

2020

CalWORKs Participation and Poverty Rates in Multigenerational Families

Destiny Wray Lovato
Walden University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Public Administration Commons](#), and the [Public Policy Commons](#)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu.

Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Destiny Wray Lovato

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee

Dr. Raj Singh, Committee Chairperson,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Dr. Ernesto Escobedo, Committee Member,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Dr. Olivia Yu, University Reviewer,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Chief Academic Officer and Provost
Sue Subocz, Ph.D.

Walden University
2020

Abstract

CalWORKs Participation and Poverty Rates in Multigenerational Families

by

Destiny Wray Lovato

MPA, University of Phoenix, 2014

BS, California State University San Bernardino, 2012

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Public Policy and Administration

Walden University

November 2020

Abstract

The State of California aids more than a million individuals under the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program at a cost of billions of dollars each year. Although adult recipients are given supportive services and offered various programs in a motivational attempt to achieve self-sufficiency, the needs of children, who are the highest population group living in poverty, are not currently addressed. The absence of programs and services targeted to children may perpetuate the generational cycle of poverty. Yet researchers have not yet examined the underlying reasons behind multiple generations receiving CalWORKs and the continuation of poverty through generations in these low-income families. The purpose of this exploratory descriptive quantitative study was to identify if there are any relationships between growing up with parents who received assistance and receiving assistance as an adult. The theoretical framework consisted of Albert Bandura's social learning theory. A cross-sectional retrospective survey design was used. 116 participants completed the World Health Organization's Adverse Childhood Effects tool. A binomial logistic regression and a Somers'd test, respectively, were performed to determine whether there were any relationships or trends between the variables. The study's results indicated no statistically significant relationship between the independent and dependent variables. Future researchers should include a higher number of participants in the aided program. The impact on social change this study may have is the further identification of relationships in the cycle of multigenerational poverty. Using study findings, policy makers may be able to develop programs targeted to children that reduce the likelihood of their living in poverty in adulthood.

CalWORKs Participation and Poverty Rates in Multigenerational Families

by

Destiny Wray Lovato

MPA, University of Phoenix, 2014

BS, California State University San Bernardino, 2012

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Public Policy and Administration

Walden University

November 2020

Dedication

I dedicate this dissertation to my son Wray G. Alva. Without him, I would have never pursued this degree. You give me purpose to keep going; even in my darkest of days you are always my light. You are my inspiration to always pursue bigger things in this life and be the best mother I can be. I hope that you always remember that anything is possible in this life with hard work and commitment. Nothing in this life worth having comes easy. Know that I believe in you, I will always love you and will go to any measure in this world for you.

Acknowledgements

Many people have supported me and guided me through this endeavor. To say the least, it has been a very long and tedious road. I want to thank first and foremost my family, for loving and supporting me throughout this process. To my son, Wray, for being my inspiration in life. My brother, Chayne, for supporting me always. My mom, Sheila, and sister, Erica, for standing behind me and cheering me on. My husband, Kevin, for putting up with my stress and lack of time that I had throughout this process. Thank you to my dear friend Courtney Coe, who has been my go-to person and my rock throughout this process. I do not know what I would do without someone to share the agony.

I would also like to thank my committee members. Dr. Raj Singh, my chair, thank you for always believing in me and pushing me forward. Without your guidance and support, I do not know where I would be. Dr. Ernesto Escobedo, my committee member, thank you for your valuable knowledge and support.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| List of Tables | ix |
| Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study..... | 1 |
| Background..... | 4 |
| Problem Statement | 5 |
| Purpose of the Study | 6 |
| Research Questions..... | 7 |
| Theoretical Framework of the Study | 8 |
| Nature of the Study | 9 |
| Definitions..... | 10 |
| Assumptions..... | 13 |
| Scope and Delimitations | 14 |
| Limitations | 15 |
| Significance..... | 15 |
| Summary | 16 |
| Chapter 2: Literature Review..... | 18 |
| Literature Search Strategy..... | 20 |
| Theoretical Foundation | 21 |
| Literature Related to Key Variables and/or Concepts | 24 |
| Summary | 33 |
| Chapter 3: Research Method..... | 35 |
| Research Design and Rationale | 35 |
| Variables | 36 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Methodology | 37 |
| Population | 38 |
| Sampling and Sampling Procedures | 38 |
| Procedures for Recruitment, Participation, and Data Collection | 39 |
| Data Analysis Plan | 42 |
| Threats to Validity | 42 |
| Ethical Procedures | 43 |
| Summary | 44 |
| Chapter 4: Results | 46 |
| Data Collection | 47 |
| Results | 51 |
| Assumptions | 51 |
| Research Question 1 | 51 |
| Research Question 2 | 54 |
| Summary | 58 |
| Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations | 60 |
| Interpretation of the Findings | 61 |
| Limitations | 62 |
| Recommendations | 62 |
| Implications | 63 |
| Conclusion | 64 |
| References | 66 |

Appendix A: Approval to Use the Adverse Childhood Experiences International
Questionnaire (ACE-IQ).....79

Appendix B: Adverse Childhood Experiences International Questionnaire
(ACE-IQ)80

Appendix C : Tables85

List of Tables

| | |
|---|-----|
| Table 1. Demographics | 49 |
| Table 2. Variables in the Equation..... | 53 |
| Table 3. Beta Coefficient Value..... | 55 |
| Table C1. Research Question 1 Somer's d test..... | 85 |
| Table C2. Research Question 2 Variables in the equation..... | 86 |
| Table C3. Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable problems..... | 91 |
| Table C4. Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable school | 91 |
| Table C5. Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable intoxication | 92 |
| Table C6. Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable: food | 92 |
| Table C7. Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable free time | 93 |
| Table C8. Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable physical abuse | 94 |
| Table C9. Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable domestic violence..... | 95 |
| Table C10. Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable yelling | 96 |
| Table C11. Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable parent death..... | 96 |
| Table C12. Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable divorce..... | 97 |
| Table C13. Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable jail | 98 |
| Table C14. Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable mental illness | 98 |
| Table C15. Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable verbal abuse | 99 |
| Table C16. Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable sexual abuse attempt | 100 |
| Table C17. Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable sexual abuse | 101 |
| Table C18. Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable sexual molestation..... | 101 |
| Table C19. Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable sexual molestation..... | 102 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Table C20. Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable physical abuse using an object..... | 103 |
| Table C21. Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable physical abuse | 104 |
| Table C22. Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable threats..... | 105 |
| Table C23. Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable bullied | 106 |
| Table C24. Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable fighting..... | 106 |
| Table C25. Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable bullied often | 107 |
| Table C26. Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable neighborhood fights | 107 |
| Table C27. Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable neighborhood violence..... | 108 |
| Table C28. Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable out placed..... | 109 |
| Table C29. Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable gang violence | 109 |
| Table C30. Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable personal gang violence..... | 110 |

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

The California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program is subsidized by the Transitional Act for Needy Families (TANF) program under the U.S. federal government (California Department of Social Services, 2017; Stanczyk, Carnochan, Hengeveld-Bidmon, & Austin, 2018). Unlike TANF, the CalWORKs program aids any child under 18 years of age or until their 19th birthday and graduation from high school (County of San Bernardino Transitional Assistance Department, 2016). In contrast, adults are given 48 months on the CalWORKs program; once they reach this time limit, they no longer receive their portion of the cash aid but are still eligible for food stamps and medical services (California Department of Social Services, 2017).

There have been various transitions in the CalWORKs program and its requirements since the Welfare Reform Act of 1996, known as the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA). The CalWORKs program addresses the needs of and barriers faced by adults participating in the program under a subprogram known as Welfare-to-Work (WTW), which was initiated in 1999 (Blumenberg & Pierce, 2016). However, none of the current supportive services address children, their barriers and/or needs (Stanczyk et al., 2018). As of September 2015, there were over half a million families receiving cash aid under the CalWORKs program who received an average cash aid grant of \$505.52 monthly (California Department of Social Services, 2017); California's monthly grant is one of the highest in the United States (Woodward, 2014). Under the CalWORKs and WTW programs there are many supportive services that are provided to adults in the case unit to address barriers and

ultimately increase self-sufficiency. These include counseling (drug and alcohol and domestic violence), transportation services, assistance with clothing, mental health services, and housing assistance (County of San Bernardino, 2016; Stanczyk et al., 2018; Woodward, 2014). Meanwhile, one in five children nationally live 100% below the federal poverty level, these levels have increased from 15.7 to 25.2% (Wimer, Nam, Waldfogel, & Fox, 2016).

However, children are not provided with these same services. Children who grow up in poverty are more likely to be subjected to child neglect and abuse (Fong, 2016). Furthermore, children who grow up in poverty are likely to experience continued poverty in adulthood. Welfare and poverty have become a supposed culture known as a “culture of poverty” (Taylor, Gross, & Towne-Roese, 2016). To those who endorse the concept, the culture of poverty represents an epidemic that has grown over the past 20 years, thriving off substance abuse, addiction, domestic violence, sexual and physical abuse, child abuse and neglect, and dependency on government human and social service agencies (Fong, 2016).

Lawmakers thought that the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, otherwise known as welfare reform, would transition families from temporary assistance to stability because of the requirement that work must be in exchange for government assistance through the TANF program (Bartle & Segura, 2003; Taylor et al., 2016; U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, n.d.). This law required families to work or engage in training activities, community service, school, or job searches with the expectation of finding other subsidized employment within five

years (Bartle & Segura, 2003; U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, n.d.). Unlike the traditional TANF program that discontinued aid after the 5-year term, the CalWORKs program allows children to remain aided until their 19th birthday and/or graduation from high school (County of San Bernardino, 2016). Yet, the failure to provide supportive services to children in these caseloads perpetuates victimization as well as the revolving door of poverty and dependency on government programs. There is an essential need to establish programs to address the issues faced by children living in poverty; such programs should include counseling, assistance with school items, tutoring, or incentives to get good grades and go to school. These programs could provide a proactive approach to ending poverty and dependency on the welfare systems such as CalWORKs and TANF.

In this chapter, I will provide background information on CalWORKs, TANF, and WTW programs as well as indicators of the culture of poverty and adverse childhood experiences. The statement of the problem will outline the current issues relating to programs and supportive services for the study population and identify the need for a study on proactive approaches to addressing the cycle of poverty and multiple generations of CalWORKs in a single family. The research questions will address the relationships between the culture of poverty using the concept of adverse childhood effects, growing up in a family receiving CalWORKs, being a CalWORKs recipient, and the amount of time spent in the CalWORKs program. I will also discuss how I applied the social learning theory, developed by Albert Bandura, to explain the behaviors of multiple generations of families receiving welfare. The chapter will also include an

overview of the nature of the study; I used a quantitative methodological approach to identify whether a relationship exists between the variables of the study. The remaining portion of the chapter will include the definitions used throughout the study and discussion of the assumptions, delimitations, limitations, and significance of the study.

Background

Researchers studying the cycle of poverty have extended their research to include TANF and various agencies pertaining to human and social services departments. This research is specific to poverty indicators and the percentages of children in poverty who are more susceptible to being victims of child abuse and neglect, as well as how many individuals are victims and perpetrators of crime, alcoholism, and drug addiction and living in poverty (Endress, 2016; Fong, 2016; McCarty, 2016; Quillian, 2017; Sun, et al., 2016; Welles, et al., 2017). The number of people who drop out of school and have no high school diploma and or GED has been the subject of some research, as well (Arentt-Hartwick, & Walters, 2016; Kalil, 2017). Other researchers have studied the expansion of various programs such as Head Start in state preschools, the removal of barriers, and increases in various benefits with the removal of the Maximum Family Grant (MFG) rule and newly formulated supportive services such as diaper assistance under Assembly Bill 480 (California Department of Social Services, 2018; Liebertz & Bunch, 2018;).

In this research study, I examined the relationship between participants on the CalWORKs program and individuals growing up with family who received CalWORKs; as well as the relationship between growing up in a culture of poverty using adverse childhood experiences (ACEs). I sought to identify both whether there is a relationship

present between the variables and the trends of multigenerational families in poverty. Findings from the trend analysis may be useful to stakeholders in taking a more proactive approach to program implementation for children whose families are on CalWORKs assistance.

Problem Statement

The problem was the lack of research on multiple-generation families receiving CalWORKs and the continuation of the culture of poverty in these low-income families. In this study, I addressed the issue of multigenerational recipients of the CalWORKs program in regard to the culture of poverty and the concept of ACEs. I explored whether there is a statistical relationship between recipients receiving aid as adults and growing up in a family that received aid and the relationship between recipients receiving aid as adults and growing up in a culture of poverty using ACEs. The current research addresses various TANF, CalWORKs and WTW programs; self-sufficiency; and the barriers of becoming self-sufficient, poverty, and the impact on children. In conducting the literature review, I found that there are no current studies that identify trends or indicate a statistically significant relationship between multiple generations of welfare recipients, culture of poverty factors, and ACEs.

By identifying if these relationships exist, this study can assist policy makers in addressing children's needs proactively rather than reactively. Many of the children's needs are not addressed until they have become a victim of abuse and or become a recipient themselves (Fong, 2016). The 2016-2017 total number of recipients on CalWORKs was 1,232,070 with 257,706 of recipients being adults over the age of 18

years and 974,364 children; the program cost \$5.3 billion in the 2016-2017 fiscal year (California Department of Social Services, 2017). One fifth of children in the United States live below the federal poverty levels by 100% (Wimer et al., 2016). Children who live in poverty are twice as likely to experience three or more ACEs by the time they turn 17 years old (Powell & Davis, 2019). These ACEs have a negative impact on children resulting in behavior and developmental changes, and they correlate with adult behaviors such as substance abuse, alcoholism, crime, domestic violence, physical and sexual abuse, and mental health issues (Powell & Davis, 2019).

Adults in the CalWORKs program have access to various programs, counseling services, supportive services, and other initiatives designed to assist them with becoming self-sufficient. The lack of services for the family as whole, however, is still an ongoing issue. This lack of services may perpetuate the generational cycle of poverty for children and adults living in a poverty, a culture that continues daily and is marked by deprivation and insecurity (Grimaldi, 2016; Stanczyk et al., 2018).

Purpose of the Study

I explored whether there is a relationship between parents and children as adults receiving CalWORKs. That is, I sought to determine the impact of living and growing up in a culture of poverty, receiving CalWORKs, and ACEs. Indicators of the culture of poverty such as domestic violence, alcoholism, drug addictions, homelessness, chronic poverty, crime, and abuse verbally, physically and or psychologically. I explored that relationship between multigenerational recipients of the CalWORKs program and the culture of poverty. The independent variables will be whether the individual's parents

were recipients as well and the various indicators of the poverty culture known as Adverse Childhood Effects (ACE's). The dependent variable will be the recipient of CalWORKs or individual taking the survey for both research questions.

Research Questions

Research Question 1: What is the relationship between children growing up with family on the CalWORKs program and becoming recipients as an adult?

H₀1: A child's family receiving CalWORKs has no effect on the likelihood of the child becoming a recipient in his or her adulthood.

H₁1: A child's family receiving CalWORKs significantly affects the likelihood of the child becoming recipient in his or her adulthood.

Research Question 2: What is the relationship between the number of adverse childhood effects experienced as a child and becoming a CalWORKs recipient as an adult?

H₀2: The number of adverse childhood effects has no effect on the child becoming a recipient of CalWORKs in his or her adulthood.

H₁2: The number of adverse childhood effects significantly affects the child becoming a recipient of CalWORKs in his or her adulthood.

I measured the variables categorically and nominally through closed yes or no responses. The surveys were conducted online and anonymously and administered to previous recipients as well as current to provide the largest possible statistical significance and least possible error. I conducted binomial logistic regression analyses to assess the relationship between the participant being on the CalWORKs program and growing up

with a family that received the CalWORKs program. It also indicated the statistical significance of whether there is a relationship between the number of ACEs experienced by the participant and whether he or she receives cash aid through the CalWORKs program. The second test was the Somers'd test for the trends between the parents of the participants and the participants on aid. The tool that was used was the World Health Organization's (WHO) Adverse Childhood Experiences International Questionnaire (ACE-IQ) tool, which analyzes various factors and challenges pertaining to child abuse and neglect, victimization, the potential of becoming a victim, and addiction issues (WHO, 2019). The ACE tool questions adults about childhood experiences as well as current situations to establish the continuum of risk behavior that includes alcoholism, domestic violence, drug abuse, physical abuse, and sexual abuse (Felitti et al., 1998). The results of this study could provide knowledge of geographic patterns related to where multigenerational recipients of CalWORKs live throughout the 58 counties in California.

Theoretical Framework of the Study

I applied the theory of social learning (Bandura, 1977) to consider how childhood experiences including instances of abuse, maltreatment, and neglect as well as certain influences and lifestyle factors make children susceptible to continuing the cycle of poverty into another generation. Bandura's (1977) social learning theory focuses on the environment and the individuals in it and states that an individual's behavior is learned from observing others. A tenet is that individuals learn by watching others and face consequences and/or reactions to the behaviors they replicate (Bandura, 1977). There are four premises on which the social learning theory is based: differential association,

definitions, differential reinforcements, and imitation (Akella & Jordan, 2015). Bandura specified four steps necessary to outline observational learning including attention, retention, reproduction, and motivation (“Introduction to Albert Bandura’s Social Learning Theory,” n.d.). An observed behavior does not need to be carried out immediately or at all; rather, individuals can learn a behavior and demonstrate it much later or not at all (Kretchmar, 2013).

Applying the theory of social learning to the multigenerational recipients of CalWORKs and culture of poverty allowed me to effectively explain the generational cycle of receiving benefits and the various indicators of this culture such as having children at a young age, abusing drugs, and engaging in criminal activity, amongst other items. I surmised that children who observe these behaviors for so long retain them, due to not understanding any other lifestyle. They demonstrate these same behaviors to survive amongst the population in which they live. If there is no positive social circle and the individuals around the child are engaged in the same activities, the differential reinforcement process cannot truly take place due to not understanding consequences and reward. In such cases, the only positive role model may be educators. However, if the child is acting out observed behavior and becomes a disruption to his or her class, the relationship between the educator and the child is not likely to be a positive one.

Nature of the Study

I used a nonexperimental descriptive cross-sectional design to establish whether there is a relationship between having received or currently receiving assistance under the CalWORKs program and having parents who also received assistance. I also examined

the relationship between the indicators of the culture of poverty using ACEs and the length of time in the CalWORKs program in the state of California. The data collection consisted of an online Internet survey administered using a third-party survey platform (SurveyMonkey.com) to ensure that the data were both confidential and anonymous. The independent variables included the dichotomous variable of whether the individual's parents received assistance when they were growing up (Yes or No) and the number of ACEs experienced, which was measured ordinally. There were two dependent variables: whether the individual was on CalWORKs, which was measured dichotomously (yes or no), and the amount of time spent on the CalWORKs program, which was measured continuously. Use of a quantitative study design allows for the identification of trends between the counties in a state and the determination of whether there is a relationship between two sets of independent and dependent variables, and it is the best way to study a large geographical area (O'Sullivan, Rassel, Berner, & Taliaferro, 2017; Rudestam & Newton, 2015). In Chapter 3, I further discuss the research design and rationale.

Definitions

The following words and definitions provide clarity and meaning in understanding the language of the research study:

Adverse childhood experiences (ACE): Traumatic life experiences that have an impact on a child's developing brain and body with lasting lifetime effects (Prewitt, 2014).

Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC): The welfare assistance program that assisted families with little or no income prior to TANF (U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, 2009).

All families: The remaining TANF cases that have not been identified as either a two-parent or a zero-parent family (California Department of Social Services, 1999).

Barrier: An obstacle that prevents movement.

California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs): A public assistance program that provides cash aid and services to eligible families that have one or more children in the home (California Department of Social Services, 2019).

Child maltreatment: All forms of abuse towards a child including but not limited to physical, emotional, or sexual abuse; neglect; and exploitation resulting in actual or potential harm to the child (The Hospital for Sick Children, 2014).

Child neglect: The failure to provide for the child's well-being such as adequate education, health, living conditions, nutrition, shelter, and emotional development. The failure to provide these things harms the health and physical, mental, spiritual, moral, and/or social development of the child (The Hospital for Sick Children, 2014).

Culture of poverty: A term that refers to a social theory that explains the cycle of poverty. It is based on the concept that the poor have a unique value system and the poor remain in poverty because of their adaptations to the burdens of poverty (USLegal, 2016).

Domestic violence: Violent or aggressive behavior within the home, involving a person in the household or a member of the immediate family (“Domestic Violence,” 2019).

Emotional abuse: The failure to provide a supportive environment for the child, which can cause harm to the physical, mental, spiritual, or social health of the child. Emotional abuse can include insulting, belittling, discriminating, ridiculing, or other rejections (The Hospital for Sick Children, 2014).

Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996: A federal law signed by President Bill Clinton and intended to end welfare; it contains strong work requirements and supports the movement from welfare to work (U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, n.d.).

Physical abuse: An interaction or lack of interaction that results in actual or potential physical harm to a child (The Hospital for Sick Children, 2014).

Poverty: The inability to meet basic needs with the family’s assistance unit income being below the poverty threshold (United States Census Bureau, n.d.).

Self-sufficiency: The ability to supply one’s own or its own needs without external assistance (“Self-Sufficient,” 2019).

Substance abuse: The involvement of a child in a sexual activity (The Hospital for Sick Children, 2014).

Transitional Assistance Needy Families (TANF): The welfare assistance program that replaced AFDC; it aids families for 60 months in a lifetime and increases work participation requirements (U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, 2009).

Two-parent: An assistance unit that includes two aided nondisabled natural or adoptive parents of a same-aided or social security recipient minor child (living in the home), unless both parents are aided minors and neither is the head-of-household (California Department of Social Services, 1999).

Welfare-to-Work (WTW): A program under CalWORKs that promotes self-sufficiency and provides supportive services and referrals to services to overcome barriers to employment (Contra Costa County Employment & Human Services Department, 2019).

Zero-parent: A case in which the parent(s) or caretaker(s) are excluded from or ineligible for cash assistance (California Department of Social Services, 1999).

Assumptions

This study will use the empiricist philosophical assumption. Also known as empiricism, this theory is a direct contrast of the philosophical assumption of rationalism. Empiricism is a theory that believes that knowledge comes from experience and it thrives off of experience, evidence and sensory perception (Markie, 2017). The primary differentiation between the two assumptions is acceptance versus belief, realists accept realities by proving them where as anti-realists or empiricists believe their realities from lived experiences (Dellsén, 2017). This theory is often used in predictions also known as empirical predictions in which observations of the past and current observations are performed and predictions are made (Dellsén, 2017). For this study it is assumed that in multigenerational recipient families of the CalWORKs program, the application process and lifestyle choices are an observation of the children of those families. Whom later

grow up and repeat the same observed behaviors creating a cycle or empirical reality.

This philosophical assumption concretizes the families who have multiple generations receiving the CalWORKs program, living in a culture of poverty and exposing their children to the same adverse childhood experiences. It is assumed that the data is accurate and that the participants only took the survey once and were truthful in their answers on the survey. Although, there is no way to verify this information. It is also assumed that all individuals receiving CalWORKs benefits are living in poverty.

Scope and Delimitations

The scope of the study addressed the relationship in question, between parents receiving welfare benefits during childhood, the factors of poverty culture, adverse childhood experiences, the individual receiving welfare benefits under the CalWORKs program, and the amount of time spent on the program. The issue of the cycle of poverty is currently trying to be cured at the adult level, with the goal to obtain self-sufficiency. However, the issue is nothing is being done at the adolescent level. Programs need to be established for children, so they can have an outlet, a role model, stay in school, assist them with homework, teach life skills such as how to balance a checking account, learn about safe sexual contact, and receive services of counseling if needed. Currently, it is required that children on an active CalWORKs case be in school and attending regularly, otherwise that parent is financially sanctioned (California Department of Social Services, 2018). Children are the sole reason adults receive cash-aid benefits, the state of California will aid a child until their 18th birthday or 19th and graduation from high school, yet there are no current programs to assist children on cash-aid with overcoming barriers. The

boundaries of the study are the State of California, the study surveys individuals currently living in California and receiving or have received benefits under the CalWORKs program. The individuals who were not included are those that have received benefits and no longer reside within California. The study's variables include those that cover the entire state of California, the results of the relationships of these variables are generalizable to the entire state of California, but also other states that have welfare programs under TANF. Identification of these relationships could assist human and social service agencies and program developments in the future.

Limitations

The limitation to the study was focused on the study's sample population, individuals who receive and or received CalWORKs benefits in the state of California. Other limitations also included the number of children in the household composition, marital status, and or race. These demographics did not play a part in the significance in the study although they were included in the questionnaire, they were not a part of the analysis of research.

Significance

This study will assist human and social service agencies to identify where the cycle of poverty begins and the need for programs not only for the adults on the case to become self-sufficient, but also, that the children need a program to help them as well. There are millions of dollars the counties have annually left over from the annual fiscal budget and in many cases, they scramble to figure out where to give it out so they can use their budgets in entirety to secure the same amount for the following fiscal year. These

last minute programs are known as incentive programs, in 2018 the California Department of Social Services implemented a one-time award for individuals that were enrolled in an education program, the individuals on the assistance unit received \$500 if he or she was enrolled in a high school diploma program and \$1000 for the enrollment of a college or training program towards a certification or degree (Goldberg, 2017). The money was given on a first-come first-serve basis until the \$4 million dollars was depleted (Goldberg, 2017). Individuals had to fill out an application with their worker and provide proof of enrollment, the money then was transferred onto their Electronic Benefits Card. Currently, there are initiatives of a new incentive program for the current year that will be initiated within the next few weeks, the program is designed to entice sanctioned parents to participate in the WTW program. However, still no incentive or program to the children on the case. Children experience abuse in all forms while more prone to it living in poverty than middle or upper class (Hyunil & Brett, 2017; Fong, 2016). These children are susceptible to living in conditions they did not ask nor want to live in, but rather were born into. By incorporating the Social Learning Theory policy makers and workers of human and social service agencies will understand that it is not just a culture of poverty but also a cycle that begins with children. Hopefully, this will give an understanding that children need more programs as an escape to the environment in which they live in, a positive impact or influence on the course of their future.

Summary

The CalWORKs program is California's welfare program. Unlike TANF, CalWORKs will aid any child until their 18th birthday or until 19 and graduation from

high school. Since the passing of PRWORA states have had more opportunity to address the needs and barriers of their recipients, supply with supportive services and meet TANF regulations (Bartle, & Segura, 2003; Woodward, 2014; Stanczyk, et al., 2018). These barriers are addressed through the WTW program and can be anything from domestic violence, substance abuse, mental health, transportation, child care, and other ancillary items needed to obtain employment, keep employment, and or meet participation requirements (Stanczyk, et al., 2018). However, there are no current programs for children, unless through Child and Family Services or directly requested by the parent through Department of Behavior Health. This study examined the relationship between children growing up in a poverty culture and with parents that received benefits under AFDC or TANF and now being CalWORKs recipients and continuing to live in a poverty culture. It will identify the trends and relationships between the participant and the factors that make up the culture of poverty such as: child maltreatment, neglect, abuse, emotional abuse, sexual abuse, domestic violence, crime, and substance abuse, it is a culture consisting of deprivation and insecurity (Grimaldi, 2016). These relationships will be tested by conducting a binomial logistic regression. The trends will be identified by running a Somers'd test. It will also identify the relationship and probability using the explanation of the Social Learning Theory that children will be recipients of CalWORKs if their parents were while growing up. Chapter two will go further into the literature review, theoretical foundation and scope of research conducted for the study.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Over 775,000 children in the state of California received cash aid benefits over \$10 monthly, and another 4,037 children that received a \$0 aid grant monthly on CalWORKs caseloads (California Department of Social Services, 2018). As discussed in Chapter 1, over \$245.50 million dollars was spent in CalWORKs benefits according to the May report (CDSS, 2017). For an individual to be eligible to be a CalWORKs case there must be deprivation or a child under 18 years old who has not graduated high school (CDSS, 2017). According to the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) December 2018 report, there were 2,515 teen parent cases; these are individuals who qualify for their own CalWORKs case due to having a child while under the age of 19 years old, attending a high school program, and residing with the child (CDSS, 2018). Due to the changes brought by PRWORA in 1996, individuals receiving CalWORKs are now required to have a WTW case as well. For an individual to be eligible for the WTW program, they must have time on their 48-month CalWORKs time clock, and they cannot be a recipient of SSI or SSDI, a fleeing felon, or undocumented individual; if so, these individuals are not aided on the CalWORKs case and are deemed ineligible for the WTW program (World Institute on Disability, 2018).

There are multiple programs available to individuals who participate in the WTW programs. Services that can be offered to the participant include domestic violence counseling, mental health counseling, substance abuse programs, job skills training, education related to employment, subsidized employment programs, and homelessness assistance (CDSS, 2017; Stanczyk et al, 2018; Woodward, 2014). These programs and

supportive services are designed to assist the individual in overcoming barriers to employment. There are many supportive services within the WTW program to assist adult recipients in becoming self-sufficient such as supportive services (e.g., child care, transportation assistance, ancillary assistance, monthly diaper payment of \$30 per child under 36 months old, and counseling and family stabilization), but none to assist children on the CalWORKs assistance unit (Speigman et al., 2011; Stanczyk et al., 2018). A program designed to help children on these caseloads is needed. These children have no outlet from a life and culture of poverty. Exposure to negative events before one is 18 years old is known as an ACE (Welles, Patel, & Chilton, 2017).

Examining the relationship between parents and children receiving CalWORKs benefits and the impact of the poverty culture will provide an explanation of multigenerational poverty and lifetime on aid. Current researchers have discussed welfare programs such as TANF and CalWORKs; poverty and the culture amongst it including substance abuse, alcoholism, domestic violence, physical and sexual abuse, child maltreatment and abuse, and mental health; ACEs; generational poverty; child welfare; and programs regarding self-sufficiency. However, none of the current literature connects or establishes a relationship between the culture of poverty and multigenerational recipients of welfare programs such as CalWORKs. In this chapter, I review the current literature regarding TANF, CalWORKs, social learning theory, factors of the culture of poverty, ACEs, and multigenerational poverty.

Literature Search Strategy

The research consisted of using various search engines, government websites, Google Scholar, and Walden University Library databases to locate academic and scholarly articles, documents, and other information. I used the follow search terms: *poverty, culture of poverty, poverty culture, multigenerational poverty, generational poverty, child welfare, CalWORKs, TANF, welfare culture, Welfare to Work, Social Learning Theory, supportive services, Adverse Childhood Effects, and Personal Responsibilities Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA)*. The research databases utilized within the Walden University Library included articles within human services, children services, health care, social sciences, behavioral studies, psychology, and public policy and administration. Within each search, deeper reviews were conducted in EBSCOhost, Taylor and Francis, New England Journal of Medicine, SAGE Journals, Crossref, Science Direct, and ProQuest. The literature review returned little research regarding the CalWORKs program and studies specific to the recipients of the program. However, many studies have been conducted that included recipients of the federal welfare TANF program (CITE). According to my review, no research has been conducted on the state, local, or federal level linking a relationship between the culture of poverty and multigenerational poverty.

The years searched were between 2013 to present; however, due to the limited number of sources found, some material used in support outside of the 5-year time frame. Sources of literature included peer-reviewed journals, dissertations, government websites and reports, nonprofit websites and reports, books, and articles. I found few studies

focused on the CalWORKs program and information and research to be nonexistent for multigenerational welfare families and/or recipients. Background information was researched using the terms culture of poverty, factors of poverty, ACE, WTW programs, and TANF.

Theoretical Foundation

The social learning theory written by Albert Bandura in 1969 is a blended behaviorism theory, blending learning from an individual's mental processes and their environment (Kretchmar, 2018). The social learning theory rationalizes and explains individuals' behavior based on the observation of others; however, it is not just observation that creates and instills behavior, it is also reinforcement (Kretchmar, 2013; Kretchmar, 2018). Bandura specified four steps that outline observational learning including attention, retention, reproduction, and motivation ("Introduction to Albert Bandura's Social Learning Theory," n.d.; Kretchmar, 2018). The theory explains that the socialization process is entangled into the language, morals, customs, values, patterns and practices that shape new members during identification, a modeling process that occurs based on behavioral similarities (Bandura, 1969). Environment also is a condition and can influence a person's behavior; a person's behavior can impact and change the environment as well (Kretchmar, 2018). The "Bobo doll" study was the first major study of the theory (Kretchmar, 2018). In the study, children watched a clip of an adult hitting, punching, and yelling at a blow-up doll; the children then were split into three separate groups (Kretchmar, 2018). The first group witnessed the adult being rewarded for his actions, the second saw the adult being punished, and the third had no reward or

consequences (Kretchmar, 2018). The children were then given the blow-up doll to play with; children in Groups 1 and 3 who saw reward or no reward and/or consequence were aggressive towards the doll, while the children in Group 2 were not (Kretchmar, 2018). In the second phase of the study, all the children were told they would be rewarded if they conducted the same behavior seen by the adult; all of the children imitated the same aggressiveness towards the doll (Kretchmar, 2018). An approach of this focuses on actual identification rather than behavioral similarities between parents and children, in which were tested in Sears, Rau, and Alpert in 1965 (Bandura, 1969). This identification stemmed from adult-like behaviors and attitudes (Bandura, 1969).

There are four premises in which the social learning theory is based on including differential association, definitions, differential reinforcements, and imitation (Akella & Jordan, 2015). Differential association allows the individual to be exposed to behaviors and models of behavior by people they are in contact with regularly; the personal social circle consists of primarily friends and family who portray attitudes, beliefs, behaviors, and values that the individual may or may not adopt as their own (Akella & Jordan, 2015). The definitions are the individuals' interpretations of what behavior is acceptable or not; they are typically reinforced through differential association (Akella & Jordan, 2015). Differential reinforcement is the actual experience by the individual and the process of weighing consequences and rewards of the behavior; the reinforcements come from society and their community and contribute to the behavior being repeated (Akella, & Jordan, 2015). Imitation is the individual repeating and carrying on the observed behaviors (Akella, & Jordan, 2015).

The theory has been referenced in several child welfare and development studies, including a teen pregnancy study and one specifically dealing with the interpersonal relationships based on attachment and social learning theories (Akella & Jordan, 2015; Markiewicz, Doyle, & Brendgen, 2001). In Akella & Jordan's teen pregnancy study, the association of girls becoming teen mothers was the exposure from their mother and "following in their footsteps" applying the Social Learning Theory (2015). The theory has proven that children learn behavior but not all demonstrate the behaviors learned (Kretchmar, 2018). This theory will explain the observed behaviors of the children's inner social circle and application of these behaviors in their adult lives. It explains the multigenerational recipients, the culture of poverty and the rationale of why children cannot break the cycle of poverty. The research question of this study examines the relationship of children on CalWORKs becoming recipients as adults. In order to be a recipient of CalWORKs there must be deprivation, in other words the applicant must have a child (California Department of Social Services, 2017). The theory will help with understanding the generational teenage pregnancy, single mother and two-parent cases. The second research question of this study examines the relationship of children and the culture of poverty. Growing up exposed to the factors of this culture including parents who suffer from drug abuse, alcoholism, domestic violence, physical violence, crime, sexual assault, mental health, etc., and the children having been victims of various types of abuse including maltreatment and neglect grow up to be addicts or victims of the same abuse also identifies a repetition of behavior applicable to the theory. The application of

this theory will support the pattern, relationship and probability of children following in their parents' footsteps on a basis of observed and learned behaviors.

Literature Related to Key Variables and/or Concepts

Current research has outlined the gap in racial and gender disparities at the poverty level and within education. The research approach is primarily focused on whether the passing of PRWORA is assisting in household poverty levels, ACEs, the programs associated with poverty, achieving self-sufficiency, and what happens to those who time-out of the TANF program. Other research located focused on child welfare primarily dealing with child maltreatment and neglect, poverty indicators, mental health and substance abuse for welfare recipients, and programs such as family stabilization to achieve barriers in the WTW program. While there may or may not be a racial and gender disparity in poverty and the welfare system. The focus of this study is on identifying the relationship between children and their parents on CalWORKs to become future recipients of the program and the relationship between the culture of poverty including all the various factors and indicators and children becoming recipients of the CalWORKs program and living in the culture of poverty as adults.

The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families TANF program replaced the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program in 1996, it establishes minimum requirements for welfare eligibility for state welfare programs (Liebertz & Bunch, 2018; Stanczyk, et al., 2018). "Welfare was to be a way station, not a way of life", to ensure that qualified applicants did not treat it as a way of life the federal government enforced guidelines including welfare-to-work programs and a 60 month time limits of benefits

(Pilkinton, 2010, P.2). Its goals are to assist single mothers in low-income, promote marriage, prevent homelessness, discourage out of wedlock babies, and transfer welfare to work (Joseph, 2018). Due to the changes of PRWORA, states were given more authority in how to operate their welfare program, and in utilizing its own funding a state could decide the provisions and sanctions of its welfare families (Wang, 2015). One of these programs include the state of California's welfare program California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs), this program abides by TANF regulations but rather than an entire case timing out of welfare benefits with the regarded 60 months, it allows parents to receive benefits for 48 months and children up until their 18th birthday, or 19 and graduated from high school. California has some of the highest benefit amounts in the United States and is one of the only states that will continue to aid children even when the parent(s) are not being aided due to timing out and or sanction (Stanczyk, et al., 2018). The ideology is that this program provides temporary relief to families while providing supportive services and overcoming barriers under Welfare-To-Work (WTW) to help families become self-sufficient (California Department of Social Services, 2017). Studies indicated that programs such as these have had an impact on poverty and crime rates, suggesting that both have reduced modestly (Liebertz & Bunch, 2018). One significant change that came with the Personal Responsibilities Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) signed in 1996, replacing the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) (Taylor, et al., 2016). It was an effort to "fundamentally change systems of public support" in the country for families and single-mothers living in poverty (Bartle & Segura, 2003, P. 2). This change in policy was not

only one that allowed states to determine the programs they would develop to help meet the TANF expectations; however, it also was focused on marriage. The PRWORA begins with

(1) Marriage is the foundation of a successful society. 2) Marriage is essential institution of a successful society that promotes the interests of children... The purpose of this part [TANF] is to increase flexibility of states in operating a program designed to- (1) provide assistance to needy families so that children may be cared for in their own homes or in the homes of relatives; 2) end the dependence of needy parents on government benefits by promoting job preparation, work, and marriage; (3) prevent and reduce the incidence of out-of-wedlock pregnancies and established annual numerical goals for preventing and reducing the incidence of these pregnancies; and (4) encourage the formation and maintenance of two-parent families (Bartle & Segura, 2003, P.3)

The new welfare policy primary agenda is to move individuals from the welfare system to employment and self-sufficiency (Hilderbrandt, 2016). When TANF was initiated taking over AFDC 68% of families in poverty received cash assistance welfare, currently only 26% receive cash assistance under TANF (Rhomberg, 2015). Case sizes for welfare programs have declined steadily since the implementation of PRWORA, but poverty rates and working poor have increased (Hilderbrandt, 2016; Taylor, et al., 2016). However, most cases are single mothers with children still consist of the highest of the cases at 83.9% of cases being one parent, with 40% of children born to single mothers (Augustine & Raley, 2012; California Department of Social Services, 2018; Speigman,

Brown, Bos, Li, & Ortiz, 2011; Taylor, et al., 2016). The CalWORKs program had objectives: (1) meet TANF goals without negatively impacting children and their well-being, the need for county assistance, and the families impacted by domestic violence; and (2) assist in the reduction of child poverty within the state of California (Speiglmán, et al., 2011). Studies has shown that welfare programs that have a priority on family's health and their wellbeing have had a positive impact on becoming self-sufficient. While most of the programs do not incorporate the reality of poverty such as homelessness, violence, crime and other culture of poverty factors into the education and training programs (Sun, Patel, Kirzner, Newton-Famous, Owens, Welles, & Chilton, 2016). Unlike most TANF programs whose entire case is sanctioned or timed out depending on the parent, when a parent is sanctioned and or times out of CalWORKs, the children portion of aid is not affected (Speiglmán, et al., 2011). Sanctioned parents are more likely to have more barriers at becoming self-sufficient such as mental health issues or victims of domestic and physical abuse (Sun, et al., 2016). These sanctioned cases are more likely to be affecting their children throughout important developmental stages (Sun, et al., 2016). At the peak of an economic crisis only 1.9 million or 20% of the 9.2 million families that were in poverty were receiving benefits under TANF (Cheng & Lo, 2014).

Poverty levels are defined by an income threshold that the federal government sets, the federal poverty threshold is \$17,346 annually and any family less than that is considered to poverty (Cheng & Lo, 2014). Poverty rates range between 8.7% and 11.7%, over half being single mother households, and over three-quarters at 75.9% being families with children under 18 years of age (Cheng & Lo, 2014). In 2014, 21.2% of

children under 18 years old lived in poverty and 25% of that consisting of children under the age of three (McCarty, 2016). Children make up the largest group of individuals living in poverty and only represent 23% of the population (McCarty, 2016). A poverty neighborhood is defined to have poverty rates above 30% (McCarty, 2016). These neighborhoods contribute in exposure to crime and other violence subjecting children to “neighborhood effects” (Quillian, 2017). These neighborhoods can be made up of multiple generations, the exposure to two or more consecutive generations can reduce a child’s ability of development by half (McCarty, 2016). Generational poverty begins at childhood and involves neighborhoods, peers and family patterns (Jindra, & Jindra, 2018).

Culture is multigenerational and societal, it is influenced and passed on generation to generation. Cultural repertoire is defined as “habits, styles, and skills, which are held together by a ‘larger worldview’, a ‘configuration of codes, contexts and institutions’ that links culture and action (Jindra, & Jindra, 2018, para 6). For instance, street culture stemmed from poverty and necessity of survival (Endress, 2016). Poverty was defined as a culture by anthropologist Oscar Lewis in 1959, claiming it to be a set of attitudes and or a way of life for people creating a dependence (Das, 2015; Joseph, 2018). The culture consisting of attitudes and behavioral traits amongst unemployment and a dependency of welfare programs (Das, 2015). As the political culture shifted to combat long-term welfare, terms such as “welfare queen” and “deadbeat dads” were developed in reference to families specifically the single mother on the program (Kohler-Hausmann, 2015). This culture primarily focuses on the beliefs, victimology, ideologies of adaptation, values,

and how people defined their social status (McCarty, 2016). Furthermore, welfare in fact does not promote self-sufficiency but rather holds families in poverty from one generation to another (Joseph, 2018). There are “concentration effects” of these neighborhoods, in which a culture lives and a set of rules and conditional factors make it difficult for those that reside within these neighborhoods to get out of poverty (Quillian, 2017). The culture of poverty and street culture are linked and within the same environment, gang affiliation, crime and drugs are just some of the factors that play a detrimental role and make up this culture (Endress, 2016). Violence thrives and is more common in neighborhoods with higher poverty rates (Welles, et al., 2017). Children that live in these neighborhoods are not only subjected to the effects of growing up poor, but also to the environment of the neighborhood that includes teen pregnancy, dropping out of school and increased health issues (McCarty, 2016). Within this created culture are several factors that include: child maltreatment, child abuse, child neglect, lower education, substance abuse, domestic violence, mental health, crime, etc (Fong, 2016). Rates of domestic violence for families on TANF are 74% compared to the general populations of 31% (Sun, et al., 2016). It is much more likely to have Adverse childhood experiences (ACE’s) such as abuse, neglect, maltreatment, household dysfunction, members of the household in prison or jail, and witnessing domestic violence or other abuse for those that receive TANF assistance than families in poverty not receiving assistance (Sun, et al., 2016; Gilbert, Nanda, & Paige, 2014; Welles, et al., 2017). Exposure to several ACE’s are associated with health conditions, alcoholism, substance

abuse, engaging in sexual activities, and mental health conditions including depression has impacted financial stability as an adult (Sun, et al., 2016; Welles, et al., 2017).

Poverty is associated with various neglect and or maltreatment abuse, physical health issues, chronic health conditions and more illnesses living in “toxic stress” (McCarty, 2016). This toxic stress environment is a result of living in constant instability and unpredictability. Children living in poverty have a higher chance of having a behavior, mood, anxiety, or conduct disorder such as ADHD (McCarty, 2016). Child welfare agencies across the United States received over six million reports annually of children being abused or neglected (Fong, 2016). Poverty is a primary indicator and predictor of child maltreatment and neglect, over 50% of children living in AFDC households reported child maltreatment (Jonson-Reid, Drake, & Zhou, 2013). Around 13% of children will have a child maltreatment report to Child Protective Services (CPS) (Berger, 2017). There is a substantial differentiation between percentages based on race, 90.9% reporting child maltreatment were African American children versus 54.6% were White, however most of these cases included single-mother households (Johnson-Reid, et al., 2013). This study’s focus is not based on race, nor segregated according to race, but rather cases of child maltreatment and neglect in poverty households. Income is linked to maltreatment due to the higher the income the less likely maltreatment is to occur due to the reduced parental stressors and increased resources for the child (Berger, 2017). In a 2003 study conducted by Paxson and Waldfogel it was found that a reduction in monthly benefit allocations was associated with higher levels of maltreatment and children ending up in foster care (Wang, 2015).

In 2002, 55.9% of mothers on TANF had a substance abuse disorder and over 22% of which used drugs within the last year (Oh, DiNitto, & Kim, 2018). Substance abuse being one of the primary barriers in obtaining self-sufficiency as well as an indicator of the poverty culture (Campos, Podus, Anglin, & Warda, 2008; Fong, 2016). It is sustained that individuals that receive public assistance through the welfare programs have more mental health and substance abuse issues, the odds of a TANF recipient having a substance abuse issue were 25% for men and 48% for women greater than others in poverty (Oh, et al., 2018). Approximately 20% of CalWORKs recipients have substance abuse issues (Campos, et al., 2008). In 1995 California began offering treatment-on-demand programs, in-patient and out-patient treatment programs for women rather than incarceration (Pilkinton, 2010). Over 10% of adults on TANF had a substance abuse disorder but only 20% of those received treatment (Oh, et al., 2018). Mental health issues include a variety of disorders, depression and anxiety being amongst the top mental health problems faced by those in poverty. It has been found previously that depression rates are three times higher at 42% for individuals on welfare than the general population 15% (Campos, et al., 2008). Domestic violence is affecting approximately two million women annually, 25% of which are abused on a regular basis (Pilkinton, 2010). Abuse can range from slapping, beating, choking, strangled, and or threatened with a knife or gun. It is estimated that 16-25% of children are exposed to domestic violence as a child, this exposure is characterized as child maltreatment (Henry, 2018). Most children that are placed in CPS custody are likely to have depression, anxiety, ADHD, PTSD, substance abuse issues, and suicidal behavior tendencies (Garcia, Circo, DeNard,

Hernandez, 2015). While 40% of children ages 2-14 that need services and assistance are referred, meanwhile only 28% of those referred received mental health services (Garcia, et al., 2015). Children whom have a parent in the criminal justice system are more likely to become involved in criminal activity (Sun, et al., 2016). Research has demonstrated that crime and poverty are linked, and that when welfare recipients see their benefits decrease, or they run out towards the end of the month they turn to commit crime to supplement the loss (Liebertz, & Bunch, 2017). A parent's education also has a role in a child's predictors of poverty. A child with parents with a higher education and higher income have less behavior problems and are more likely to attend and graduate high school and college than a child with parents with a lower education and less income (Kalil, 2017). Education achievement is strongly associated and a predictor of standardized test scores, completion of grades, and attaining degree or graduation (McCarty, 2016). Children living in poverty are more prone to failing academically and one-third of students drop out before the 12th grade (Arnett-Hartwick, & Walters, 2016). Children who drop out of high school are more likely to repeat the cycle of poverty and be unemployed, have children young, be on welfare, and become criminals (Arnett-Hartwick, & Walters, 2016). The academic struggles and gaps in achievement are apparent even as young as kindergarten (McCarty, 2016). Studies have implicated that children living in poverty are lacking experiences and a nurturing environment that are healthy for brain growth, are more exposed to stress and higher anxiety levels making them more prone to participate in substance abuse, school failure, underage sexual activities, etc. (Evans, & Anderson, 2013). To break this cycle two things must occur 1)

obtain an education, at least a high school diploma; and 2) have positive role models to interfere encouraging children (Arnett-Hartwick, & Walters, 2016).

Summary

The literature reviews in detail the welfare programs of TANF and CalWORKs. It also addresses poverty, the culture of poverty, adverse childhood experiences, crime, mental health, substance abuse, child neglect, and maltreatment. There is much known about the effects the 1996 PRWORA act on welfare programs and poverty levels throughout the United States. Decreased the caseloads of TANF and allowed states to have more control over programs and time limits on their welfare programs; the programs addressing barriers of families on welfare and the goals of self-sufficiency; on poverty; adverse childhood experiences and their ties to poverty and depression; and the indicators of the “culture of poverty”. However, there is not anything regarding the culture of poverty and multigenerational poverty tying into multi-generations of CalWORKs or even TANF recipients. This study will fill the gap in the literature for the welfare program in California known as CalWORKs and the relationship between children growing up in poverty with parents on CalWORKs and following in their footsteps applying Bandura’s Social Learning Theory. It will give a broader understanding of generation after generation living in poverty and becoming recipients of the CalWORKs program. This will further the knowledge of how programs can intervene and help in assisting with stopping the cycle of generational poverty. Instead of the sole focus being concentrated on the participant of WTW, programs should be implemented to assist the children on the caseload as well. In order to identify this relationship between

multigenerational recipients and the culture of poverty an exploratory statistical analysis must be conducted. By conducting a quantitative study, surveying current and timed-out CalWORKs recipients and performing a binomial logistic regression analysis we will be able to determine if there is statistical significance in these relationships.

Chapter 3: Research Method

I conducted an exploratory statistical analysis of data collected from a retrospective cross-sectional survey taken by CalWORKs recipients, both current and timed out of the program, to determine if there was a relationship between individuals receiving CalWORKs and their parents having received it while growing up. I also examined if there was a relationship between the culture of poverty using the number of ACEs and being a recipient of CalWORKs. I used a tool known as the ACE-IQ to determine the number of ACEs someone experienced as a child (World Health Organization, 2019). I wanted to examine whether the number of experiences correlated with the barriers to employability and dependability on CalWORKs.

A binomial logistic regression was used to determine the interaction variance between the dependent and independent variable of both research questions. This is an appropriate analysis for relationship prediction as well as the direction and magnitude of the dependent variable based on the independent variable (Statistics solutions, 2013). A Somers'd test was used to identify if there are any trends between the variables. I discuss the design, population, sample, data collection, and threats to validity in this chapter.

Research Design and Rationale

A quantitative study was conducted with the goal of identifying relationships and patterns involving several variables of poverty and multiple generations receiving benefits through the CalWORKs program, including the recipient surveyed. Following are the study's research questions and hypotheses:

Research Question 1: What is the relationship between children growing up with family on the CalWORKs program and becoming recipients as an adult?

H₀1: A child's family receiving CalWORKs has no effect on the likelihood of the child becoming a recipient in his or her adulthood.

H₁1: A child's family receiving CalWORKs significantly affects the likelihood of the child becoming recipient in his or her adulthood.

Research Question 2: What is the relationship between the number of adverse childhood effects (ACEs) experienced as a child and becoming a CalWORKs recipient as an adult?

H₀2: The number of adverse childhood effects (ACEs) has no effect on the child becoming a recipient of CalWORKs in his or her adulthood.

H₁2: The number of adverse childhood effects (ACEs) significantly affects the child becoming a recipient of CalWORKs in his or her adulthood.

The literature review identified the following indicators of the culture of poverty: domestic violence, mental health, sexual abuse, substance abuse, alcoholism, physical abuse, and neglect. Children in poverty are twice as likely as children not in poverty to have experienced three or more ACES by the time they are 17 years old (Powell, & Davis, 2019). Factors that impact the experience of ACES but have not been substantially researched are teenage births, number of children, marital status, ethnicity, and race.

Variables

The first research question's independent variable was whether the participant's family received CalWORKs benefits while growing up and was measured nominally (yes or no).

The dependent variable was whether the participant was currently receiving or has received assistance through the CalWORKs program and was measured nominally (yes or no). The second research question's independent variable was the number of ACEs, which was measured categorically (number of ACEs). These categories include substance abuse, alcoholism, mental health, domestic violence, physical abuse, sexual abuse, neglect, and crime, as indicated by using the ACE tool. The dependent variable was whether the individual was receiving CalWORKs (yes or no; nominal). Previous researchers have identified the phenomenon known as the culture of poverty and victimology associated with the culture of poverty in both children and adults. Other environmental factors also coexist (Lauer, Metcalf, Metcalf, & Mohr, 2018).

Methodology

By using an Internet-based survey hosted on SurveyMonkey.com, I was able to reach a larger number of participants over the entire state of California in a shorter amount of time, rather than focusing on a specific county within the state of California. Covering the entire state of California's CalWORKs program and not one county specifically allowed for a larger sample to participate in the survey and produced more reliable and valid data while remaining anonymous and maintaining confidentiality. The use of a correlational design was consistent with my goal of identifying if a relationship exists between the study variables. By identifying the number of ACE's an individual has been subjected to; which are indicators of the culture of poverty, if their family was on welfare growing up, their current program status in CalWORKs, and the number of years

on the program, trends and patterns will emerge if there is a statistically significant relationship between the two sets of variables.

Population

The population selected for the study were adults living in the state of California. According to the last report by California Department of Social Services in February 2018, there were approximately 1,060,888 recipients of the CalWORKs program alone, with 30% of that number being child only cases, 30% actively participating in WTW services, 20% exempt from participating, and 10% sanctioned and not participating in any WTW services. Over 80% are female single-parent cases; 50% of cases being Hispanic and 75 % of child only cases being Hispanic. 30% of cases being White and only 12.2% of child only cases being White. An average of 15% of cases being Black and only 8.5% being child only cases, and 3% of cases being Asian and 1.8% being child only cases (California Department of Social Services, 2018). The survey in this study targeted all recipients of welfare in California and asked whether individuals are receiving and or have received the CalWORKs program, specifically, not the federal TANF program.

Sampling and Sampling Procedures

The sampling derived from residents of California. This will allow various groupings in both categorical (active, timed-out, or never received) and scale in number of years on aid or have spent on aid. By using social media, I was able to recruit participants from across the state. Inclusion criteria included individuals currently living in California. The exclusion criteria included individuals not currently living in the state

of California. Other exclusions included individuals under the age of 18 years old and individuals who did not speak and/or read English.

Using the G Power tool, I calculated that the study will need at the least 111 participants to have statistical significance. Inserting the correlation statistical test with an effect size of 0.3, an error probability of 0.05, and power of 0.95 the total sample size is 111 people (Franz, 2008). The minimum number of participants in the sample is 125, the goal is 250 people and the maximum number of people is 300 state wide.

Procedures for Recruitment, Participation, and Data Collection

The data collection will utilize a retrospective cross-sectional questionnaire or survey data collection instrument, this survey will contain closed ended and scaled questions (Hardcastle, Bellis, Ford, Hughes, Garner, & Rodriguez, 2018). The survey will be advertised through various social media sites such as Facebook, Instagram and Twitter. The link to the survey will be available through these social media posts for individuals to take the survey voluntarily. Demographic information that will be collected from the participant includes: age, gender, race, and county living within California. There will be a disclosure ensuring the participant understands he or she is voluntarily consenting and by writing their date email address and date it will provide as consent of participation. Since the survey is conducted electronically, there is no pressure to continue the survey, answer untruthfully, or be in fear of identification. The survey will be hosted online through a third-party survey company known as Survey Monkey. Links to the survey will be posted utilizing various social media sites, until the participation level is reached. Participants will simply complete the survey to exit or if they do not

wish to finish the survey they can simply click out of the survey. There are no follow-up procedures and is unnecessary being the course of study.

Instrumentation and Operationalization of Constructs

The survey will utilize the World Health Organization's Adverse Childhood Experiences International Questionnaire (ACE-IQ) tool, this tool analyzes various factors and challenges that collect information pertaining to child abuse and neglect, victimization, the potential of becoming a victim, and addiction issues (World Health Organization, 2019). This instrument is a subsidiary of the Adverse Childhood Experience (ACE) questionnaire developed by Dr. Vincent Felitti and Dr. Robert Anda for the Center of Disease Control and Kaiser Permanente in 1998 (World Health Organization, 2019). The ACE-IQ is designed and intended to measure ACEs in every country and for participants 18 years-old or older (World Health Organization, 2019). With the number of exposures to each ACE the percentages and chances of abuse, addiction and even early death were increased (Felitti, & et al., 1998). In California, 61.7% of adults have had at least one ACE and 16.7 % have had four or more (Prewitt, 2014). Studies have shown that exposure to ACEs were more likely to have long term effects as an adult. In a 2009 study conducted by Zielinski, the research study utilized the National Comorbidity Survey (NCS) that was administered between 1990 and 1992, this survey is a nationwide general population survey that has been used commonly in reference to psychopathology and socioeconomics (Zielinski, 2009). The NCS survey contained 5877 participants as a representative sample of non-institutionalized citizens. Zielinski removed any children and or students from the sample date and concluded with 5004 individuals. It was

discovered that those that had experienced maltreatment as a child were twice as likely and those that were subjected to physical abuse were 140% more likely to be unemployed (Zielinski, 2009). Additionally, victims of physical child abuse were 60% and those that were victims of severe child neglect were 90% more likely to fall below the national poverty level (Zielinski, 2009). Zielinski's study supported previous research findings in a 2000 study by Hyman, both studies resulted that victims of child abuse and maltreatment were significantly more likely to have lower income levels and over half were on a welfare program than non-victims (Zielinski, 2009). This study revealed needed studies to be conducted longitudinally in order to identify specific causation. However, due to the use of the National Comorbidity Survey (NCS) that there is any reason to believe error in reporting socioeconomic status, but there could be individuals that did not report maltreatment occurring as a child. Reports from Child Protective Services (CPS) indicates that a majority of reports of neglect, physical and sexual abuse are for children under two years old, indicating a potential lack of recalling events by the participants (Zielinski, 2009). This early research study linked ACE's to income levels and poverty also indicated that 25 to 35% of maltreatment victims continued the cycle with their own children continuing an intergenerational cycle (Zielinski, 2009). Individuals with exposure to four or more ACE's have more negative behaviors such as: 12.2 times more likely to attempt suicide, 10.3 times more likely to have substance abuse issues and 7.4 times more likely to be an alcoholic (Prewitt, 2014). The survey tool consists of both dichotomous and scale answers. Using this appraisal tool both assesses childhood experiences as well as current adult situations to establish the continuum of

risk behavior (Felitti, et al., 1998). There are ten recognized ACE's that are grouped into three separate categories including: abuse, neglect and household dysfunction (Prewitt, 2014).

Data Analysis Plan

To test if there is a relationship between the dependent variables and the independent variables a binomial logistic regression will be performed. This test is appropriate considering that there are two separate independent and dependent variables for the two research questions. The binomial logistic regression will test the independent variable of the participant growing up with family on CalWORKs and the dependent variable of the participant being a recipient on CalWORKs for research question 1. It will also test the independent variable of the number of ACE's experienced as a child and the dependent variable of the participant being a recipient on CalWORKs for research question 2. This type of regression can also be used to predict interactions and outcomes of the dependent variable (Laerd statistics, 2018). A Somers delta or Somers'd test will be ran to test for any identifiable trends between the participants being on aid and their parents having been on aid or not. This test is appropriate with the given that we want to differentiate between the dependent and independent variables versus some of the other similar tests do not perform this distinction (Laerd statistics, 2018).

Threats to Validity

In conducting this non-experimental study there are always questions of validity of the research being performed. The research study could have minor threats to validity, due to the large geographical area, change in programs and culture. Threats to validity

can be either external, internal or both. This study did not identify and threats of external or internal validity according to the factors identified in Campbell and Stanley (1963). Since there is no interaction with the participants of the study, it is being conducted through a quantitative survey given through an online database, there an unlikelihood for bias and or exposure to an experimental setting (Campbell, & Stanley, 1963). There is no control group in the study, due to conducting a quasi-experimental study. It does not require a time lapse or repeated measurement for completion, this is a one-shot case study, therefore many of these factors are not relevant (Campbell, & Stanley, 1963). Due to the survey being conducted once, there is not a risk of maturation, effects of a second testing, instrumentation, bias, mortality, history, and regression.

The purpose of the study was to test and establish if there is a causal, correlation and a confound relationship between recipients of the CalWORKs program and factors of the culture of poverty and families CalWORKs history. According to John Stuart Mill a causal relationship is established and exists if “(1) The cause preceded the effect, (2) the cause was related to the effect, and (3) we can find no plausible alternative explanation for the effect other than the cause” (Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2002, P.7).

Ethical Procedures

The data collection used consent forms prior to taking the online based survey. The recruitment was conducted using the social media site Facebook.com and a link to the survey. The participants remained anonymous with no personal identifiable information inserted into the survey questionnaire. To maintain validity of the survey, the consent procedure includes entering their email address and date as an informed consent

to take the survey. The questions of the research survey included demographic information and closed ended questions including ones that ended in a categorical, ordinal and or scale answer. If the participant does not wish to complete the survey, he or she simply exits out of it. There are no adverse effects on the participant to complete or not complete the research survey. The online data will be stored for five years on the Survey Monkey's website, where the questionnaire will be hosted. The outcome of the study will identify the relationship between these factors and allow social service agencies to establish programs in assisting these families break the cycle of poverty and receiving CalWORKs.

Summary

The purpose of this research study was to identify and establish whether there is a relationship between the independent variables of parents receiving and or received CalWORKs and poverty factors such as substance usage, alcoholism, domestic violence, child abuse and neglect, and crime also known as ACE's and the dependent variable for both research questions is the participant receiving assistance through the CalWORKs program. Statistical significance and predictability of the relationship was determined using a binary logistic regression analysis. The use of the ACE-IQ tool will help assess ACE's and the relationship of issues as an adult. Created by the World Health Organization the 18 questions contain both dichotomous and scale variable answers; this is less than the original author's 76 question ACE questionnaire. The use of an online data collection tool reduces the risks of violating confidentiality and anonymity with the participants. It allows the research study to cover a larger geographic area of California

also producing a larger sample size for reliability. It is the intent of the study to assist human and social service agencies in California in understanding the culture and multi-generational poverty, in hopes to establish proactive programs to assist in the declination of both cycles.

Chapter 4: Results

In this study I explored if there was a statistically significant relationship between CalWORKs parents and children as adults receiving CalWORKs. My goal was to identify the multigenerational cycle of poverty in the CalWORKs program. The study aimed to determine the impact of living and growing up in a culture of poverty, receiving CalWORKs, and experiencing ACEs. A quantitative cross-sectional retrospective survey was given for anyone over the age of 18 years old. The survey was provided using the Internet platform SurveyMonkey and was voluntary and anonymous. Following are the two research questions I sought to answer and the corresponding hypotheses:

Research Question 1: What is the relationship between children growing up with family on the CalWORKs program and becoming recipients as an adult?

H_01 : A child's family receiving CalWORKs has no effect on the likelihood of the child becoming a recipient in his or her adulthood.

H_11 : A child's family receiving CalWORKs significantly affects the likelihood of the child becoming recipient in his or her adulthood.

Research Question 2: What is the relationship between the number of adverse childhood effects (ACEs) experienced as a child and becoming a CalWORKs recipient as an adult?

H_02 : The number of adverse childhood effects (ACEs) has no effect on the child becoming a recipient of CalWORKs in his or her adulthood.

H_12 : The number of adverse childhood effects (ACEs) significantly affects the child becoming a recipient of CalWORKs in his or her adulthood.

I used a binomial logistic regression to determine if a relationship was present between the independent and dependent variables, using the alpha level of .05 to determine statistical significance. A Somers'd test was conducted for each question and each independent variable separately to determine the strength of the relationship. In this chapter, I will discuss the data collection, the demographics of the participants, and the results of the data analyzed.

Data Collection

The data were from 116 surveys, which were collected over a 6-week span. The survey was hosted using the survey generator website Survey Monkey; I posted the link the social media site Facebook. In an effort to reach the entire state of California, I posted the link on county social media pages, as well as community pages and my own personal webpage. The response rates were high the first week or two and then declined in the weeks to follow. I posted the survey once more in the fifth week and met the G*Power minimum goal of 111 participants. Out of the 116 responses, six were missing data for a total of 110 valid responses.

The original plan was to obtain 125 responses using Facebook as well as other social media platforms such as Instagram and Twitter. The issue was posting the survey to Instagram; it could not be done without posting a picture to accompany it. The second issue was my lack of familiarity with Twitter. Therefore, both of these platforms were not used in the data collection. The final issue I had in data collection was having my post removed from the county pages because it was against the department's posting policies.

The demographics reflected 116 participants, with six refusing to answer. San Bernardino County was the home of 75% of the respondents, 80.2% were female, 60.3% were over the age of 35 years old, 54.3% were white or Caucasian, 37.1% had some college, and 54.3% were married as shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Demographics

| | Variable | Frequency | % |
|-----------|----------------------------------|-----------|------|
| County | Butte | 1 | 0.9 |
| | Inyo | 2 | 1.7 |
| | Los Angeles | 2 | 1.7 |
| | Merced | 2 | 1.7 |
| | Mono | 4 | 3.4 |
| | Orange | 3 | 2.6 |
| | Riverside | 3 | 2.6 |
| | San Bernardino | 87 | 75 |
| | San Diego | 1 | 0.9 |
| | Santa Cruz | 1 | 0.9 |
| Ethnicity | Stanislaus | 1 | 0.9 |
| | White or Caucasian | 63 | 54.3 |
| | Black or African American | 3 | 2.6 |
| | Hispanic or Latino | 39 | 33.6 |
| | American Indian or Alaska Native | 1 | 0.9 |
| | Another race | 3 | 2.6 |
| Gender | Male | 16 | 13.8 |
| | Female | 93 | 80.2 |
| | Prefer not to say | 1 | 0.9 |

(table continues)

| | Variable | Frequency | % |
|-----------------|----------------------------|-----------|------|
| Education level | No high school diploma/GED | 3 | 2.6 |
| | High school diploma/GED | 14 | 12.1 |
| | Some college | 43 | 37.1 |
| | Associates degree | 18 | 15.5 |
| | Bachelors degree | 17 | 14.7 |
| | Masters degree | 13 | 11.2 |
| | PhD/Doctoral | 1 | 0.9 |
| | Marital status | Yes | 62 |
| No | | 47 | 40.5 |
| Age | 18-20 | 1 | 0.9 |
| | 21-25 | 7 | 6 |
| | 26-30 | 10 | 8.6 |
| | 31-35 | 22 | 19 |
| | 35+ | 70 | 60.3 |

There were 257,706 individuals over the age of 18 years old on CalWORKs according to the 2016-2017 CDSS report (California Department of Social Services, 2017). Based on these data, the 116 participants of this survey accounted for approximately less than 1% of the population on assistance in California.

Results

The sample had a total of 116 responses with six missing. The sample included 93 female respondents and 16 male respondents. The sample varied in terms of counties, education, race, and age as shown in Table 1.

Assumptions

Prior to the data collection assumptions were made that the participants would only take the survey once. The dependent and independent variable for the first research question are both dichotomous. While the independent variable for the second research question is ordinal and the dependent variable is dichotomous. It was assumed that all individuals receiving CalWORKs are living in poverty.

Research Question 1

Research Question 1: What is the relationship between children growing up with family on the CalWORKs program and becoming recipients as an adult?

H_01 : A child's family receiving CalWORKs has no effect on the likelihood of the child becoming a recipient in his or her adulthood.

H_11 : A child's family receiving CalWORKs significantly affects the likelihood of the child becoming recipient in his or her adulthood.

A binary logistic regression analysis to investigate the relationship between children growing up with family on the CalWORKs program and becoming recipients as an adult was conducted. This analysis is appropriate under the following assumptions: there is a dichotomous dependent variable, one or more independent variable, independence of observation, there cannot be multicollinearity, and no significant outliers (Laerd

Statistics, 2018). Due to the independent variables not being continuous there is no need to test for linearity. There is no linear relationship between the independent and dependent variables. The significance of the model determines whether the predictor variable contributes to the model. As seen in Table 2 the predictor variable, *did your parent(s)/guardian(s) receive cash-aid under the CalWORKs program as a child*, was not statistically significant and therefore does not contribute to the model. Statistical significance was tested at the alpha level $\alpha=.05$. There found to be no statistical significance for research question number 1 ($p > .05$). This means that the null hypothesis is accepted as follows: H_0 : A child's family receiving CalWORKs has no effect on the likelihood of the child becoming a recipient in his or her adulthood. This means that a child's family receiving CalWORKs has no effect on the likelihood of the child becoming a recipient in his or her adulthood. Therefore, there is no relationship between a child's parent(s)/guardian(s) receiving CalWORKs and then receiving CalWORKs as an adult. The unstandardized Beta weight for the Constant; $B= 2.695$, $SE= .462$, $Wald= 34.007$. The unstandardized Beta weight for the predictor variable: $B= .638$, $SE= 1.118$, $Wald= .325$.

Table 2.

Variables in the Equation

| | β | S.E. | Wald | df | p | Exp(B) |
|--|---------|-------|--------|----|-------|--------|
| Step 1 ^a | | | | | | |
| Did your parent(s)/guardian(s) receive cash-aid under the CalWORKs program as child? | 0.638 | 1.118 | 0.325 | 1 | 0.568 | 1.892 |
| Constant | 2.695 | 0.462 | 34.007 | 1 | 0 | 14.8 |

Note: Model Summary: $X^2= 0.000$, $p=.544$, Nagelkerke $R^2= 0.10$, $p >.05$

In regards to hypothesis testing, type I error rejecting a null hypothesis when it should be true (Banerjee, Chitnis, Jadhav, Bhawalkar, & Chaudhury, 2009). This test is based on the alpha level of .05, due to the significance being 0.568 it is above the significance level. Therefore, meeting the type I error for the hypothesis. The type II error rejects the null hypothesis. This test is based on the Beta level, typically between .05-.20 (Banerjee, et al., 2009). The β level for this study had a power of 95, this means that there is a 95% chance of the errors occurring. Due to the β coefficient for parents receiving cash-aid under CalWORKs being 0.638, it is indicated that there is a 63.8 % chance when parents receiving aid increase the probability of being a CalWORKs recipient. A Somers'd test (see appendix table c1) was conducted to indicate the strength and direction of the relationship between the independent and dependent variable. The Somers'd test can range from -1 to +1 indicating the direction of a relationship between variables (Laerd Statistics, 2018). The test reflected that there is a negative correlation between the

recipient being on CalWORKs and their parent(s)/guardian(s) being on CalWORKs ($d = -.108$).

Research Question 2

Research Question 2: What is the relationship between the number of adverse childhood effects experienced as a child and becoming a CalWORKs recipient as an adult?

H_02 : The number of adverse childhood effects has no effect on the child becoming a recipient of CalWORKs in his or her adulthood.

H_12 : The number of adverse childhood effects significantly affects the child becoming a recipient of CalWORKs in his or her adulthood.

A binary logistic regression analysis to investigate the relationship between the number of Adverse Childhood Effects (ACE's) experienced as a child and becoming a CalWORKs recipient as an adult was conducted. The predictor variable, *number of Adverse Childhood Effects (ACE's) experienced as a child*, was found not to contribute to the model. There was no statistical significance for the research question tested ($p > .05$). The questions listed in the WHO instrument (appendix b) were independently ran and none of the variables reflected statistical significance (appendix table c2). The unstandardized Beta weight for the Constant; $B = (-1.067)$, $SE = 311817.408$, $Wald = .000$. There is no linear relationship between the independent and dependent variables. The null hypothesis was accepted as follows H_02 : The number of Adverse Childhood Effects (ACE's) has no effect on the child becoming a recipient of CalWORKs in his or her adulthood. This means that the number of ACE's an individual experienced as a child has

no effect on the likelihood of the child becoming a recipient in his or her adulthood. Therefore, establishing there is not a relationship present between the number of ACE's a child experiences and becoming a recipient of the CalWORKs program. The research questions hypothesis was tested using the type I and type II tests once more. Type I test is based on the alpha level of .05, due to the significance being 1 it is above the significance level. Therefore, meeting the type I error for the hypothesis. The type II error rejects the null hypothesis. This test is based on the Beta level, typically between .05-.20 (Banerjee, et al., 2009). The β level for this study had a power of .95, this means that there is a 95% chance of the errors occurring. Due to the number of β coefficient for each of the ACE's experienced as a child (table 3, appendix table c2). A Somers'd test (see appendix tables c3-30) was conducted to indicate the strength and direction of the relationship between each of the independent and dependent variables. The Somers'd test reflected that there are various correlations between the recipient being on CalWORKs and each ACE. Due to the independent variables being ran separately there are 28 different correlations shown below in Table 3.

Table 3.

Beta coefficient value

| Variable | β coefficient | Variable | β coefficient | Variable | β coefficient |
|--|---------------------|---|---------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| Did your parent(s)/guardian(s) understand your problems and worries? | -0.102 | Did you live with a household member who was ever sent to prison or jail? | -0.33 | How often were you bullied? | -0.05 |

| | | | | | |
|--|-------|---|-------|---|--------|
| How often did your parent(s)/guardian(s) not send you to school even when it was available? | 0.391 | Did you live with a household member who was depressed, mentally ill or suicidal? | 0.191 | How often were you in a physical fight? | -0.057 |
| Were your parent(s)/guardian(s) too drunk or intoxicated by drugs to take care of you? | 0.09 | Did a parent, guardian or other household member yell, scream or swear at you, insult or humiliate you? | 0.072 | How were you bullied most often? | 0.503 |
| How often did your parent(s)/guardian(s) not give you enough food even when they could easily have done so? | 0 | Did someone actually have oral, anal, or vaginal intercourse with you when you did not want them to? | 0.192 | Did you see or hear someone being beaten up in real life? | 0.013 |
| Did your parent(s)/guardian(s) really know what you were doing with your free time when you were not at school or work | 0.039 | Did someone attempt oral, anal, or vaginal intercourse with you when you did not want them to? | 0.319 | Were you forced to go and live in another place due to any of these events? | -0.097 |

| | | | | | |
|---|--------|--|--------|---|--------|
| Did you see or hear a parent or household member in your home being hit or cut with an object, such as a stick (or cane), bottle, club, whip, knife, etc? | 0.068 | Did someone make you touch their body in a sexual way when you did not want them to? | 0.168 | Did you see or hear someone being stabbed or shot in real life? | 0.079 |
| Did you see or hear a parent or household member in your home being slapped, kicked, punched, or beaten up? | 0.076 | Did someone touch or fondle you in a sexual way when you did not want them to? | 0.242 | Was a family member or friend killed or beaten up by soldiers, police, militia, or gangs? | 0.109 |
| Did you see or hear a parent or household member in your home being yelled at, screamed at, sworn at, insulted, or humiliated? | -0.263 | Did a parent, guardian or other household member hit or cut you with an object, such as a stick (or cane), bottle, club, knife, whip, etc? | -0.039 | Were you beaten up by soldiers, police, militia, or gangs? | -0.032 |
| Did your mother, father, or guardian die? | 0.038 | Did a parent, guardian or other household member spank, slap, | -0.123 | Did your parent(s)/guardian(s) receive cash-aid under the CalWORK | -0.108 |

| | | | | |
|--|-------|--|-------|--------------------------|
| | | kick, punch or beat you up? | | s program as a child? |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | Did a parent, guardian or other household member threaten to, or actually abandon you or throw you out of the house? | | |
| Were your parents ever separated or divorced? | 0.034 | | 0.285 | |

Summary

The research study analyzed 116 participant surveys, in which six were missing data for a total number of 110 surveys used in the data analysis. It contains two separate research questions, the first what is the relationship between growing up with family on the CalWORKs program and becoming recipients as an adult? The second what is the relationship between the number of Adverse Childhood (ACEs) experienced as a child and becoming a CalWORKs recipient as an adult? The first question had one independent variable of whether the parent(s)/guardian(s) received CalWORKs and the dependent variable of the individual receiving CalWORKs. The second research question had 26 independent variables that indicated the factors or indicators of poverty and the dependent variable as in the first research question. A binomial logistic regression was conducted to test the relationship for each question and the independent variables in each. The binomial logistic regression for research question one, showed no statistical

significance ($p > .05$). Therefore, accepting the null hypothesis that H_o1 : A child's family receiving CalWORKs has no effect on the likelihood of the child becoming a recipient in his or her adulthood. The binomial logistic regression was also conducted for each of the 26 independent variables of the second research question, none of which had any statistical significance ($p > .05$). Therefore, accepting the null hypothesis that H_o2 : The number of Adverse Childhood Effects (ACE's) has no effect on the child becoming a recipient of CalWORKs in his or her adulthood. The sample size accounts for less than once percent of California's population. The study provided that there is no statistical relationship between the variables. Chapter five will discuss the conclusions and recommendations of this study. It will include the implications of the study tied to the literature review, limitations to the research study and explanation of how the Social Learning Theory applies to the research, recommendations of future research studies, implications of positive social change, and any final thoughts.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The purpose of this research study was to identify if a relationship existed between participants of the CalWORKs program and growing up with a family who received CalWORKs. I also sought to identify if a relationship existed between participants of the CalWORKs program and growing up in a culture of poverty as indicated by the number of ACEs. Multiple studies have indicated that the more ACEs experienced as a child the higher the rate of substance abuse, alcoholism, criminal behavior, domestic violence, physical and sexual abuse, and mental health issues in adulthood (Powell & Davis, 2019). This research also indicates that children growing up in poverty are twice as likely to experience at least three or more ACEs by the time they reach the age of 17 (Powell & Davis, 2019).

Over 1,232,070 individuals were aided by the CalWORKS program in 2016-2017 (California Department of Social Services, 2017). I wanted to identify the contributing factors of long-term poverty and multigenerational dependency among program recipients. Currently, there are no programs or services directed specifically to the children on the CalWORKs assistance unit; children are only directly serviced once Child and Family Services becomes involved. I found that there is no statistical relationship between the variables tested. In both research questions, the null hypothesis was accepted. This chapter will include the interpretation of the study's findings connected to the literature review, the limitations of the study, recommendations for future studies, implications for social change, and a conclusion.

Interpretation of the Findings

The study found that there was not a statistically significant relationship present between the independent and dependent variables in Research Questions 1 or 2. The literature review includes extensive research on the culture of poverty indicators listed in the WHO's Adverse Childhood Effects tool as they relate to a continuing culture of poverty. The study's findings disconfirmed the literature review due to the acceptance of both null hypotheses that there is no statistical relationship between an individual receiving CalWORKs, a government assistance program for low-income families, and growing up with a parent or guardian who received or did not receive CalWORKs aid. There was no statistical relationship between those who receive CalWORKs and the number of ACEs exposed to as a child.

The literature review suggests an increase in the number of working poor and poverty rates and a decrease in TANF case sizes (Hilderbrandt, 2016; Tayler et al., 2016). It provides statistical data showing that children are the largest group living in poverty, with over 83% of cases being a single-parent case (Augustine & Raley, 2012; California Department of Social Service, 2018; McCarty, 2016; Speigman, Brown, Bos, Li, & Ortiz, 2011; Taylor, et al., 2016). It discussed the factors of cultural poverty including child maltreatment; abuse; neglect; substance abuse; mental health issues; crime; and low-income neighborhoods where various factors exist such as gang affiliation, crime, drugs, teen pregnancy, school dropouts, and health issues (Endress, 2016; McCarty, 2016). It also suggests that these factors are found in more individuals on welfare programs such as TANF than the general population (Gilbert, Nanda, & Paige, 2014; Sun

et al., 2016; Welles et al., 2017). However, the study did not confirm or disconfirm the literature review findings, due to the majority of participants not receiving aid under the CalWORKs program.

Limitations

The sample size of the study included all adults over the age of 18 living in California, including both those who were receiving CalWORKs and those who were not. The limitations of the study were the time period of survey responses. Responses did not come in as originally anticipated, nor did they vary across the state as originally anticipated. A majority of the responses were from individuals who resided in the County of San Bernardino. Due to the survey being confidential and anonymous, there were no concerns with reliability or validity. However, due to a majority of the responses being from those who did not receive aid within the CalWORKs program, the trustworthiness of the data can be questioned. The study still holds its validity due to its being anonymous and meeting the G*Power requirements for participation. Yet, the results may have differed had the study included more individuals on the CalWORKs program. If the survey ran for a longer period of time and included individuals who received aid under the CalWORKs program, the statistical results may have differed.

Recommendations

Recommendations for future studies could be to run the survey for a longer period of time and advertise over more social media platforms to receive more participant responses. Future studies could also include looking at individual counties and or cities and surveying individuals that receive aid under the CalWORKs program to discover the

if there is a statistical relationship present between receiving aid and the number of ACE's the individual has been exposed to.

Implications

Identification of the where the cycle of poverty begins and understanding how to end it is of great importance for human and social service programs at the federal, state and local levels. The generational cycle of poverty is something that has to be addressed to create a better society for future generations to live in. Although the study's results contradicted the literature review's findings of relationships between individuals living in poverty and the number of ACE's exposed to. If there were more programs implemented specific to children in poverty to encourage them to stay in school and assist them with educational needs how would that impact high school dropout levels? If children received supportive services as adults do on the assistance units prior to becoming a part of the child and family services system what kind of impact would that have on their future and the cycle of poverty? These are all questions that are asked in the field of human and social services, employees and volunteers of non-profit agencies ask themselves, what else can be done to help? The Social Learning theory states that behavior is taught and learned through the environment in which children and individuals alike reside through observation and behavioral similarities (Bandura, 1969; Kretchmar, 2018). It also reflects the idea that not all behavior traits are carried out, that an individual can learn from observation and choose not to repeat the same behaviors. As noted in the "Bobo doll" study in the literature review, where the children witnessed an adult hitting, punching and yelling at a blow-up doll and the second and third groups of children did not repeat the

behavior because there was no reward attached to it (Kretchmar, 2018). If children are observing a lifestyle of poverty and understand the consequences of crime and abuse, are they more likely to continue the behavior as an adult if they understand there is another alternative through differential association and reinforcement. By identifying these relationships human and social service programs have an opportunity to develop and implement programs and supportive services for everyone on the assistance unit and not just the adults.

Conclusion

The results of this study were contradictory to the literature review's findings. The literature review defined the factors of the culture of poverty, the statistical data of how many in poverty are exposed to these indicators versus those that are not in poverty. While the study indicated no statistical relationship between a parent of a child receiving aid under the CalWORKs program and the participant receiving aid under the CalWORKs program as well as the number of ACE's experienced as a child and receiving aid under the CalWORKs program as an adult. Previous findings support that individuals living in poverty are exposed to the conditions and that the children in poverty are exposed to them as well (Fong, 2016). This presents a need for further research, studies that obtain a higher percentage of respondents on aid to examine the statistical significance of the relationships. The well-being of society and the future of children in society should be a priority to everyone, but most of all to the human and social service agencies designed to assist. The on-going paramount need for aid in the state of California is clear by the number of cases and individuals receiving it, but how

can human and social service agencies assist to end the cycle of poverty? That is a question asked commonly, with California having one of the most giving welfare programs of the country, with the highest benefit amounts and differentiated regulations from other states (Stanczyk, et al., 2018). In order to be proactive in poverty and create a better future for generations to come, it is vital that agencies find a way to assist all those on the assistance units not just the adults.

References

- Akella, D., & Jordan, M. (2015). Impact of social and cultural factors on teen pregnancy. *Journal of Health Disparities Research & Practice*, 8(1), 41-61. Retrieved from <https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/jhdrp/>
- Arnett-Hartwick, S. E., & Walters, C. M. (2016). Advancing learning by countering the effects of poverty. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences*, 108(4), 18-22. doi:10.14307/JFCS108.4.18
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall
- Banerjee, A., Chitnis, U. B., Jadhav, S. L., Bhawalkar, J. S., & Chaudhury, S. (2009). Hypothesis testing, type I and type II errors. *Industrial Psychiatry Journal*, 18(2), 127-131. doi:10.4103/0972-6749.62274
- Bartle, E., & Segura, G. (2003). Welfare policy, welfare participants and CalWORKs caseworkers: How participants are informed of supportive services. *Journal of Poverty*, 7(1/2), 141-161. doi:10.1300/J134v07n01_08
- Berger, L. M. (2017). Does increased income reduce child maltreatment. *Focus*, 33(2), 9-10. Retrieved from <https://www.irp.wisc.edu/publications/focus/pdfs/foc332c2.pdf>
- Blumenberg, E., & Pierce, G. (2017). The drive to work: The relationship between transportation access, housing assistance and employment among participants in the Welfare to Work voucher program. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 37(1), 66-82. doi:10.1177/0739456X16633501

California Department of Social Services. (1999). *Policy and reporting instructions for California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CALWORKS) performance and fraud incentives* (County Fiscal Letter No. 99-54). Retrieved from <http://www.cdss.ca.gov/getinfo/acl99/99-54.PDF>

California Department of Social Services. (2017a). *Fact sheet CalWORKs Program*.

Retrieved from

http://www.cdss.ca.gov/Portals/9/CalWORKs/FINAL_CW%20Program%20Fact%20Sheet%20Jan%202017.pdf?ver=2017-03-30-103611-213

California Department of Social Services. (2017b). *Public assistance facts and figures*.

Retrieved from

<http://www.cdss.ca.gov/Portals/9/DSSDB/PAFF/PAFFMay17.pdf?ver=2018-02-23-142011-783>

California Department of Social Services. (2018b). *Cal-Learn*. Retrieved from

<http://www.cdss.ca.gov/inforesources/CalWORKs/Cal-Learn>

California Department of Social Services. (2018c). *Implementation of assistance with*

diaper costs-supportive services (All County Letter No. 18-38). Retrieved from

<http://www.cdss.ca.gov/Portals/9/ACL/2018/18-38.pdf?ver=2018-03-29-082841-527>

California Department of Social Services. (2018c). *STAT 45- Cal-Learn Program Teen*

Parent Monthly Status Report, Fiscal Year 2018-19 [Date file and code book].

Retrieved from [http://www.cdss.ca.gov/inforesources/Research-and-](http://www.cdss.ca.gov/inforesources/Research-and-Data/CalWORKs-Data-Tables/STAT45)

[Data/CalWORKs-Data-Tables/STAT45](http://www.cdss.ca.gov/inforesources/Research-and-Data/CalWORKs-Data-Tables/STAT45)

- California Department of Social Services. (2018d). *237 CW-CalWORKs Cash Grant Caseload Movement Report, Fiscal Year 2018-19* [Data file and code book]. Retrieved from <http://www.cdss.ca.gov/inforesources/Research-and-Data/CalWORKs-Data-Tables/CA-237-CW>
- Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research* [DX Reader Version]. Retrieved from <http://www.jameslindlibrary.org/campbell-dt-stanley-jc-1963/>
- Campos, M.D., Podus, D., Anglin, M. D., & Warda, U. (2008). Mental Health Need and Substance Abuse Problem Risk: Acculturation Among Latinas as a Protective Factor Among CalWORKs Applicants and Recipients. *Journal of Ethnicity in Substance Abuse, 7*(3), 268-291. doi: 10.1080/15332640802313262.
- Cheng, T. C., & Lo, C. C. (2014). An analysis of welfare participation: Rational-Choice perspective and group-threat hypothesis. *Journal of Social Service Research, 40*(2), 189-200. doi: 10.1080/01488376.2013.865580.
- Contra Costa County Employment & Human Services Department. (2019). CALWORKS Welfare-To-Work Program. Retrieved from <https://ehsd.org/benefits/calworks-welfare-to-work-program/>
- County of San Bernardino Transitional Assistance Department, Program Development Division. (2016a). *CalWORKs Policy Handbook*. Retrieved from http://hs.sbcounty.gov/tad/Documents/HANDBOOKS_PUBS/CWPHB.pdf

County of San Bernardino Transitional Assistance Department, Program Development

Division. (2016b). *Welfare-To-Work Policy Handbook*. Retrieved from

http://hs.sbcounty.gov/tad/Documents/HANDBOOKS_PUBS/WTWPHB.pdf

Dellsén, F. (2017). Reconstructed Empiricism. *Acta Analytica*, 32(1), 95-113. doi:

10.1007/s12136-016-0289-9.

Domestic Violence. (2019). Dictionary.com. Retrieved from

<https://www.dictionary.com/browse/domestic-violence?s=t>

Endress, B. (2016). Jonathan Iian: Understanding street culture: Poverty, crime, youth

and cool. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 45(9), 1954. doi: 10.1007/s10964-

016-0540-0.

Evans, S., & Anderson, W. (2013). Demetrio's Story: Socialization and Family

Adjustments Based on Long-Term Immersion in a Culture of Poverty. *Children & Schools*, 35(4), 244-247. Retrieved from

<http://ezp.waldenulibrary.org/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=92051942&site=eds-live&scope=site>

Felitti, V. J., Anda, R. F., Nordenberg, D., Williamson, D. F., Spitz, A. M., Edwards, V.,

Koss, M. P., & Marks, J. S. (1998). Relationship of childhood abuse and

household dysfunction to many of the leading causes of death in adults. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 14(4), 245-258. doi:10.1016/S0749-

3797(98)00017-8.

Fong, K. (2016). Child welfare involvement and contexts of poverty: the role of parental

adversities, social networks, and social services. *Children and Youth Services*

Review, 5(13), 1-9. Retrieved from https://ac-els-cdn-com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/S0190740916303346/1-s2.0-S0190740916303346-main.pdf?_tid=dc519202-15d0-4274-90e2-cd55c3e1e5b7&acdnat=1520809236_f9ca7ff2a883ba975ddf88f185553d21

Franz, F. (1992). G*Power (Version 3.0.10) [Computer program]. Universität Kiel, Germany.

Garcia, A. R., Circo, E., DeNard, C., & Hernandez, N. (2015). Barriers and facilitators to delivering effective mental health practice strategies for youth and families served by the child welfare system. *Children & Youth Services Review*, Vol 52, 110-122.

Retrieved from https://ac-els-cdn-com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/S0190740915000912/1-s2.0-S0190740915000912-main.pdf?_tid=5b8ef680-8fb5-4649-a276-951f16d7b964&acdnat=1547353559_336d34bf0ddf4ef81b10d29cbf7ad198

Gilbert, D., Nanda, J., & Paige, D. (2014). Securing the safety net: concurrent participation in income eligible assistance programs. *Maternal and Child Health Journal*, 18(3), 604-612. doi: 10.1007/s10995-013-1281-2.

Goldberg, S. (2017). CalWORKs education opportunity and attainment program. LSNC Regulation Summaries. Retrieved from <http://reg.summaries.guide/2017/12/calworks-educational-opportunity-and-attainment-program/>

Grimaldi, H. R. (2016). Culture of poverty, emotional health and family life.

International Review of Psychiatry, 28(2), 189-196. Retrieved from <https://eds-b->

ebscohost-

com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=2&sid=7dfdaa0c-6998-40c4-b399-e79010286da5%40sessionmgr104

- Hardcastle, K., Bellis, M. A., Ford, K., Hughes, K., Garner, J., & Rodriguez Ramos, G. (2018). Measuring the relationships between adverse childhood experiences and educational and employment success in England and Wales: findings from a retrospective study. *Public Health*, Vol 165, 106-116. doi: <http://dx.doi.org.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2018.09.014> .
- Hilderbrandt, E. (2016). Understanding the lives and challenges of women in poverty after TANF. *Policy, politics, & nursing practice*, 17(3), 156-169. doi: 10.1177/1527154416672204.
- Introduction to Albert Bandura's Social Learning Theory. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://d2l.deakin.edu.au/d2l/eP/presentations/presentation_preview_popup.d2l?presId=96946
- Jindra, I. W., Jindra, M. (2018). Connecting poverty, culture and cognition: The bridges out of poverty process. *Journal of Poverty*, 22(1), 42-64. doi: 10.1080/10875549.2016.1204644.
- Johnson-Reid, M., Drake, B., & Zhou, P. (2013). Neglect subtypes, Race, and Poverty: Individual, family, and service characteristics. *Child Maltreatment*, 18(1), 30-41. doi: 10.1177/1077559512452452.
- Joseph, R. (2018). The welfare/self-sufficiency gap among single mothers through theoretical lenses. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 28(6),

731-745. Retrieved from <https://www-tandfonline-com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/doi/full/10.1080/10911359.2018.1458678?scroll=top&needAccess=true>

Kalil, A. (2017). The role of parenting in the intergenerational transmission of poverty.

Focus, 33(2), 6-8. Retrieved from

<https://www.irp.wisc.edu/publications/focus/pdfs/foc332c1.pdf>

Kretchmar, J. (2013). Social Learning Theory. *Research Starters*, 1-11. Retrieved from

[https://eds-b-ebshost-](https://eds-b-ebshost-com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/eds/detail/detail?vid=1&sid=c0581280-134d-4c68-81ad-7ea0caaaa879%40sessionmgr120&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWRzLWxpdmUmc2NvcGU9c2l0ZQ%3d%3d#AN=89164452&db=ers)

[com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/eds/detail/detail?vid=1&sid=c0581280-134d-4c68-](https://eds-b-ebshost-com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/eds/detail/detail?vid=1&sid=c0581280-134d-4c68-81ad-7ea0caaaa879%40sessionmgr120&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWRzLWxpdmUmc2NvcGU9c2l0ZQ%3d%3d#AN=89164452&db=ers)

[81ad-](https://eds-b-ebshost-com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/eds/detail/detail?vid=1&sid=c0581280-134d-4c68-81ad-7ea0caaaa879%40sessionmgr120&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWRzLWxpdmUmc2NvcGU9c2l0ZQ%3d%3d#AN=89164452&db=ers)

[7ea0caaaa879%40sessionmgr120&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWRzLWxpdmUmc2NvcG](https://eds-b-ebshost-com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/eds/detail/detail?vid=1&sid=c0581280-134d-4c68-81ad-7ea0caaaa879%40sessionmgr120&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWRzLWxpdmUmc2NvcGU9c2l0ZQ%3d%3d#AN=89164452&db=ers)

[U9c2l0ZQ%3d%3d#AN=89164452&db=ers](https://eds-b-ebshost-com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/eds/detail/detail?vid=1&sid=c0581280-134d-4c68-81ad-7ea0caaaa879%40sessionmgr120&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWRzLWxpdmUmc2NvcGU9c2l0ZQ%3d%3d#AN=89164452&db=ers)

Kretchmar, J. (2018). Social Learning Theory. *Research Starters Education*, 1-11.

Retrieved from [https://eds-b-ebshost-](https://eds-b-ebshost-com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/eds/detail/detail?vid=0&sid=7640d188-b35c-4b56-883c-e061b7946f50%40sessionmgr101&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWRzLWxpdmUmc2NvcGU9c2l0ZQ%3d%3d#db=e0h&AN=27577934)

[com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/eds/detail/detail?vid=0&sid=7640d188-b35c-4b56-](https://eds-b-ebshost-com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/eds/detail/detail?vid=0&sid=7640d188-b35c-4b56-883c-e061b7946f50%40sessionmgr101&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWRzLWxpdmUmc2NvcGU9c2l0ZQ%3d%3d#db=e0h&AN=27577934)

[883c-](https://eds-b-ebshost-com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/eds/detail/detail?vid=0&sid=7640d188-b35c-4b56-883c-e061b7946f50%40sessionmgr101&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWRzLWxpdmUmc2NvcGU9c2l0ZQ%3d%3d#db=e0h&AN=27577934)

[e061b7946f50%40sessionmgr101&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWRzLWxpdmUmc2Nvc](https://eds-b-ebshost-com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/eds/detail/detail?vid=0&sid=7640d188-b35c-4b56-883c-e061b7946f50%40sessionmgr101&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWRzLWxpdmUmc2NvcGU9c2l0ZQ%3d%3d#db=e0h&AN=27577934)

[GU9c2l0ZQ%3d%3d#db=e0h&AN=27577934](https://eds-b-ebshost-com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/eds/detail/detail?vid=0&sid=7640d188-b35c-4b56-883c-e061b7946f50%40sessionmgr101&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWRzLWxpdmUmc2NvcGU9c2l0ZQ%3d%3d#db=e0h&AN=27577934)

Laerd Statistics. (2018a). Binomial Logistic Regression [Website]. Retrieved from

[https://statistics.laerd.com/premium/spss/blr/binomial-logistic-regression-in-](https://statistics.laerd.com/premium/spss/blr/binomial-logistic-regression-in-spss.php)

[spss.php](https://statistics.laerd.com/premium/spss/blr/binomial-logistic-regression-in-spss.php)

- Laerd Statistics. (2018b). Somers'D [Website]. Retrieved from <https://statistics.laerd.com/premium/spss/sd/somers-d-in-spss.php>
- Liebertz, S., & Bunch, J. (2018). Examining the Externalities of Welfare Reform: TANF and Crime. *JQ: Justice Quarterly*, 35(3), 477-504. Retrieved from <http://ezp.waldenulibrary.org/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=128201016&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Markie, P. (2017). Rationalism vs. Empiricism. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy [website]. Retrieved from <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/rationalism-empiricism/#Oth>
- McCarty, A. T. (2016). Child poverty in the United States: A tale of devastation and the promise of hope. *Sociology Compass*, 10(7), 623-639. doi: 10.1111/soc4.12386.
- McClelland, D. C. (1987). *Human Motivation*. Cambridge, NY.
- O'Sullivan, E., Rassel, G. R., Berner, M., & Taliaferro, J. D. (2017). *Research methods for public administrators*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pilkinton, M. (2010). TANF recipients' barriers to employability: Substance abuse and domestic violence. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 20(8), 1-13. Retrieved from <https://eds-b-ebscohost-com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/eds/detail/detail?vid=0&sid=c2abf99a-b6bc-4227-8a38-89c151d96f28%40pdc-v-sessmgr01&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWRzLWxpdmUmc2NvcGU9c2l0ZQ%3d%3d#d b=swh&AN=82194>

- Powell, T. M., & Davis, J. P. (2019). Addressing the social emotional needs of children in chronic poverty: A pilot of the journey of hope. *In Children and Youth Services Review*, Vol 98, 1-9. doi: 10.1016/j.chilyouth.2018.11.010.
- Prewitt, E. (2014). Hidden Crisis: Findings on adverse childhood experiences in California. Retrieved from https://acestoohigh.files.wordpress.com/2014/11/hiddencrisis_report1014.pdf
- Quillian, L. (2017). Neighborhood and the intergenerational transmission of poverty. *Focus*, 33(2), 402-417. Retrieved from <https://www.irp.wisc.edu/publications/focus/pdfs/foc332e1.pdf>
- Rhomberg, C. (2015). We forgot to end poverty. *In these times; Chicago*, 39(1), 17-17. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1640951093/abstract/715188EC59884D6FPQ/1>
- Rudestam, K. E., & Newton, R. R. (2015). *Surviving your dissertation: A comprehensive guide to content and process*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Self-sufficient. (2019). Dictionary.com. Retrieved from <https://www.dictionary.com/browse/self-sufficiency>
- Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). *Experimental and Quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference*. Boston, MA; New York, NY. Houghton Mifflin Company. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/9453/f229a8f51f6a95232e42acfae9b3ae5345df.pdf>

- Shafritz, J. M., Ott, J. S., & Jang, Y. S. (Eds.). (2016). *Classics of organization theory*. Belmont, CA.
- Speiglmán, R., Brown, H., Bos, J. M., Li, Y., & Ortiz, L. (2011). TANF child-only cases in California: Barriers to self-sufficiency and well-being. *Journal of Children & Poverty, 17*(2), 139-163. doi: 10.1080/10796126.2011.555391.
- Stanczyk, A., Carnochan, S., Hengeveld-Bidmon, E., & Austin, M.J. (2018). Family-focused services for TANF participants facing acute barriers to work: Pathways to implementation. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Social Services, 99*(3), 219-231. doi: 10.1177/1044389418783253.
- Statistics Solutions. (2018). Simple Linear Regression [website]. Retrieved from <https://statistics.laerd.com/premium/spss/lr/linear-regression-in-spss.php>
- Sun, J., Patel, F., Kirzner, R., Newton-Famous, N., Owens, C., Welles, S. L., & Chilton, M. (2016). The Building Wealth and Health Network: methods and baseline characteristics from a randomized controlled trial for families with young children participating in temporary assistance for needy families (TANF). *BMC Public Health, 16*(1), 1-15. doi: 10.1186/s12889-016-3233-4.
- Taylor, T., Gross, C. L., & Towne-Roese, J. K. (2016). Program barriers and challenges to self-sufficiency: A qualitative analysis of Ohio Welfare-to-Work program manager identity. *Critical Sociology, 42*(7-8), 1125-1141. doi: 10.1177/0896920515569084.

- The Hospital for Sick Children (Sickkids). (2014). *SCAN What is child maltreatment?*[website]. Retrieved from <http://www.sickkids.ca/SCAN/what-we-do/Child-maltreatment/index.html>
- United States Census Bureau. (n.d.). *Poverty: How the Census Bureau measures poverty* [website]. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/topics/income-poverty/poverty/guidance/poverty-measures.html>
- United States Department of Health & Human Services, Office of the Assistance Secretary for Planning and Evaluation. (1996). *The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996* [website]. Retrieved from <https://aspe.hhs.gov/report/personal-responsibility-and-work-opportunity-reconciliation-act-1996>
- United States Department of Health & Human Services, Office of the Assistance Secretary for Planning and Evaluation. (2009). *Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)- Overview* [website]. Retrieved from <https://aspe.hhs.gov/aid-families-dependent-children-afdc-and-temporary-assistance-needy-families-tanf-overview-0>
- US Legal. (2016). Culture of Poverty definition. Retrieved from <https://definitions.uslegal.com/c/culture-of-poverty/>
- Wang, J. (2015). TANF coverage, state TANF requirement stringencies, and child well-being. *In Children and Youth Services Review*, Vol 53, 121-129. doi: 10.1016/j.chilyouth.2015.03.028.

- Welles, S. L., Patel, F., & Chilton, M. (2017). Does employment-related resilience affect the relationship between childhood adversity, community violence, and depression? *Journal of Urban Health, 94*(2), 233-243. doi: 10.1007/s11524-016-0117-y.
- Wimer, C., Nam, J., Waldfogel, J., & Fox, L. (2016). Trends in child poverty using an improved measure of poverty. *Academic Pediatrics, 16*(3), 60-66. doi: 10.1016/j.acap.2016.01.007.
- Woodward, K. (2014). "Pimping the system": How economic, social, and cultural capital are deployed in a welfare program. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 43*(1), 3-37. doi: 10.1177/0891241613483561.
- World Health Organization. (2019). Adverse Childhood Experiences International Questionnaire. In Adverse Childhood Experiences International Questionnaire (ACE-IQ). [website]. Retrieved from https://www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/violence/activities/adverse_childhood_experiences/en/
- World Institute of Disability. (2018). *CalWORKs: The details*. Retrieved from https://ca.db101.org/ca/programs/income_support/calworks/program2c.htmv
- Zielinski, D. S. (2009). Child maltreatment and adult socioeconomic well-being. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 33*(10), 666-678. Retrieved from <https://www.clinicalkey.com/#!/content/playContent/1-s2.0-S014521340900180X?returnurl=https%2F%2Flinkinghub.elsevier.com%2Fretre>

ve%2Fpii%2FS014521340900180X%3Fshowall%3Dtrue&referrer=&scrollTo=
%23h10001157

Appendix A: Approval to Use the Adverse Childhood Experiences International

Questionnaire (ACE-IQ)

From: SMINKEY, Laura Ann <sminkeyl@who.int>
Sent: Thursday, March 28, 2019 1:08 AM
To: Destiny Lovato
Subject: RE: ACE-IQ follow up

Dear Destiny, My apologies. I thought my colleagues on the Prevention of Violence team had responded to you. Yes, you have our permission to use this instrument. Please just credit WHO using the citation noted on this page:https://www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/violence/activities/adverse_childhood_experiences/en/ All the best with your research. Kind regards, Laura

From: Destiny Lovato <destiny.lovato@waldenu.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, March 27, 2019 3:46 PM
To: SMINKEY, Laura Ann <sminkeyl@who.int>
Subject: ACE-IQ follow up

Ms. Sminkey,

Good morning!

I am following up with an email that was previously sent to you requesting permission to use the ACE-IQ test in my PhD dissertation and have not received a response or confirmation that you received my email. I am trying to proceed with my research and would value an approval. Can you please let me know if it is approved or a time frame on an approval.

Thank you,

Destiny Lovato

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

Appendix B: Adverse Childhood Experiences International Questionnaire (ACE-IQ)

| 0 | | DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION | |
|-------------|--|--|--|
| 0.1 [C1] | Sex (<i>Record Male / Female as observed</i>) | Male | |
| | | Female | |
| 0.2 [C2] | What is your date of birth? | Day [][] Month [][] Year [][][][] Unknown (<i>Go to Q.C3</i>) | |
| 0.3 [C3] | How old are you? | [][] | |
| 0.4 [C4] | What is your [<i>insert relevant ethnic group / racial group / cultural group / others</i>] background? | [<i>Locally defined</i>] | |
| | | [<i>Locally defined</i>] | |
| | | [<i>Locally defined</i>] | |
| | | Refused | |
| 0.5 [C5] | What is the highest level of education you have completed? | No formal schooling | |
| | | Less than primary school | |
| | | Primary school completed | |
| | | Secondary/High school completed | |
| | | College/University completed | |
| | | Post graduate degree | |
| | | Refused | |
| 0.6 [C6] | Which of the following best describes your <u>main</u> work status over the last 12 months? | Government employee | |
| | | Non-government employee | |
| | | Self-employed | |
| | | Non-paid | |
| | | Student | |
| | | Homemaker | |
| | | Retired | |
| | | Unemployed (able to work) | |
| | | Unemployed (unable to work) | |
| | | Refused | |
| 0.7 [C7] | What is your civic status? | Married (<i>Go to Q.M2</i>) | |
| | | Living as couple | |
| | | Divorced or separated | |
| | | Single | |
| | | Widowed (<i>Go to Q.M2</i>) | |
| | | Other | |
| | | Refused | |
| 1 | | MARRIAGE | |
| 1.1 [M1] | Have you ever been married? | Yes | |
| | | No (<i>Go to Q.M5</i>) | |
| | | Refused | |
| 1.2 [M2] | At what age were you first married? | Age [][] | |
| | | Refused | |
| 1.3 [M3] | At the time of your first marriage did you yourself choose your husband/wife? | Yes (<i>Go to Q.M5</i>) | |
| | | No | |
| | | Don't know / Not sure | |
| | | Refused | |
| 1.4 [M4] | At the time of your first marriage if you did <u>not</u> choose your husband/wife yourself, did you give your consent to the choice? | Yes | |
| | | No | |
| | | Refused | |
| 1.5 [M5] | If you are a mother or father what was your age when your first child was born? | Age [][] | |
| | | Not applicable | |
| | | Refused | |

| 2 | | RELATIONSHIP WITH PARENTS/GUARDIANS | |
|--|--|--|------------------|
| When you were growing up, during the first 18 years of your life . . . | | | |
| 2.1 [P1] | Did your parents/guardians understand your problems and worries? | Always | Most of the time |
| | | Sometimes | Rarely |
| | | Never | Refused |
| 2.2 [P2] | Did your parents/guardians really know what you were doing with your free time when you were not at school or work? | Always | Most of the time |
| | | Sometimes | Rarely |
| | | Never | Refused |
| 3 | | | |
| 3.1 [P3] | How often did your parents/guardians not give you enough food even when they could easily have done so? | Many times | A few times |
| | | Once | Never |
| | | Refused | |
| 3.2 [P4] | Were your parents/guardians too drunk or intoxicated by drugs to take care of you? | Many times | A few times |
| | | Once | Never |
| | | Refused | |
| 3.3 [P5] | How often did your parents/guardians not send you to school even when it was available? | Many times | A few times |
| | | Once | Never |
| | | Refused | |
| 4 | | FAMILY ENVIRONMENT | |
| When you were growing up, during the first 18 years of your life . . . | | | |
| 4.1 [F1] | Did you live with a household member who was a problem drinker or alcoholic, or misused street or prescription drugs? | Yes | No |
| | | Refused | |
| 4.2 [F2] | Did you live with a household member who was depressed, mentally ill or suicidal? | Yes | No |
| | | Refused | |
| 4.3 [F3] | Did you live with a household member who was ever sent to jail or prison? | Yes | No |
| | | Refused | |
| 4.4 [F4] | Were your parents ever separated or divorced? | Yes | No |
| | | Not applicable | Refused |
| 4.5 [F5] | Did your mother, father or guardian die? | Yes | No |
| | | Don't know / Not sure | Refused |
| <p>These next questions are about certain things you may actually have heard or seen IN YOUR HOME. These are things that may have been done to another household member but not necessarily to you.</p> | | | |

| When you were growing up, during the first 18 years of your life . . . | | |
|--|---|-------------|
| 4.6 [F6] | Did you see or hear a parent or household member in your home being yelled at, screamed at, sworn at, insulted or humiliated? | Many times |
| | | A few times |
| | | Once |
| | | Never |
| | | Refused |
| 4.7 [F7] | Did you see or hear a parent or household member in your home being slapped, kicked, punched or beaten up? | Many times |
| | | A few times |
| | | Once |
| | | Never |
| | | Refused |
| 4.8 [F8] | Did you see or hear a parent or household member in your home being hit or cut with an object, such as a stick (or cane), bottle, club, knife, whip etc.? | Many times |
| | | A few times |
| | | Once |
| | | Never |
| | | Refused |
| These next questions are about certain things YOU may have experienced. | | |
| When you were growing up, during the first 18 years of your life . . . | | |
| 5 | | |
| 5.1 [A1] | Did a parent, guardian or other household member yell, scream or swear at you, insult or humiliate you? | Many times |
| | | A few times |
| | | Once |
| | | Never |
| | | Refused |
| 5.2 [A2] | Did a parent, guardian or other household member threaten to, or actually, abandon you or throw you out of the house? | Many times |
| | | A few times |
| | | Once |
| | | Never |
| | | Refused |
| 5.3 [A3] | Did a parent, guardian or other household member spank, slap, kick, punch or beat you up? | Many times |
| | | A few times |
| | | Once |
| | | Never |
| | | Refused |
| 5.4 [A4] | Did a parent, guardian or other household member hit or cut you with an object, such as a stick (or cane), bottle, club, knife, whip etc? | Many times |
| | | A few times |
| | | Once |
| | | Never |
| | | Refused |
| 5.5 [A5] | Did someone touch or fondle you in a sexual way when you did not want them to? | Many times |
| | | A few times |
| | | Once |
| | | Never |
| | | Refused |
| 5.6 [A6] | Did someone make you touch their body in a sexual way when you did not want them to? | Many times |
| | | A few times |
| | | Once |
| | | Never |
| | | Refused |
| 5.7 [A7] | Did someone attempt oral, anal, or vaginal intercourse with you when you did not want them to? | Many times |
| | | A few times |
| | | Once |

| | | |
|-------------|---|---|
| | | Never |
| | | Refused |
| 5.8 [A8] | Did someone actually have oral, anal, or vaginal intercourse with you when you did not want them to? | Many times |
| | | A few times |
| | | Once |
| | | Never |
| | | Refused |
| 6 | PEER VIOLENCE | |
| | <p>These next questions are about BEING BULLIED when you were growing up. Bullying is when a young person or group of young people say or do bad and unpleasant things to another young person. It is also bullying when a young person is teased a lot in an unpleasant way or when a young person is left out of things on purpose. It is not bullying when two young people of about the same strength or power argue or fight or when teasing is done in a friendly and fun way.</p> <p>When you were growing up, during the first 18 years of your life . . .</p> | |
| 6.1 [V1] | How often were you bullied? | Many times |
| | | A few times |
| | | Once |
| | | Never (Go to Q.V3) |
| | | Refused |
| 6.2 [V2] | How were you bullied most often? | I was hit, kicked, pushed, shoved around, or locked indoors |
| | | I was made fun of because of my race, nationality or colour |
| | | I was made fun of because of my religion |
| | | I was made fun of with sexual jokes, comments, or gestures |
| | | I was left out of activities on purpose or completely ignored |
| | | I was made fun of because of how my body or face looked |
| | | I was bullied in some other way |
| | | Refused |
| | <p>This next question is about PHYSICAL FIGHTS. A physical fight occurs when two young people of about the same strength or power choose to fight each other.</p> <p>When you were growing up, during the first 18 years of your life . . .</p> | |
| 6.3 [V3] | How often were you in a physical fight? | Many times |
| | | A few times |
| | | Once |
| | | Never |
| | | Refused |
| 7 | WITNESSING COMMUNITY VIOLENCE | |
| | <p>These next questions are about how often, when you were a child, YOU may have seen or heard certain things in your NEIGHBOURHOOD OR COMMUNITY (not in your home or on TV, movies, or the radio).</p> <p>When you were growing up, during the first 18 years of your life . . .</p> | |
| 7.1 [V4] | Did you see or hear someone being beaten up in real life? | Many times |
| | | A few times |
| | | Once |
| | | Never |
| | | Refused |
| 7.2 | Did you see or hear someone being stabbed | Many times |

| | | |
|--------------|---|-------------|
| [V5] | or shot in real life? | A few times |
| | | Once |
| | | Never |
| | | Refused |
| 7.3 [V6] | Did you see or hear someone being threatened with a knife or gun in real life? | Many times |
| | | A few times |
| | | Once |
| | | Never |
| | | Refused |
| 8 | EXPOSURE TO WAR/COLLECTIVE VIOLENCE | |
| | <p>These questions are about whether YOU did or did not experience any of the following events when you were a child. The events are all to do with collective violence, including wars, terrorism, political or ethnic conflicts, genocide, repression, disappearances, torture and organized violent crime such as banditry and gang warfare.</p> <p>When you were growing up, during the first 18 years of your life . . .</p> | |
| 8.1 [V7] | Were you forced to go and live in another place due to any of these events? | Many times |
| | | A few times |
| | | Once |
| | | Never |
| | | Refused |
| 8.2 [V8] | Did you experience the deliberate destruction of your home due to any of these events? | Many times |
| | | A few times |
| | | Once |
| | | Never |
| | | Refused |
| 8.3 [V9] | Were you beaten up by soldiers, police, militia, or gangs? | Many times |
| | | A few times |
| | | Once |
| | | Never |
| | | Refused |
| 8.4 [V10] | Was a family member or friend killed or beaten up by soldiers, police, militia, or gangs? | Many times |
| | | A few times |
| | | Once |
| | | Never |
| | | Refused |

Appendix C : Tables

Table C1

Research Question 1 Somer's d Test

| | | | Value | Asymptotic Standard Error | Approximate T | Approximate Significance |
|--------------------------|----------|---|--------|---------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Somers'd | Symmetric | -0.045 | 0.067 | -0.66 | 0.509 |
| | | Are you currently receiving cash-aid under the CalWORKs? | -0.029 | 0.044 | -0.66 | 0.509 |
| | | Did your parent(s)/gua rdian(s) receive cash- aid under the CalWORKs program as a child? | -0.108 | 0.158 | -0.66 | 0.509 |
| | | Dependent | -0.108 | 0.158 | -0.66 | 0.509 |

Table C2

Research Question 2 Variables in the Equation

| | B | S.E. | Wald | df | <i>p</i> | Exp(B) |
|--|-------------|----------|------|----|----------|------------|
| Step 1 ^a Did your parent(s)/guardian(s) understand your problems and worries | -3.098 | 17863.28 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.045 |
| How often did your parent(s)/guardian(s) not send you to school even when it was available? | 12.246 | 5919.422 | 0 | 1 | 0.998 | 208184.498 |
| Were your parent(s)/guardian(s) too drunk or intoxicated by drugs to take care of you? | 9.559 | 12973.65 | 0 | 1 | 0.999 | 14175.905 |
| How often did your parent(s)/guardian(s) not give you enough food even when they could easily have done so? | - 10.818 | 24092.11 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Did your parent(s)/guardian(s) really know what you were doing with your free time when you were not at school or work | 2.705 | 8143.678 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 14.948 |
| Did you live with a household member who was a problem drinker or alcoholic, or misused street or prescription drugs? | - 44.113 | 24837.25 | 0 | 1 | 0.999 | 0 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--------|----------|---|---|-------|------------|
| Did you see or hear a parent or household member in your home being hit or cut with an object, such as a stick (or cane), bottle, club, whip, knife, etc? | 2.83 | 24917.35 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 16.952 |
| Did you see or hear a parent or household member in your home being slapped, kicked, punched, or beaten up? | 30.963 | 10892.59 | 0 | 1 | 0.998 | 2799967 |
| Did you see or hear a parent or household member in your home being yelled at, screamed at, sworn at, insulted or humiliated? | - | 9431.745 | 0 | 1 | 0.998 | 0 |
| Did your mother, father, or guardian die? | 11.736 | 21448.82 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 124975.897 |
| Were your parents ever separated or divorced? | -3.801 | 16533.02 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.022 |
| Did you live with a household member who was ever sent to prison or jail? | -20.87 | 25469.98 | 0 | 1 | 0.999 | 0 |
| Did you live with a household member who was depressed, mentally ill or suicidal? | 32.78 | 13369.55 | 0 | 1 | 0.998 | 172192362 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|----------|---|---|-------|-----------|
| Did a parent, guardian or other household member yell, scream or swear at you, insult or humiliate? | -4.665 | 20818.64 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.009 |
| Did someone actually have oral, anal, or vaginal intercourse with you when you did not want them to? | 1.329 | 19263.56 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.778 |
| Did someone attempt oral, anal, or vaginal intercourse with you when you did not want them to? | - 17.545 | 40949.98 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Did someone make you touch their body in a sexual way when you did not want them to? | 9.44 | 24287.03 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 12581.363 |
| Did someone touch or fondle you in a sexual way when you did not want them to? | 10.567 | 33107.38 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 38815.447 |
| Did a parent, guardian or other household member hit or cut you with an object, such as a stick (or cane), bottle, club, knife, whip etc? | - 25.751 | 14740.68 | 0 | 1 | 0.999 | 0 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--------|----------|---|---|-------|-----------|
| Did a parent, guardian or other household member spank, slap, kick, punch or beat you up? | 2.706 | 16672.68 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 14.966 |
| Did a parent, guardian or other household member threaten to, or actually, abandon you or throw you out of the house? | 10.892 | 25522.9 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 53769.72 |
| How often were you bullied? | -6.171 | 9942.41 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.002 |
| How often were you in a physical fight? | 3.201 | 9532.33 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 24.552 |
| How were you bullied most often? | 5.08 | 4234.995 | 0 | 1 | 0.999 | 160.783 |
| Did you see or hear someone being beaten up in real life? | 1.249 | 13762.36 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.486 |
| Did you see or hear someone being stabbed or shot in real life? | 1.785 | 7919.718 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5.958 |
| Were you forced to go and live in another place due to any of these events? | - | 18871.08 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Was a family member or friend killed or beaten up by soldiers, police, militia, or gangs? | 19.36 | 25105.15 | 0 | 1 | 0.99 | 255721701 |
| Were you beaten up by soldiers, police, militia, or gangs? | -26.07 | 101452.9 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |

Did you experience
the deliberate
destruction of your
home due to any of
these events?

| | | | | | | |
|----------|--------|----------|---|---|------|-----------|
| | 24.292 | 24270.83 | 0 | 1 | 0.99 | 354669039 |
| Constant | -1.067 | 311817.4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.344 |

Note: Model Summary: $X^2(30)=0.000$, $p=.177$,
Nagelkerke $R^2= 1.00$

Table C3

Research Question 2 Somers' d Test: Variable Problems

| | | | Value | Asymptotic Standard Error | Approximate T | Approximate Significance |
|--------------------------|--------------|---|--------|---------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Somers' d | Symmetric | -0.025 | 0.053 | -0.467 | 0.64 |
| | | Are you currently receiving cash-aid under the CalWORKs? | -0.014 | 0.031 | -0.467 | 0.64 |
| | | Did your parent(s)/gua rdian(s) understand your problems and worries? | -0.102 | 0.215 | -0.467 | 0.64 |

Table C4

Research Question 2 Somers' d Test: Variable School

| | | | Value | Asymptotic Standard Error | Approximate T | Approximate Significance |
|--------------------------|--------------|---|-------|---------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Somers' d | Symmetric | 0.117 | 0.059 | 1.68 | 0.093 |
| | | Are you currently receiving cash-aid under the CalWORKs? | 0.069 | 0.041 | 1.68 | 0.093 |

| | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|------|-------|
| How often did your parent(s)/guardian(s) not send you to school even when it was available? | 0.391 | 0.182 | 1.68 | 0.093 |
|---|-------|-------|------|-------|

Table C5

Research Question 2 Somers' d Test: Variable Intoxication

| Ordinal by Ordinal | Somers' d | Symmetric | Value | Asymptotic Standard Error | Approximate T | Approximate Significance |
|--------------------|-----------|--|-------|---------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| | | Symmetric | 0.037 | 0.084 | 0.44 | 0.66 |
| | | Are you currently receiving cash-aid under the CalWORKs? | 0.023 | 0.053 | 0.44 | 0.66 |
| | | Were your parent(s)/guardian(s) too drunk or intoxicated by drugs to take care of you? | 0.09 | 0.202 | 0.44 | 0.66 |

Table C6

Research Question 2 Somers' d Test: Variable: Food

| Ordinal by Ordinal | Somers' d | Symmetric | Value | Asymptotic Standard Error | Approximate T | Approximate Significance |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------|-------|---------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| | | Symmetric | 0 | 0.085 | 0 | 1 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|-------|---|---|
| Are you currently receiving cash-aid under the CalWORKs? | 0 | 0.058 | 0 | 1 |
| How often did your parent(s)/guardian(s) not give you enough food even when they could easily have done so? | 0 | 0.163 | 0 | 1 |

Table C7

Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable free time

| | | Value | Asymptotic Standard Error | Approximate T | Approximate Significance |
|--------------------|--|-------|---------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Somers'd | | | | |
| | Symmetric | 0.01 | 0.038 | 0.254 | 0.8 |
| | Are you currently receiving cash-aid under the CalWORKs? | 0.005 | 0.022 | 0.254 | 0.8 |
| | Did your parent(s)/guardian(s) really know what you were doing with your free time when you were not at school or work | 0.039 | 0.153 | 0.254 | 0.8 |

Table C8

Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable physical abuse

| | | | Value | Asymptotic Standard Error | Approximate T | Approximate Significance |
|--------------------------|--------------|--|-------|---------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Somers 'd | Symmetric | 0.026 | 0.081 | 0.315 | 0.753 |
| | | Are you currently receiving cash- aid under the CalWORKs? | 0.016 | 0.05 | 0.315 | 0.753 |
| | | Did you see or hear a parent or household member in your home being hit or cut with an object, such as a stick (or cane), bottle, club, whip, knife, etc? | 0.068 | 0.214 | 0.315 | 0.753 |

Table C9

Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable domestic violence

| | | | Value | Asymptotic Standard Error | Approximate T | Approximate Significance |
|--------------------------|----------|---|-------|---------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Somers'd | Symmetric | 0.024 | 0.069 | 0.343 | 0.732 |
| | | Are you currently receiving cash-aid under the CalWORKs? | 0.014 | 0.041 | 0.343 | 0.732 |
| | | Did you see or hear a parent or household member in your home being slapped, kicked, punched, or beaten up? | 0.076 | 0.221 | 0.343 | 0.732 |

Table C10

Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable yelling

| | | | Value | Asymptotic Standard Error | Approximate T | Approximate Significance |
|--------------------------|--------------|---|--------|---------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Somers' d | Symmetric | -0.073 | 0.062 | -1.113 | 0.266 |
| | | Are you currently receiving cash-aid under the CalWORKs? | -0.043 | 0.038 | -1.113 | 0.266 |
| | | Did you see or hear a parent or household member in your home being yelled at, screamed at, sworn at, insulted or humiliated? | -0.263 | 0.215 | -1.113 | 0.266 |

Table C11

Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable parent death

| | | | Value | Asymptotic Standard Error | Approximate T | Approximate Significance |
|--------------------------|----------|-----------|-------|---------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Somers'd | Symmetric | 0.015 | 0.076 | 0.194 | 0.846 |

| | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Are you currently receiving cash-aid under the CalWORKs? | 0.009 | 0.047 | 0.194 | 0.846 |
| Did your mother, father, or guardian die? | 0.038 | 0.195 | 0.194 | 0.846 |

Table C12

Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable divorce

| | | | Value | Asymptotic Standard Error | Approximate T | Approximate Significance |
|--------------------|----------|--|-------|---------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Somers'd | Symmetric | 0.011 | 0.09 | 0.122 | 0.903 |
| | | Are you currently receiving cash-aid under the CalWORKs? | 0.007 | 0.054 | 0.122 | 0.903 |
| | | Were your parents ever separated or divorced? | 0.034 | 0.28 | 0.122 | 0.903 |

Table C13

Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable jail

| | | | Value | Asymptotic Standard Error | Approximate T | Approximate Significance |
|--------------------------|----------|--|-------|---------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Somers'd | Symmetric | - | | | |
| | | Are you currently receiving cash-aid under the CalWORKS? | 0.135 | 0.03 | -2.507 | 0.012 |
| | | Did you live with a household member who was ever sent to prison or jail? | - | | | |
| | | | 0.085 | 0.033 | -2.507 | 0.012 |
| | | | -0.33 | 0.048 | -2.507 | 0.012 |

Table C14

Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable mental illness

| | | | Value | Asymptotic Standard Error | Approximate T | Approximate Significance |
|--------------------------|----------|-----------|-------|---------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Somers'd | Symmetric | 0.077 | 0.085 | 0.863 | 0.388 |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | Are you currently receiving cash-aid under the CalWORKs? | 0.048 | 0.056 | 0.863 | 0.388 |
| | Did you live with a household member who was depressed, mentally ill or suicidal? | 0.191 | 2.09 | 0.863 | 0.388 |

Table C15

Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable verbal abuse

| | | | Value | Asymptotic Standard Error | Approximate T | Approximate Significance |
|---------|----------|--|-------|---------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| Ordinal | by | | | | | |
| Ordinal | Somers'd | Symmetric | 0.021 | 0.071 | 0.289 | 0.772 |
| | | Are you currently receiving cash-aid under the CalWORKs? | 0.012 | 0.041 | 0.289 | 0.772 |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | Did a parent, guardian or other household member yell, scream or swear at you, insult or humiliate? | 0.072 | 0.246 | 0.289 | 0.772 |
|--|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|

Table C16

Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable sexual abuse attempt

| | | | Value | Asymptotic Standard Error | Approximate T | Approximate Significance |
|--------------------------|----------|--|-------|---------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Somers'd | Symmetric | 0.081 | 0.123 | 0.649 | 0.516 |
| | | Are you currently receiving cash-aid under the CalWORKs? | 0.052 | 0.08 | 0.649 | 0.516 |
| | | Did someone actually have oral, anal, or vaginal intercourse with you when you did not want them to? | 0.192 | 0.287 | 0.649 | 0.516 |

Table C17

Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable sexual abuse

| | | | Value | Asymptotic Standard Error | Approximate T | Approximate Significance |
|--------------------------|----------|--|-------|---------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Somers'd | Symmetric | 0.081 | 0.123 | 0.649 | 0.516 |
| | | Are you currently receiving cash-aid under the CalWORKs? | 0.052 | 0.08 | 0.649 | 0.516 |
| | | Did someone actually have oral, anal, or vaginal intercourse with you when you did not want them to? | 0.192 | 0.287 | 0.649 | 0.516 |

Table C18

Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable sexual molestation

| | | | Value | Asymptotic Standard Error | Approximate T | Approximate Significance |
|--------------------------|----------|-----------|-------|---------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Somers'd | Symmetric | 0.114 | 0.106 | 1.023 | 0.307 |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | Are you currently receiving cash-aid under the CalWORKs? | 0.07 | 0.068 | 1.023 | 0.307 |
| | Did someone attempt oral, anal, or vaginal intercourse with you when you did not want them to? | 0.319 | 0.289 | 1.023 | 0.307 |

Table C19

Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable sexual molestation

| | | | Value | Asymptotic Standard Error | Approximate T | Approximate Significance |
|--------------------|----------|--|-------|---------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Somers'd | Symmetric | 0.064 | 0.112 | 0.563 | 0.573 |
| | | Are you currently receiving cash-aid under the CalWORKs? | 0.04 | 0.07 | 0.563 | 0.573 |

| | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Did someone make you touch their body in a sexual way when you did not want them to? | 0.168 | 0.292 | 0.563 | 0.573 |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|

Table C20

Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable physical abuse using an object

| | | Value | Asymptotic Standard Error | Approximate T | Approximate Significance |
|--------------------|--|--------|---------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Somers'd Symmetric | -0.018 | 0.082 | -0.225 | 0.822 |
| | Are you currently receiving cash-aid under the CalWORKS? | -0.012 | 0.054 | -0.225 | 0.822 |
| | Did a parent, guardian or other household member hit or cut you with an object, such as a stick (or cane), bottle, club, | -0.039 | 0.175 | -0.225 | 0.822 |

knife,
whip etc?

Table C21

Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable physical abuse

| | | | Value | Asymptotic Standard Error | Approximate T | Approximate Significance |
|--------------------------|----------|---|------------|---------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Somers'd | Symmetric | - 0.035 | 0.073 | -0.479 | 0.632 |
| | | Are you currently receiving cash-aid under the CalWOR Ks? | - 0.021 | 0.043 | -0.479 | 0.632 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|-------|-------|--------|-------|
| Did a parent, guardian or other household member spank, slap, kick, punch or beat you up? | - | 0.123 | 0.253 | -0.479 | 0.632 |
|---|---|-------|-------|--------|-------|

Table C22

Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable threats

| | | | Value | Asymptotic Standard Error | Approximate T | Approximate Significance |
|--------------------|----------|---|-------|---------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Somers'd | Symmetric | 0.101 | 0.073 | 1.276 | 0.202 |
| | | Are you currently receiving cash-aid under the CalWORKs? | 0.062 | 0.048 | 1.276 | 0.202 |
| | | Did a parent, guardian or other household member threaten to, or actually, abandon you or throw you out of the house? | 0.285 | 0.197 | 1.276 | 0.202 |

Table C23

Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable bullied

| | | | Value | Asymptotic Standard Error | Approximate T | Approximate Significance |
|--------------------------|----------|---|------------|---------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Somers'd | Symmetric | - 0.015 | 0.056 | -0.257 | 0.797 |
| | | Are you currently receiving cash-aid under the CalWOR Ks? | - 0.008 | 0.033 | -0.257 | 0.797 |
| | | How often were you bullied? | -0.05 | 0.194 | -0.257 | 0.797 |

Table C24

Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable fighting

| | | | Value | Asymptotic Standard Error | Approximate T | Approximate Significance |
|--------------------------|----------|---|------------|---------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Somers'd | Symmetric | - 0.016 | 0.059 | -0.276 | 0.783 |
| | | Are you currently receiving cash-aid under the CalWOR Ks? | -0.01 | 0.034 | -0.276 | 0.783 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|-------|-------|--------|-------|
| | How often were you in a physical fight? | - | 0.057 | 0.207 | -0.276 | 0.783 |
|--|---|---|-------|-------|--------|-------|

Table C25

Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable bullied often

| | | | Value | Asymptotic Standard Error | Approximate T | Approximate Significance |
|--------------------------|----------|---|-------|---------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Somers'd | Symmetric | 0.131 | 0.047 | 1.999 | 0.046 |
| | | Are you currently receiving cash-aid under the CalWORKs? | 0.075 | 0.037 | 1.999 | 0.046 |
| | | How were you bullied most often? | 0.503 | 0.148 | 1.999 | 0.046 |

Table C26

Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable neighborhood fights

| | | | Value | Asymptotic Standard Error | Approximate T | Approximate Significance |
|--------------------------|----------|-----------|-------|---------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Somers'd | Symmetric | 0.004 | 0.062 | 0.059 | 0.953 |

| | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Are you currently receiving cash-aid under the CalWORKs? | 0.002 | 0.036 | 0.059 | 0.953 |
| Did you see or hear someone being beaten up in real life? | 0.013 | 0.213 | 0.059 | 0.953 |

Table C27

Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable neighborhood violence

| | | Value | Asymptotic Standard Error | Approximate T | Approximate Significance | |
|--------------------|-----------|---|---------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|-------|
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Somers' d | Symmetric | 0.028 | 0.069 | 0.404 | 0.686 |
| | | Are you currently receiving cash-aid under the CalWORKs ? | 0.017 | 0.042 | 0.404 | 0.686 |
| | | Did you see or hear someone being stabbed or shot in real life? | 0.079 | 0.193 | 0.404 | 0.686 |

Table C28

Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable out placed

| | | | Value | Asymptotic Standard Error | Approximate T | Approximate Significance |
|--------------------------|----------|---|-------|---------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Somers'd | Symmetric | - | | | |
| | | Are you currently receiving cash-aid under the CalWORKs? | 0.078 | 0.02 | -2.053 | 0.04 |
| | | | - | | | |
| | | Were you forced to go and live in another place due to any of these events? | 0.065 | 0.026 | -2.053 | 0.04 |
| | | | - | | | |
| | | | 0.097 | 0.031 | -2.053 | 0.04 |

Table C29

Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable gang violence

| | | | Value | Asymptotic Standard Error | Approximate T | Approximate Significance |
|--------------------------|----------|-----------|-------|---------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Somers'd | Symmetric | 0.1 | 0.145 | 0.661 | 0.508 |

| | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Are you currently receiving cash-aid under the CalWORKs? | 0.093 | 0.136 | 0.661 | 0.508 |
| Was a family member or friend killed or beaten up by soldiers, police, militia, or gangs? | 0.109 | 0.16 | 0.661 | 0.508 |

Table C30

Research Question 2 Somers'd Test: Variable personal gang violence

| | | | Value | Asymptotic Standard Error | Approximate T | Approximate Significance |
|--------------------|----------|--|-------|---------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Somers'd | Symmetric | - | | | |
| | | Are you currently receiving cash-aid under the CalWORKs? | 0.043 | 0.015 | -1.475 | 0.14 |
| | | Were you beaten up by soldiers, police, militia, or gangs? | 0.063 | 0.025 | -1.475 | 0.14 |
| | | | 0.032 | 0.018 | -1.475 | 0.14 |