) agreed that the welfare to work program helped them with barriers to employment. Forty-three percent (n = 13) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Twenty-three (n = 7) percent remained neutral in their response. It appears that more people disagree that welfare to work helped them overcome barriers to employment based upon a mode average from respondents and a standard deviation of .986.

Did you intend on becoming employed while participating in the WTW program?

Eighty-three percent (n = 25) respondents intended on becoming employed while participating in the welfare to work activity while the other seventeen percent (n = 5) did not.

If you did not intend on becoming employed, what were your goals while participating in the WTW program?

Although this question was intended for people who had no intention of working during the 5 years of welfare to work eligibility, the respondents marked the survey with applicable choices denoting other goals besides employment. Goals were broken into six
sections as follows: child care, fifty-seven percent (n = 17); care for significant other (mental or physical health, ten percent (n = 3); care for oneself (mental or physical health), seven percent (n = 2); educational pursuits, twenty percent (n = 6); bridge between grant of unearned income source, seventeen percent (n = 5).

Client and Worker Relations

I believe my case manager wanted me to become successful.

Fifty percent (n = 15) took a neutral stance to the statement regarding how they believe their case manager felt about them becoming successful. Thirty percent (n = 9) disagree or strongly disagree with the above statement. While twenty percent (n = 6) either agree or strongly agree (n = 1) that their case manager wanted success for them.

I believe WTW staff, other than my case manager, wanted me to become successful (WTW staff are those who work in other areas of the program, like Job Club or CWEX).

Fifty-three percent (n = 16) were neutral in their responses to the statement about their impressions of other staff members wanting them to be successful. Thirty percent (n = 9) disagree and strongly disagree (n = 5) with the above statement. Seventeen percent (n = 5), however, agree with the statement.

I believe my case manager understood the WTW program.

Sixty-three percent (n = 19) were neutral or agreed (n = 13) in their response that their case worker understood the welfare to work program. Thirty-seven percent (n = 11) disagreed or strongly disagreed.
My case manager explained the WTW program thoroughly and answered my questions.

Fifty percent (n = 15) agreed or were neutral (n = 10) when responding on the questionnaire regarding the case manager explaining program rules and answering questions of the respondents. The remaining fifty percent (n = 15) were nearly split in responses of disagree and strongly disagree.

I believe I understood the WTW program while I was participating.

While forty-three percent (n =13) agreed or were neutral in responding about their own understanding of the welfare to work program, fifty-seven percent (n = 17) disagreed or strongly disagreed that they had an understanding of the program they navigated for income security for five years.

I believe my case manager supported me while I participated in other government mandated programs.

Twenty percent (n = 6) did not have other mandated programs to fulfill like court, parole and probation mandates, CPS mandates, work furloughs, etc. Of the remaining respondents where this question is more applicable, forty percent (n = 12) believe the case manager was not supportive of the respondent fulfilling other mandated programs tied to the legal system. The remaining forty percent (n = 12) were neutral or agreed (n = 4) that the case manager was, in fact, supportive of the respondent’s accountability to other government agencies.
Cross-Tabulation Results

Caseworkers explaining the Welfare to Work program rules and overcoming barriers to employment

There is a statistically significant relationship between participants overcoming barriers to employment when Welfare to Work rules were explained thoroughly by the caseworker, $X^2(9, N = 30) = 17.41, p = .043$. Although statistically significant the relationship between the variables is relatively weak. However the data does infer that with the rules clearly explained then there is greater likelihood of participants being successful at overcoming employment barriers.

Participation in Welfare to Work activities and overcoming barriers to employment

There is no statistically significant relationship between participants’ perception of overcoming barriers to employment and participation in Welfare to Work activities, $X^2(3, N = 30) = 6.26, p = .10$. The data suggests that there are other variables impeding employment that Welfare to Work activities may not address. Although no statistical significance was found, it is interesting to note that each respondent ($N = 30$) reported participation in work readiness activities.

Ethnicity and understanding the Welfare to Work program

There is no statistically significant relationship between participant’s ethnicity and understanding of the Welfare to Work program, $X^2(9, N = 30) = 10.30, p = .3$. In short, a participants’ ethnicity does not increase or decrease the likelihood of understanding the Welfare to Work program.
Education level and understanding the Welfare to Work program

There is no statistically significant relationship between participant’s level of education and comprehension of Welfare to Work program rules, $X^2 (15, N = 30) = 10.38, p = .795$. Because most of sample population ($n = 26$) had high school diplomas or higher education it is interesting to note the minimal relationship between educational levels and understanding of program rules.

This chapter described the results from 30 respondents to a 35-question survey regarding the efficacy of welfare reform as it impacts their lives. Demographics, income and expenses, living situations and attitudes regarding past participation in the Welfare to Work program are among the categories covered in the results. Associations among variables (i.e., participating in work readiness activities and having program rules explained as they relate to overcoming employment barriers) were tested and reported in this chapter. Major findings and implications based upon the analysis of the data will be discussed in the following chapter.
Chapter 5

CONCLUSION

Summary

Welfare time limits were put into place as an incentive to work and have been the subject of many studies that have shown minimal difference between how welfare leavers and timed-out adults are faring economically post-welfare reform. Regardless of the reason for cash assistance sanctioning, (i.e., non-compliance, meeting time limits, employment opportunities), adults have been shown to still need to utilized other social services because of working low-wage jobs that keep them at or near poverty level and still not meeting reforms ultimate goal of self-sufficiency in most cases.

The study data from chapter 4 suggests that the CalWORKs program has social service elements designed to address the barriers to employment experienced by many welfare income families but participants are not accessing the services. Welfare to work participants are not engaging in the activities provided to assist in overcoming substance abuse, minimal education and little work experience, for instance.

Findings

This researcher found that there are several findings of note that essentially agree with the findings from similar studies conducted since welfare reform. Four major findings resulting from this study will be discussed.

The first major finding is that former welfare participants believe that the welfare to work program did not help them with job retention. This is a major finding in the
study because considering approximately 63% of the sample studied participated in Job Club, the job readiness activity. Nearly half of the participants became employed while receiving welfare. Of those who became employed approximately 52% returned to welfare rolls within one year. This finding suggests that job retention is an issue that should be addressed. There is a major focus helping welfare assistance families obtain employment, however, this finding further suggests that there is a need for energies to be directed to job retention skills for welfare to work participants to reduce the chances of a cycling through welfare to work to welfare (DeAngelis, 2001).

The second major finding is that study respondents agreed at 63% that they believe the caseworker understood the welfare to work rules and regulations; however, 57% of the respondents felt that they did not understand the program that they were depending on for income and employment assistance over a 5-year period. This finding is noteworthy because each respondent was participating in welfare to work for a number of years and even at the conclusion of services, they do not have a clear understanding of the program. It is also important to note that half of the respondents report that caseworkers did not explain the welfare to work program or answer their questions, again adding to the argument that program policy should be revisited with participants regularly instead of intake alone (Nam et al, 2009).

Thirdly, post-welfare assistance families continued to rely on other social services after the maximum time limit has been reached for cash assistance. Every respondent surveyed utilizes food stamps since the welfare time limit sanction. Along with food stamps, 93% of those surveyed also uses subsidized healthcare, MediCal. This finding
suggests again that employment wages are too low to lift families above the poverty and eligibility lines for a real view of what self-sufficiency looks like. With 40% of the respondents working but nearly all of them requiring other social services to meet their families’ basic needs of food and healthcare assurance, it brings the question again of whether welfare to work is actually effective considering families are not faring well economically after timing out (Cherlin et al., 2009).

Finally, there was found to be a statistically significant relationship \( (p = .043) \) between caseworkers explaining program rules and the participants overcoming employment barriers. This significant finding suggests that when people are appropriately informed of the process, they are better able to navigate the system they are working within. Although this finding does not speak to overall success of the program based upon participant knowledge of the rules, it does suggest better outcomes can be expected when people comprehend the consequences and benefits of participating in Welfare to Work. Considering certain barriers such as mental health and substance abuse, it can be assumed that participant disclosure may be more likely in these instances. In other words, when the caseworker shows interest in the families’ well-being by putting forth the effort to clarify important details, the caregiver may internalize enough trust in the caseworker to reach out for help.

Important findings also resulting from this study that are the instances of 10% of families losing housing placement after the time limit sanction. Although it is not clear from this study the cause of each respondent’s homeless status other than it occurred after the sanction it is safe to state that losing some economic assistance had some impact on
the situation. Another important finding is that children have been reported leaving the care and control of the parent after reaching the maximum time limit for cash assistance. Approximately 27% of the respondents have one or more of their children living with someone else. Again this study did not look into the causes for children leaving their parent’s home (i.e., family or CPS intervention or voluntary means). The change in living arrangements occurred after welfare sanctioning according to the survey answers so there could be a correlation. This survey only looked at those parents who are timed out so no correlation could be made without a control group of cash assistance eligible parents and children with changes in living arrangements.

Limitations

The limitations of this study are the sample size ($N = 30$). With Sacramento County population being approximately $1.4$ million people, an increase in unemployment rates in the 2000’s impacting an increase in welfare caseloads, the sample is a too small to to draw solid conclusions regarding the programs’ effectiveness; although congruent findings with other research conducted could be made. The study design was a collection of quantitative data that for the purposes of this study was effective, however the information gained from qualitative data could have filled in the gaps on some information shared by respondents. Due to the nature of snowball sampling it appears that the sample population studied had similar demographic characteristics considering respondents were referred to the researcher. Assuming that there were small degrees of separation from one respondent to the next, it still appears
that snowballing limited the randomization of the demographics and did not reflect the diverse population of Sacramento County residents.

Implications

Because the finding of this study were regarding job retention, lack of understanding of program rules and continued reliance on social services the implication for the profession of social work is clear. As stated in chapter 1, the theoretical framework associated with the study is building on the strengths of the family and empowering them to affect the betterment of their lives.

Certain studies discussed in chapter 2 suggest reform is necessary for welfare reform. This researcher suggests that the CalWORKs program be reformed in a way that emphasizes the utilization of social workers in a role of more directly addressing the barriers of substance abuse, mental health, domestic violence, housing, minimal education, skills building and job retention. Currently the caseworkers employed to perform the functions are not adequately trained or are overwhelmed by increased caseloads to do an appropriate assessment and referral. At this point welfare to work participants are being referred to job readiness activities to address resume building when upon further examination, there is a need to refer to counseling or education services to increase the chances of getting and keeping a job. Social workers need a more effective role in the lives of welfare to work participants to aid in utilizing the 5 years of welfare more efficiently.

It appears from the research that low income wage earners, especially welfare to work participants, are getting connected with jobs but lack the skills to maintain the job
and therefore opportunity to learn and earn promotions. The promotion or resume and skills building could be the economic break needed to get off welfare with better paying jobs. Furthermore the stress of maintaining a household with minimal resources and managing the stringent and often unclear requirements of the welfare assistance program will suggest stagnancy in the progress of welfare participants. This study’s results suggest that welfare to work participants are on a hamster wheel of cash assistance, job readiness activities, low wage jobs, and back to sanctioned or no cash assistance. Unfortunately for those who have exhausted time limits, the cash assistance is decreased from what is already less than enough to adequately sustain families.

The power to change families is in the hands of the family. Therefore, when social workers are involved in empowering individuals they are strengthening families and communities. In reference to a common saying, “knowledge is power”, it is imperative that welfare to work participants are made aware of the program and program implications within their very specific family situations. The program is not designed to be cookie cutter, but with the limited training and resources for time, the services are being delivered in a cookie cutter fashion. This is evidenced by the number large number of the study sample that completed the Job Club activity but had no reported contact with a Vocational Assessment Counselor nor Mental Health counseling.

Recommendations

This researcher’s suggestions for further study on this topic come from limitations of this study. It would be beneficial to have a larger sample population with respondents gathered by random sampling methods to determine if the study results are any different.
Another area of interested is the study of the correlation of welfare to work time limit sanctioning and the rate of children who are removed from the parent’s care. Again the interest lies in the limitation of this study seeking the cause of children living with someone other than the custodial parent after maximum time limits are reached.

Illustrated above are three major finding from the research conducted regarding the efficacy of the welfare to work program, CalWORKs in Sacramento County. Lack of job retention skills, program rules knowledge and children separated from parents were the key findings in this study. Limitations and suggestions for further research are described as well as a charge to social workers to continue to empower families with information. Furthermore, a charge to welfare assistance agencies to make better use of social workers to make necessary and appropriate assessments and referrals before time runs out.
APPENDIX A

Consent to Participate as a Research Subject
California State University, Sacramento
Division of Social Work

You are being asked to participate in research will be conducted by Elizabeth A. Harrison, a graduate student in Social Work at California State University, Sacramento. The purpose of this study is to understand the impact of CalWORKs, also known as Welfare-To-Work, program in assisting families in gaining long-term, sustainable employment. I am hoping the results of this study will contribute to future reforms of the current program.

You will be given a survey of 35 questions about your experience in the program as well as your experience after participating in the program. The survey will require approximately 10 minutes of your time, and will be conducted at a location of your convenience.

Some of the questions asked in the survey may seem personal. You are under no obligation to answer any questions that make you feel uncomfortable.

You may benefit from participating in this research by 1) having the opportunity to share your experience in the Welfare-To-Work program and 2) sharing the impact of no longer being eligible to participate in the program and 3) whether or not the program adequately addressed you needs prior to the 60 months of participation ending.

To ensure your confidentiality, your legal name or any identifying characteristics will NOT be used in this study. Your responses to all survey questions will remain confidential. All data collected in this study will be kept in a locked cabinet, only accessible to the single researcher, and will be destroyed at the end of the study.

If at any point while completing the survey or any time afterward you experience discomfort or have mental health concerns, please contact Sacramento County Mental Health Services at (916) 875-1055 or see the attached list of counseling referrals in the greater Sacramento area.

If you have any questions or concerns about this research, you may contact Elizabeth Harrison at (916) 230-4011 or by email at eah46@saclink.csus.edu. You may also contact my project advisor, Professor Kisun Nam, PhD at 916-278-4184 or by email at knam@saclink.csus.edu.
Your participation in this research is entirely voluntary. You will not be compensated for participating in this study. You may decline to participate now or any time in the future without risk.

Your signature below indicates that you have read and understand this consent form and agree to participate in this research project.

________________________________________ ____________________________
Participant Signature     Date
Counseling Referrals

For professional help in the greater Sacramento County, please contact the following locations:

1. Sacramento County Adult Access Team
   Phone: (916) 875-1055
   TTY/TDD (916) 874-8070

2. Sacramento County Mental Health
   2150 Stockton Blvd.
   Sacramento, CA 95817-1887
   Phone: 916-875-1000
   URL: http://www.sacdhhs.com

3. La Familia Counseling Center, Inc.
   5523 34th Street
   Sacramento, CA 95820
   Phone: 916-452-3601
   TDD: (800) 735-2929 or 711
   Email: anitab@lafcc.com
   URL: http://www.lafcc.com/about.html

4. Asian Pacific Community Counseling Center
   7273 14th Ave. #120-B
   Sacramento, CA 95820
   Phone: 916-383-6783
   URL: http://www.apccounseling.org

5. Center for Counseling and Diagnostics Services Sacramento State Student Health Center
   6000 J Street Sacramento, CA 95819
   Phone: 916-278-6252
   URL: http://www.csus.edu/psysrv/resources.htm
6. Catholic Social Service of Sacramento
   New Pathways Counseling
   5890 Newman Ct
   Sacramento, CA 95819
   Phone: (916) 452-7481 ext. 0
   Email: kchismark@diocese-sacramento.org
   URL:  http://www.csssac.org/index.html

   Additional locations can be found at the following link: http://sacros.org/default.aspx
APPENDIX B

Survey Questions
(Please circle the letters next to your answers or fill in the blank)

Demographics

1. Birth Year: _____________

2. Gender:  a) Male  b) Female  c) Transgender


5. Highest level of education:  a) Some high school  b) HS diploma/GED  c) Some college  d) AA degree  e) BA degree  f) Graduate degree  g) Vocational training or certificate

6. Number of all children in the household, even if unrelated to you: ______________

Living Arrangements

7. Since timing-out of welfare, has either of your children started living with someone else?  a) Yes  b) No

8. Number of adults in your home who earn money, including yourself?  a) 0  b) 1  c) 2  d) 3 or more

9. Are you currently homeless? (defined as couch surfing, no stable address)  a) Yes  b) No

Income

10. What is your current monthly income including employment, cash assistance, child support, settlements, etc.? __________________
11. What types of unearned income do you currently receive, with the exception of CalWORKS?  
(Circle all that apply)  
a) SSI/SSP  b) SDI  
c) Child Support  
d) Unemployment Insurance Benefits  
e) Pension/Retirement Benefits  
f) Structured Legal Settlement  
g) Lottery Winnings issued in allotments  
h) Inheritance or Trust issuances  
i) N/A I don’t receive any unearned income  

12. What is your current employment status?  
a) P/T permanent  b) P/T temporary  c) F/T permanent  
d) F/T temporary  e) Self-employed  f) Unemployed  

13. Are you receiving CalWORKs for your children even though you timed-out?  
a) Yes  b) No  

Expenses  
14. How much is your rent or mortgage per month?  
______________  

15. Do you currently purchase or are provided private health insurance?  
a) Yes  b) No  

16. Have you paid for child care since timing out?  
a) Yes  b) No  

Social Services Participation  
17. Are you ever received government-subsidized healthcare since timing out? (Medi-Cal, CMISP, Medicare)  
a) Yes  b) No  

18. Since timing out, have you ever received federal food stamps?  
a) Yes  b) No  

19. Have you ever participated in a subsidized childcare program like Child Action since timing out?  
a) Yes  b) No  c) N/A, children are too old for child care services  

20. Since timing out have you ever lived in government-subsidized housing? (Section 8, income restricted properties, Conventional Housing)  
a) Yes  b) No
CalWORKS Participation

21. How long since you timed out or used all 60 months of CalWORKs & WTW eligibility?
   a) less than 12 months  b) 1 year to 2 years  c) 3 years to 5 years  d) 6 years or more

22. Which activities did you participate in while in the WTW program? (Circle all that apply)
   a) Job Club (JCL)
   b) Community Work Experience (CWEX)
   c) On Job Training (OJT)
   d) Vocational Assessment Counseling (VAC)
   e) Mental Health Counseling (including drug and alcohol counseling)
   f) Education (vocation, trade, degree or certification program)
   g) Employment
   h) None

23. If you worked within the 60 months of participation, how long were you employed before returning to CalWORKs?
   a) N/A did not become employed within the 60 months
   b) less than 3 months
   c) 3 to 6 months
   d) Less than 1 year
   e) Less than 2 years
   f) Continued to receive Cal WORKS cash aid benefits while employed

24. Were you ever sanctioned for non-compliance during your WTW participation?
   a) Yes  b) No

Perceptions of WTW Program

25. The WTW program trained me in job retention skills.
   a) Strongly Agree
   b) Agree
   c) Neutral
   d) Disagree
   e) Strongly Disagree
   f) I did not participate in any WTW activities

26. The WTW program helped me determine goals for employment and/or education.
   a) Strongly Agree
   b) Agree
   c) Neutral
   d) Disagree
   e) Strongly Disagree
27. **The WTW program helped me with barriers to employment.** (Issues related to drug and/or alcohol abuse, criminal justice involvement, domestic violence, mental health issues, housing, child care, clothing, emergency food, school attendance and performance)
   a) Strongly Agree
   b) Agree
   c) Neutral
   d) Disagree
   e) Strongly Disagree

28. Did you intend on becoming employed while participating in the WTW program?
   a) Yes  b) No

29. If you did not intend on becoming employed, what were your goals while participating in the WTW program?
   a) Stay home to care for children
   b) Care for significant person in your life who was ill (mental or physical)
   c) Care for yourself who was ill (mental or physical)
   d) Attend school without WTW program rules interference
   e) Waiting to be granted another source of income (SSI, SDI, Workman’s Comp, Legal Settlement)
   f) N/A I intended on becoming employed
   g) Other, please explain __________________________________________________

**Social Services Worker Relations**

30. **I believe my case manager(s) wanted me to become successful.**
   a) Strongly Agree
   b) Agree
   c) Neutral
   d) Disagree
   e) Strongly Disagree

31. **I believe WTW staff, other than my case manager(s), wanted me to become successful.**
    (Job Club staff, CWEX coordinators, Job Developers, Social Workers, Vocational Assessment Counselors, Non-Compliance workers)
    a) Strongly Agree
    b) Agree
    c) Neutral
    d) Disagree
    e) Strongly Disagree
    f) I did not interact with other WTW staff members
32. I believe my case manager(s) understood the Welfare-To-Work program.
   a) Strongly Agree
   b) Agree
   c) Neutral
   d) Disagree
   e) Strongly Disagree

33. My case manager(s) explained the Welfare-To-Work program thoroughly and answered my questions.
   a) Strongly Agree
   b) Agree
   c) Neutral
   d) Disagree
   e) Strongly Disagree

34. I believe I understood the Welfare-To-Work program while I was participating.
   a) Strongly Agree
   b) Agree
   c) Neutral
   d) Disagree
   e) Strongly Disagree

35. I believe my case manager(s) supported me while I participated in other government mandated programs. (CPS mandates, court, work furlough, parole or probation check-ins, etc.)
   a) Strongly Agree
   b) Agree
   c) Neutral
   d) Disagree
   e) Strongly Disagree
   f) N/A, I did not participate in other mandated programs
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