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ABSTRACT

An Exploratory Study Of Workplace Accommodations Provided To Welfare-To-Work Participants In Housekeeping Classifications

by

Terry K. Jones

Dr. Gerald Goll, Examination Committee Chair
Professor of Hotel Administration
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

This study explored the workplace needs of welfare recipients in their transition from welfare to work, and the willingness of housekeeping managers and supervisors to provide workplace accommodations that could enhance the probability of a successful transition to self-sufficiency. Personal interviews and two separate survey questionnaires were used to survey employers and welfare recipients in an attempt to explore several research questions. Questions focused on the respective needs of employers and welfare recipients, and on each group’s perceptions of the other group. This exploratory study was supported by a literature review and survey techniques. Data was subjected to appropriate statistical analysis in order to generate conclusions and formulate hypotheses for future research.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

On August 22, 1996 President Bill Clinton signed into law H.R. 3734, The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (1996), more commonly known as the Personal Responsibility Act, or simply the Act, as often referred to hereafter. One of the most significant acts of welfare reform legislation in American history, the Personal Responsibility Act eliminated most of the Federal responsibility for the administration of public welfare and placed the responsibility squarely in the hands of individual states (see Table 1). In addition to giving individual states the responsibility of designing and administering their own welfare programs, the Act limits receipt of welfare cash benefits to a maximum of five years, at which time benefits cease. Although Federal guidelines mandated a maximum of five-year limits, individual states have set different time limits, some as short as two years. As time limits expire, thousands of welfare recipients, no longer eligible to receive cash payments will be forced to seek alternate forms of subsistence. A small number of people will disappear altogether into society, while some will rely on family or friends for support. The majority of welfare recipients, however, will be forced into the workplace just as the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act intended.
Table 1

**Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1966 (PRWORA)**

- Eliminated welfare assistance as an entitlement or as right of citizenship.
- Gave individual states responsibility for administering their own programs.
- Changed basis of assistance from need to ability to work.
- Replaced Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) with Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF).
- Established nationwide, five-year lifetime limit for collecting cash assistance.\(^a\)
- Required each welfare recipient to be engaged in work activity at end of two years.\(^b\)
- Provided for general reduction in benefits over time, as people return to work.\(^c\)
- Small reductions in school lunch programs.
- Redefined eligibility of recipients, including drug, alcohol, and disability.


\(^a\)Recipients moving from state to state still have only a five-year maximum. Recipients may go off and come back on, but cumulative time can’t exceed five years.

\(^b\)Work activities may be defined as employment, work study, internships, or community service. Teen parents must be attending school and living in an adult supervised setting.

\(^c\)If recipient is 18-55 years old and not working or looking for work, food stamps apply only for 3 months out of 3 years.
Purpose

This research project was an exploratory study of recent welfare reform legislation and how that legislation affected welfare recipients who were being forced off welfare and into the workplace. Employers were also affected by this legislation since they have been asked by the Federal government to help provide jobs for welfare recipients. Employers may be reluctant to hire welfare recipients who may often be unskilled and uneducated; who may have substance abuse problems; who may have a very poor work history; or may have medical problems which require some workplace accommodation. Without some workplace accommodations, welfare recipients will probably have a very difficult time keeping a job long enough to become self-sufficient.

Workplace accommodations could include such things as extended training programs, reduced probationary periods, flexible scheduling, child care assistance or on-site child care facilities, transportation assistance to and from work, on-site counseling services, life-skills training, English as a second language (ESL) or GED training.

For most welfare recipients the transition from welfare to work could probably be accomplished with little difficulty, because in fact the majority of welfare recipients are able-bodied, willing to work, and anxious to be off welfare. Studies by Bane & Ellwood (as cited by S. B. Collins, in S.W. Carlson-Thies & J.W. Skillen, 1996), show that a majority of welfare spells are short-term, usually lasting two years or less, and that fewer than one out of six welfare episodes are long-term, lasting eight years or more. A large part of the welfare population consists of single mothers, perhaps unwed teenagers or just as likely, older women, recently divorced, abandoned, or widowed, who suddenly find
themselves with no means of support, and often with dependent children. Still another segment of public assistance consists of displaced workers—workers unemployed because of plant closings, business slowdowns, or relocation of businesses to other areas. For these groups, public assistance functions just as it was designed to --- a temporary support system until a more permanent method of subsistence can be found.

The primary group of interest for this study however, is the nearly twenty percent of long-term welfare recipients who use the welfare system as their principal form of subsistence. While nearly all welfare recipients experience personal difficulties that impede self-sufficiency, members of this group, known as Hardest to Employ (HtE) almost always experience multiple barriers to employment, some of which include poor work history, lack of education, substance abuse, long-term welfare dependency, and medical/health difficulties (Department of Labor, Internet, 1996). Employers are generally reluctant to retain individuals who exhibit these kinds of problems and as a result, HtE’s who find a job, seldom keep a job long enough to become self-sufficient.

Objectives

In addition to studying the workplace relationship between employers and workfare participants, this study offered three related ideas that could help to set the stage for understanding the objective.

First, examining the social and political climate that led to recent welfare reform legislation should help to explain why the Personal Responsibility Act was such a significant issue. National debt and social conscience combined in the late 1990s to
influence a change in the way welfare programs were looked at in the United States. After generations of welfare queens, learned helplessness, and subsidized promiscuity, Americans were less willing to extend public assistance to welfare recipients that society had deemed employable.

Second, a brief presentation of the complexity of the welfare system illustrates how difficult reforming the system can be. The American welfare system has its roots in England’s 17th century Elizabethan Poor Laws, and formally legislated public assistance programs have been in place since 1647 in America (Axinn and Levin, 1975). To reform welfare is to reform the very fabric of American culture.

Third, was to present a view of the workplace from both the employer and from the welfare recipient. Successful welfare reform will require cooperation from both sides. The employer must find some social or economic value in helping workfare participants succeed. Stockholders are probably less motivated by social responsibility than by a profitable return on their investment, though in the long run fulfilling social responsibility may greatly increase the value of their investment. Welfare recipients must make a commitment to overcome whatever obstacles lie in the path to self-sufficiency. Depression, helplessness, a lack of education, and a lifetime of welfare dependency are heavy burdens, and generally not well tolerated in the workplace.

Justification

In the fall of 1996 and spring of 1997, human resource managers in Las Vegas hotels experienced a sharp increase in the number of state and local welfare agency
referrals for entry level positions in housekeeping and food service departments. As a result of the August 1996 enactment of the Personal Responsibility Act, welfare agencies increased their efforts to assist welfare recipients find work. Because many welfare recipients are poorly educated and have few work skills, welfare agencies were concentrating on securing the kinds of entry-level jobs that welfare recipients could handle. Housekeeping related job classifications like general cleaner, kitchen worker, dishwasher, porter, and guest room attendant (GRA) are typically positions which require few technical skills and minimal education.

Personal experience can be a powerful motivator (Bunker Pearlson, & Schulz, 1995, as cited in N. Sinn), and as Executive Housekeeper for a 1,500-room Las Vegas hotel and casino, the researcher was involved in interviewing and hiring welfare recipients, including several HtE referrals. Over a five-week period in February and March 1997, approximately thirty women, including six welfare referrals, were interviewed for the housekeeping position of GRA. Except the six welfare referrals, all applicants were currently working somewhere else and wanted a job change, had recently left a similar position at another hotel, or had just arrived in Las Vegas from another state or country. A review of employment applications revealed that the six welfare applicants as a group, had been unemployed for significantly longer periods of time, had held more jobs for shorter periods, or had very little work experience because they had recently left high school. All applicants received similar interviews, during which they expressed their desire and availability to work any shift, any day, either part-time or full-time. All said they were available to work “on-call” and attested to having reliable transportation. At the
conclusion of interviews twelve non-welfare applicants were hired, and, largely at the urging of human resources, four of the six welfare recipients were hired. All sixteen persons were identically processed, trained, and integrated into the work force. Housekeeping managers received no information or special instructions for treating the welfare referrals differently than the other newly hired employees.

Within several weeks, two or three of the welfare referrals began exhibiting the kinds of behavior characteristic of many welfare recipients. They called in sick more often or left work early due to illness; they couldn’t get to work because they had no transportation; they had sick children or child related emergencies; they had no telephone and couldn’t call to be scheduled; or had appointments with doctors, counselors, attorneys, or social agencies. In addition to the personal, off-work problems, they seemed slower at learning the tasks associated with the GRA position, and were generally less concerned about the quality of their work. For several women their poor quality work, lack of concern, and diminished social skills resulted in disrespect, even ostracism by co-workers. They had little support from co-workers, and as a result their bad habits only got worse. Just one of the original four welfare referrals completed the forty-shift probationary period. Two were terminated for poor work performance and excessive absenteeism, and one simply quit. She said, unabashedly, that she just didn’t want to work and could get by on welfare. Subsequent conversations with human resource managers and with housekeepers at other hotels revealed that this experience with welfare-to-work participants was not uncommon.
The concept for this study was an outgrowth of numerous discussions with human resource managers and housekeeping managers, about the complexity of welfare reform and about the difficulties experienced not only by persons trying to make the transition from welfare to work, but also by employers. Much is written about the social impact of the American welfare system and about the shortcomings of welfare recipients. Often it seems that when reform programs fail to get people off welfare and back to work, the welfare recipient is most often blamed for the failure. It appears that very little thought is given to what responsibility the employer might bear, or how the employer could modify management practices to ease transition into the workplace.

Through this study an attempt was made to identify common ground in the workplace, where the responsibility for success could be more evenly shared between employers and welfare-to-work participants, particularly in the earliest stages of employment.

Research Questions

In this study, no hypotheses were formed about possible relationships between employers and welfare recipients. Exploratory studies, according to Sellitz, Wrightsman, & Cook (as cited in Churchill, 1995) are used for;

1. formulating a problem for more precise investigation or for developing hypotheses,
2. establishing priorities for further research,
3. increasing the researcher’s familiarity with the problem, or
4. clarifying concepts.

In order to formulate a more precise understanding of the problem, these four questions were posed:

1. What kinds of workplace accommodations do workfare participants feel they need in order to keep a job and achieve self-sufficiency?

2. What kinds of workplace accommodations are employers willing to provide in order to increase the probability of success for workfare participants?

3. How do employers perceive welfare recipients as a group, and as potential employees?

4. How do welfare recipients view themselves as a group, and as potential employees?

Constraints

By necessity or design, the gathering of data relative to most research studies must be confined to sources that are both relevant and of proximate nature to the topic of interest. Constraints set the boundaries for how far afield one will or can go to collect data. Constraints are not necessarily good or bad, but it is important to know the conditions that effected the final study. Constraints in this study are of two kinds; limitations --- those things over which the researcher had no control, and delimitations --- imposed by the researcher due to limited resources such as time, money, or personnel.
**Limitations**

The scope of research focused on the following sources:

1. Information available on The Personal Responsibility Act, which was passed in August 1996 and began implementation in January 1997. Because the law was so new, little data was available at the inception of this study.

2. For the Welfare survey, questions were limited to those which caused no particular concern for, or implied no sponsorship by, the Nevada State Welfare Division.

**Delimitations**


3. Data available from United States Government agencies, including:
   - Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Labor, and the Census Bureau.


5. Textbooks and publications available in the Clark County Library system and the University of Nevada, Las Vegas library.

6. The Internet and related electronic database sources.

7. Survey data are limited by the total number of respondents to questionnaires presented to housekeeping managers and supervisors, and to current and/or
former welfare recipients. Research data is further limited to personal interviews with welfare-to-work service providers, community activists, and Southern Nevada Private Industry Council members who were willing to participate in the study.


9. Limited time and financial resources restricted the collection of primary data used to describe welfare recipients only in the Las Vegas, Nevada metropolitan area.

10. The focus of this research was intentionally restricted to the employee / employer relationship and particularly to the introductory period, usually up to six months, when a new employee might be on a probationary status. Most businesses, especially those subject to collective bargaining agreements, require some sort of introductory period, during which a manager often must train, evaluate, and counsel new employees. Typically, it is during a probationary period that an employee would be most vulnerable, and workfare participants may be even more vulnerable to uncontested termination if they exhibit the poor work habits often attributed to their group.

11. Entry-level jobs were the only jobs considered in this study, and are described as any job that would allow a low-skilled, uneducated, or novice worker to enter the workforce. Typically, these jobs would require a relatively high level of physical activity, often with only a few repetitive tasks; would require few verbal or
computational skills; and could usually be accomplished with a minimum of interaction with co-workers. For purposes of this study, housekeeping-related jobs like GRA, porter, dishwasher, general cleaner, or kitchen worker are considered entry-level positions. These jobs abound in the Las Vegas hospitality industry, and the assumption was that each job description would be essentially the same anywhere in America.

Summary

Chapter 1 has introduced the Personal Responsibility Act and presented highlights of this very significant welfare reform legislation. Welfare recipients are faced with elimination of cash benefits and must be engaged in work activities within two years. Many welfare recipients will have an easier time making the transition to work if employers are willing to accommodate some to the barriers to employment often faced by welfare recipients.

This exploratory study looked at employers in housekeeping related positions and at welfare recipients in the Las Vegas, Nevada metropolitan area. The study attempted to show how each group might meet the needs of the other and thereby contribute to successful welfare reform and to the welfare recipient's transition into the workplace.
Definition of Terms

**AFDC**
Aid to Families with Dependent Children. Federally funded child welfare program which provides public assistance, primarily cash payments, to needy families with dependent children. Established by the Social Security Act of 1935. Predecessor of TANF. Sometimes called Mother's Aid (Gensler, 1996).

**TANF**
Temporary Aid to Needy Families. State and Federal welfare programs which provide temporary public assistance, primarily cash payments to needy families. Amended by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 to provide grants to states and local communities. Umbrella agency for HTW and WtW programs. Replaced AFDC as the administrative agency for welfare (Personal Responsibility Act of 1996).

**PIC**
Private Industry Council. Organizations composed of state industry and business leaders, labor unions, and professional organizations. Responsible for administering each state’s welfare system, and for controlling federal funds associated with Welfare to Work. May be several in each state.

**WtW**
Welfare to Work. For purposes of the study, refers to welfare reform programs brought about by the 1996 PRWORA. Is a “work first” concept that requires the HTW to have a job commitment before receiving training or other employment focused services.

**IEHA**
International Executive Housekeepers Association. Professional group of cleaning and maintenance industry managers, equipment manufacturers.
and product suppliers. Used as the population for the IEHA survey shown in Appendix E. Approximately five-thousand members.

SSI
Supplemental Security Income. Established in January, 1974, SSI is a conglomeration of numerous welfare programs principally involved with aid to the aged, the blind, and the permanently and totally disabled.

HtE
Hardest to Employ. Approximately twenty percent of the American welfare population. This group is characterized by a combination of employment barriers, including poor work history (worked less than three consecutive months in the past twelve months in an unsubsidized job), lack of education (no high school diploma/GED and scored less than 8.9 grade level in reading and math), substance abuse (requires treatment for employment), and long-term welfare assistance (more than 30 months) (Blue, 1998).

NCP
Non-custodial Parent. Parent of a dependent or minor child. A non-custodial parent can be either the mother or father of a dependent child, or children. For purposes of study, NCP refers to absentee fathers who provide no financial or social support for their biological children. NCP's may be legally married to the mother of the dependent child, but in reality, seldom are. NCP's are a significant reason for the existence of welfare programs. Census data from 1998 estimated that in 1996 approximately 12 million dollars in child support payments were collected --- only 15.5 percent of all payments due (U.S Census Bureau, 1998).
JTPA  Job Training Partnership Act. Established in 1982 when CETA expired. JTPA is funded by the federal government but administered by state governors. JTPA, like CETA, provides maintenance funds and training programs for unemployed workers (Leigh, 1989).

WIB  Work Incentive Board. Administrative organization that replaced JTPA in 1998. Carries out essentially the same responsibilities and programs as JTPA but calls for more work incentives and cooperative actions with employers.

RFP  Request for Proposal. A method of securing services through a process of competitive bidding wherein the bidders follow a rigid and complex set of instructions and requirements (PIC Meeting Minutes, 1998).

Welfare Activist  For purposes of this study, a welfare activist is a person familiar with the welfare system, either as a recipient, or as one who has represented members of the welfare community in some unofficial capacity, for example, educating new members through an informal communication network, or speaking up at public meeting on the behalf of persons not willing or able to voice their opinions.

Entry-level job  For this study, any job that would allow a low-skilled, uneducated, or novice worker to enter the workforce. Typically, these jobs would require a relatively high level of physical activity, often with only a few repetitive tasks; would require few verbal or computational skills; and could usually be accomplished with a minimum of interaction with co-workers.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Public welfare programs in America have been formalized since 1647, when in the first session of its colonial legislature, Rhode Island adopted the Elizabethan Poor Laws which had evolved in England over the previous two hundred years, and embraced the principle of public responsibility for the poor. Welfare reform efforts are recorded as early as 1662, when the Act of Settlement added a residency requirement for recipients of public assistance, and allowed town officials to physically (and against their will if necessary) return vagrants to their legal place of residence even if they had not applied for aid (Axinn & Levin, 1975). Ever since, welfare and welfare reform have been major parts of the American political and social fabric.

This chapter begins with a view of welfare as a social and cultural concept, then offers broad pictures of the genesis and growth of the American welfare system and of the continuing efforts to reform the welfare system. The chapter then discusses some characteristics of welfare recipients. The literature review concludes with an exploratory look at present day relationships between employers and welfare recipients, many of whom are being forced off welfare and back to work as a result of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996.
Theory of Social Welfare

Whether it is called welfare, public aid, social assistance, supplemental income or any number of other names, the concept of helping those who cannot help themselves is essentially a human trait. In any society, there are members who haven't the means or methods to be self-sufficient or to provide support for themselves or their families. If a society views itself as civilized, righteous and caring about the well-being of its members, seldom will disputes exist about the responsibility of caring for the “worthy” poor. Widows, children, the aged, the infirm, and the disabled have generally been considered as “worthy” poor. In most societies military veterans have long been treated as a special class, deserving of public assistance. In early America, a country whose very birth resulted from a desire to pursue religious principles and being my “brother’s keeper” could often mean the difference between living or dying, public welfare was not only for the common good, it was the Christian thing to do. Various biblical teachings refer often to religious implications of public aid, for example Mason (1996), quotes Deuteronomy 24:19 ff concerning harvesting of crops, “...it seems likely, therefore, that they were intended primarily for weaker families or individuals. Gleanings and corners of fields were to be left ungathered and unharvested for the poor, especially the widows, orphans, and sojourners....” (p. 159).

Emergence of the Welfare State

For many followers of cultural and social concepts, politics, not religion, is the real reason that welfare systems come into existence. For welfare theorists, a rather fine line
separates the discussion about whether welfare is part of a larger battle between the haves and the have-nots, or whether welfare systems are a natural, evolutionary process that accompany the growth of society and politics. Just as people’s political views differ, so do their views differ about welfare programs, and these conflicting interpretations are another reason for the complexity of the American welfare system. Drew (1996) offered several different explanations about how welfare systems can emerge in a society, and how they can be perpetuated. Drew’s political theories fall into two broad categories: class conflict and evolution. Class conflict and evolution are then further divided into three schools of thought.

The first of the conflict-oriented theories is electoral competition, which promotes the idea that welfare systems are primarily redistributive in nature and arise from the ability of the lower-class to get what they need by utilizing all the regular channels available in a two-party political system. High voter turnout, urban representation, and strong government leaders are typical of this system, and the reason the system works is because the have-nots have learned to play one political candidate against another. This system wouldn’t work nearly as well in a one-party system, since an incumbent probably wouldn’t need the votes of a small and otherwise ineffective group.

The second conflict-oriented theory involves the organization of the working class into “cause” groups such as labor unions, churches, co-ops, or agricultural granges. Such voluntary organizations, where there is a lot of member participation, tend to foster pro welfare-state ideologies and big spending (Wilensky, as cited in Gensler, 1996).
Mass insurgency, the third and final conflict theory, explains that although welfare programs are, doubtless, desired by the poor it is actually the rich who establish welfare programs in order to keep the poor in line. Enforcement of work norms, repression of the lower class, and preservation of public order are the concepts of this theory. Proponents point out that relief programs are instituted or rapidly expanded during occasional periods of civil disorder, and are eliminated or trimmed back when order is restored. Expansive relief programs are designed to mute civil disobedience, while restrictive programs are instituted to reinforce work norms (Piven & Cloward, as cited in Gensler, 1996). Durman (as cited in Gensler, 1996) believes that increases in welfare spending can be also traced to factors that precede social unrest, for example increased activity of population segments like the black population in the early 1960s, or changes in eligibility requirements and the increase in female heads of household. According to Durman, the have-nots, in reality have very little influence over the welfare state by any means, including political action, interest groups, or mass disorder.

Evolutionary theories on the emergence of welfare states include the following three ideas; modernization, diffusion, and social learning. According to the modernization theory, there are four reasons for the emergence of a formal welfare state;

1. increased productivity actually supports a larger dependent population,
2. increased urbanization and industrialization result in worker dislocations that require stabilization,
3. advanced technology requires skilled, educated workers and,
4. greater economic interdependence requires greater economic security.
At the heart of this theory is the fact that as people move out of a self-sufficient agrarian society, many of the services that used to be done by community or family groups are now being done by governmental agencies.

Diffusion, the second evolutionary theory, explains that welfare states and the administration of welfare states are often a result of a “me-too” attitude when lesser developed communities follow examples set by more developed communities. Occasionally, community political systems may be so rigidly structured that adoption of new practices is done with little foresight as to consequences, and less room to change after adoption. As could be expected, public welfare programs developed as a result of diffusion might be ineffective since what seems appropriate for one (leader) community may be quite inappropriate for another (follower) community. During the Progressive Era (1890s-1920s) when social reform activity was at its zenith in America, Europe too, was experiencing many of the same social and cultural changes as the United States, including the emergence of public welfare programs. Proponents of this theory believe that through diffusion, America adopted some of the European system of social insurance, particularly worker’s compensation programs and mothers’ pension programs.

Social learning is the final theory on the emergence of welfare states, and portrays the perpetuation of welfare programs essentially as learning by our mistakes. Welfare programs arise as a result of administrators and individual activists reacting to social changes, and more critically, to the perceived failures of current policies. According to Helco (as cited in Gensler, 1996) “policy was one beat behind the rhythm of events, forever remedying the defects perceived to be emerging from the previous policy change.”
(p. 12). A sentiment echoed by Lovejoy (as cited in Gensler, 1996) on the subject of child welfare reform, "We are a great people for correcting big abuses, but we have no interest at all in keeping the abuse from arriving. We do not pass good fire laws till the whole town is swept away." (p 18).

American culture and society have evolved from their agrarian beginnings, through the industrial revolution and into the current age of service and information. So too, has welfare changed, and like most social concepts, welfare programs and policies can be viewed as cyclical—depending, for example on national or world economies--or as generational events that tend to wax and wane according to society's view of itself and its responsibility to members of the society at large. While most Americans would agree on the principle of social welfare, opinions vary greatly on the practice of social welfare. Debates on welfare often focus on two general themes: the purpose of welfare, and the effective administration of welfare programs. How societies view the purpose of welfare programs depends largely on how they view the benefit recipients. If people are thought to be basically lazy and indolent, the purpose of welfare is more likely to be of a punitive nature, aimed at getting individuals back to work through training programs or work incentive programs. If, however, welfare recipients are viewed as helpless victims, thrust into poverty by an unjust or racist economic system, then the purpose of welfare may be to facilitate individual movement through the system or to make accommodations for individuals thought to be downtrodden, deprived, or unjustly discriminated against.
Poverty

Collins (1996) presents three distinct theories about causes underlying poverty and how each would differ in the matter of program design and administration. The first poverty theory, known as the "individual/cultural deficiency model" explains that poverty is caused by the shortcomings of the poor, themselves, and is characterized by alcoholism, long-term welfare dependency, and family disintegration. Welfare programs relative to this theory include limited benefits to discourage dependence, and programs that would rehabilitate, train and educate in order to instill good work habits and appropriate behavior. This model would be applicable for most of America's history up until the 1930s, and again in the late 1990s.

The second poverty theory, the "reformist/environmental reality model" identifies the cause of poverty as economic depression, which is characterized by long-term unemployment as a result of changes in workforce, or relocation of jobs. Response programs for this model would seek to coordinate and redistribute resources and services. As in the Great Depression, these programs would provide income supplements, minimum-wage laws and work-guarantee programs.

Collins' third poverty theory, the "structural/discrimination model" recognizes poverty as the result of lowered social status and the redistribution of rights in the political, social and economic structure of society. This model may be the most useful to society because it provides a low-wage, flexible work force. Response programs for this model, as they did in the 1960s, would include comprehensive work designs, industrial job
development to eliminate low social status, and legislation to remove racial and gender
inequalities and provide equal access to the system.

Table 2

Causes of Poverty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collins</th>
<th>Poverty Theory</th>
<th>Harpham &amp; Scotch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual/Cultural Deficiency Model</td>
<td>Individual moral inadequacy. People are poor because they lack motivation, are lazy or are otherwise ill prepared to compete in the marketplace. Welfare programs are set up to be punitive, with fewer benefits, and to force recipients back into the workplace.</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CDC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformist Environmental Reality Model</td>
<td>Individual is a victim of the system. Capitalist economy is inherently unfair, with too few jobs that provide too little income. Welfare programs are set up to restructure society and to provide more benefits that will ease the plight of the poor.</td>
<td>Radical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ERR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Discrimination Model</td>
<td>Poverty is the result of fundamental social inequalities, lack of access to the system. Welfare programs set up to reestablish individual rights, provide work programs, and pass legislation to remove gender and racial barriers and provide equal access to the system.</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SDL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (continued)

**Causes of Poverty**


Harpham & Scotch (1989), present three ideological perspectives of poverty which parallel Collins’ poverty theories, but are introduced in more political undertones — conservative, liberal, and radical. By examining major welfare legislation beginning in the early 1960s’ to the present, one can get a sense not only of the politics of the day, a la Harpham and Scotch, but also of the social mood regarding the purpose of welfare, a la Collins.

Table 2 compares Collins’ ideas with Harpham & Scotch’s concept of poverty. Because these six theoretical can rather easily be applied to both social and to political concepts have been combined and are referred to in later sections as the CDC model (cultural deficiency / conservative), the ERR model (environmental reality / radical), and the SDL model (structural discrimination / liberal).

**The American Welfare System**

1600s to 1860s

Misconceptions often exist that formalized welfare programs are relatively new in America, but in fact, welfare principles and practices were a part of life in the earliest
American settlements. Elizabethan Poor Laws, which stressed public responsibility for the poor, had been codified in England as early as 1601 and brought to America by colonists in the 1600s. Colonial welfare policies and practices were often designed more for protection of the public than for protection of the needy. Public aid policy was governed by the basic tenants of local responsibility for care, family responsibility for care, and a residency requirement of legal settlement. Centralized government in the early colonial period was minimal, so any type of public relief was the responsibility of each settlement.

Low productivity and the great need for laborers in the colonies meant that everyone had to be productive in order for the community to survive. Because there was generally so little in public coffers, the family and relatives of sick or disabled citizens were their primary source of support. A great deal of unspoken stigma was the reward for families that could not care for their own, and the Puritan work ethic of the time served to minimize the need for public aid. While poverty could not, in itself, be considered a reason for "unworthiness", taking from the public dole would suggest that one was in a "diminished state of grace." Not only was receiving public aid frowned upon, but the religious attitudes of the day suggested that giving too much to charity actually contributed to the decline of society by fostering laziness in the community. So, while giving within reason was encouraged, it was done more for the salvation of the rich than out of real concern for the poor (Axinn & Levin, 1975). The dominant theory of the period held that if people, or families were inclined toward poverty, it was a result of their own lack of effort, and not due to economic factors.
Families that could not care for themselves were thought to be both physically and morally dangerous, and social custom dictated that the community, and the family, were better off with poor families being dismantled. Children were often taken from poor families in an effort to save the children from learning, and perpetuating, parental failures. Children would be placed as indentured servants to farmers or as apprentices to business owners so that they might learn a trade, while at the same time contribute to the public good. Drew (1996) explains that the Puritan’s view of childhood development was based on a belief of infant depravity, and that infants were born sinners and liars who needed to be taught adult ways and proper habits as soon as possible in order that they become productive citizens. In colonial America, children working as indentured servants or as wards of the state were a major source of labor. Very few children attended school since formal education was deemed unnecessary as long as the child was learning a useful trade. Parents, too, were affected by Puritan ideology, and were just as likely as the children to be farmed out as laborers to the lowest bidder who agreed to care for the pauper and put him or her to work. As population and wealth centers developed in New England, paupers might be sentenced to urban work houses (also known as almshouses), public correction facilities, or poor farms, where proper punishment and hard labor could be administered (Axinn & Levin, 1975). Almshouses were intended to be places of mercy, a refuge where paupers could restructure their life and become constructive citizens, but in reality most almshouses were places of degradation, filth, and sorrow.

Contractors and public providers offered the public needy either “indoor” relief - care provided within institutions or homes other than one’s own, or “outdoor” relief - cash
payments to persons whose poverty resulted from illness, age, or disability. Outdoor relief was provided in the recipient's own home, and although recipients of outdoor relief were considered to be "worthy" of aid, the stigma of poverty often remained, as demonstrated by a 1718 statute of the Province of Pennsylvania which made it obligatory that every person receiving public relief,

"...upon the shoulder of the right sleeve...in open and visible manner, wear...a large Roman P. together with the first letter of the name of the county, city or place whereof such poor person is an inhabitant, cut either in red or blue cloth, and by the overseers of the poor it shall be directed and appointed" (Axinn & Levin, 1975, p. 14).

While the public poor continued to rely on extended families, churches, and local governments for support, disabled soldiers and sailors fared no such fate as they had been recognized in 1593 by the English "Acte of Reliefs for Souldiours" as a special class of recipient and provided relief as a right on the basis of their wartime contribution to society. By 1777, all but one colony had enacted similar legislation concerning veterans. The significant difference in military welfare was its administration by the Federal (colonial) government, and the relative lack of social stigma that was associated with private poverty. The system of administering military welfare proved to be so popular that it was extended from the military to certain other classes of "unsettled poor" and eventually opened the door for Federal administration of all social welfare programs.

During the first half of the 18th century, national expansion, trade, and economy flourished in America, and by the 1750s American culture had become quite different than...
the English feudal system which bore the original poor laws. Throughout New England, and later in the southern colonies of Virginia, North Carolina and South Carolina, English Poor Laws continued to dominate public welfare practices, but increasingly came under fire not only because of the severe social penalties associated with poverty, but also because of opposition by influential American policy makers and politicians. The New England states had become an industrial and manufacturing center while the southern states, with plentiful slave labor were solidly established as an agricultural power, growing year-round crops such as tobacco and cotton. As northern and southern economies continued to polarize into industrial and agricultural respectively, other events were occurring in the country to change the face of America.

By the 1820s, spreading economic uncertainty in the northern states resulted in more children than ever were being placed in “poorhouses” and institutions for the care of paupers. In addition, thousands of immigrants, unable to provide for themselves or their families had been subject to indentured service which effectively resulted in their children either becoming wards of the state, or being forced to survive on their own. According to an 1852 police report, more than 10,000 orphaned, abandoned, or runaway children were roaming the streets of New York City (Bremmer, 1956). The Children’s Aid Society of New York was founded in 1853 in an effort to improve the ways in which poor, orphaned, or abandoned children were treated. Almshouses, originally designed to be safe havens for the worthy poor, had become something quite different. In 1857, a report by the New York State Select Senate Committee to Visit Charitable and Penal Institutions (as cited in Axinn & Levin, 1975) described many almshouses as, “...badly constructed, ill-arranged,
ill-warmed, and ill-ventilated. The rooms are crowded with inmates; and the air, particularly in the sleeping apartments, is very noxious, and to casual visitors, almost insufferable.” The report states further, “The evidence...exhibits such a filth, nakedness, licentiousness, general bad morals, and disregard for religion and the most common religious observances, as well as of gross neglect of the most ordinary comforts and decencies of life, as if published in detail would disgrace the State and shock humanity.” (p. 49, 50). The fact that farm labor in the west was in great demand proved to be a partial solution to the large numbers of children under state government care, and between 1853 and 1864, nearly 5000 orphaned or abandoned children were sent to work on Western farms, and during the decade after the war, nearly double that number of children were sent westward.

By 1850, slaves and free blacks made up nearly thirty percent of the southern population, and although slavery had no direct effect upon public welfare institutions or voluntary aid providers, its affect upon the country was evidenced by a great deal of social and economic reform activity. Former slaves and free blacks were prohibited from receiving any kind of public aid, and were expected to provide for their own in times of hardship.

Westward expansion to the Pacific coast was complete by 1860, and the northern and southern borders were fixed. Between 1790, the year of the first official United States census, and 1860, the combination of native births, territorial acquisitions, and mass migrations to the United States, primarily from Ireland and Germany, increased the US...
population from nearly 4 million to almost 32 million, with the largest increase occurring between 1830 and 1860, when the population increased nearly 6 times.

Millions of immigrants, uneducated and unskilled, arrived in the United States in dire need of assistance, and public welfare providers were extremely hard pressed to help all those who needed help.

In the early 1860s, northern and southern states alike were overburdened with unemployment and reeling from three major economic depressions which had occurred between 1815 and 1859. Public welfare programs were still administered by individual states, with the Federal government providing aid only to military veterans, some freed slaves, and a number of Indian tribes whose native lands had been taken over by the government.
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**Figure 1.** US Population Growth, 1790-1860.
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Despite economic hardship and difficult times, by the mid-1800s, the American population, whether native-born or immigrants, began to view their successes not as divine providence, but as a result of their own hard work. They believed they had the power to change the future and accomplish their individual dreams. This was a vastly different view from the colonial Puritans who believed that man was predestined to condemnation and that their collective toil served only to minimize their evil ways. Not only was the Puritan work ethic rapidly being replaced by an entrepreneurial spirit, but the Puritan view of children as sinners was disappearing. A large portion of European immigrants who had come to America by the hundreds of thousands during the late 1700s and early 1800s were Catholics whose customs favored large families and held the belief that children needed to experience all the playfulness of childhood before they could grow into responsible adults. In this new society, children were be nurtured, coveted and perhaps most important of all, educated.

By the second half of the nineteenth century, waves of social consciousness were sweeping the country. A new and powerful group of citizens known as the “Middle Class” rose up in favor of egalitarianism and universal education, while at the same time influential women’s rights groups promoted suffrage, temperance, better care for the poor, humane treatment of the insane, child-saving, rehabilitation of criminals, and of course, an end to slavery (Axinn & Levin, 1975). Nearly two hundred years after its founding, America was increasingly a society that had no real need, or desire, to maintain the English Poor Laws of the early colonists.
The Civil War did not, by itself, bring about great changes in the public welfare system, but before the war ended in 1865, Federally administered veterans' programs were inundated with hundreds of thousands of wounded and disabled soldiers, as well as the widows and orphans of nearly 719,000 Union dead. Initially, Confederate soldiers were not deemed “worthy” of federal aid, beyond the provision of artificial limbs and some minor medical care. Programs for Union veterans expanded rapidly after 1865, and by 1890 fully 34% of the entire Federal budget was set aside for veteran’s aid and pension programs (Berkowitz & McQuaid, 1988). In addition, veteran’s aid programs remained the largest single expenditure (except for debt service) of Federal funds every year from 1885 to 1897. The Pension Act of 1890 was the first federal legislation which provided pensions for veterans or their widows and orphans solely on the basis of need, regardless of whether or not the veteran had been wounded or disabled.

Unemployment and economic chaos ruled all in the post-Civil War South. Confederate veterans fared as badly as the public poor. Although the Amnesty Act of 1873 restored civil rights to most citizens of the former Confederate states, nearly 500 former military officers were still deemed as traitors to the Union. Certainly, in the southern states they were considered “worthy” but veteran welfare programs were severely overburdened and funding was minimal in the post-war economy. Ex-soldiers and their families joined thousands of unemployed “poor whites” and free blacks as they wandered throughout the south, surviving by nearly any manner possible. The vagrancy provisions of the Poor Laws were reinstituted, and anyone, though mostly blacks, unlucky
enough to be branded a vagrant was often sent to a work camp or prison construction gang for as long as ten years or more. Even though most northern states had voluntarily outlawed slavery in the late 1700s, and President Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation in 1863 had freed all remaining slaves in America, southern blacks, in general, continued to be excluded from public assistance from any federal, state, or private source. Although slavery had been officially abolished in 1865 by the passage of the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution, many southern plantation owners and farmers wanted blacks to remain dependent in order to keep them working in the cotton fields and on the tobacco plantations. Freed blacks were allowed to travel to the northern states, though few did because the majority of jobs that blacks would have been allowed to do had already taken by European immigrants. Unlike the south, the north had maintained the capacity to organize and administer welfare programs for “worthy” recipients and beginning in 1865, many of the freed blacks received assistance from America’s first Federal welfare agency, the Freedmen’s Bureau. The agency provided only food, housing, and clothing prior to 1867 when they acquired the power to appropriate Federal funds for cash payments. The Freedman’s Bureau continued to be the major welfare provider for both northern and southern states from 1865 until 1872, when public outrage against redistribution of northern money to southern states resulted in the agency’s demise (Axinn & Levin, 1975). This brief period was one of the few times in American history that America’s black population had been allowed to receive public assistance, and after the Freedman’s Bureau was disbanded, it would be nearly half a century before blacks would once again receive public assistance.
Agriculture too, had been seriously impacted by the Civil War and in the decades following the war, major changes evolved in America’s farming industry. Prior to the war, farms in the south averaged nearly 352 acres but by 1900 had fallen to 108 acres (Axinn & Levin, 1975). Cash crops in the south, primarily cotton and tobacco were still grown on the larger farms, but farms operated by freed slaves and blacks averaged only 51 acres, recalling the post-war proposal that southern plantations be broken up and that blacks and poor whites should each receive “forty acres and a mule.” (W.W. Jennings, as cited in Axinn & Levin, 1975, p. 78). Many blacks and poor whites became tenant farmers and were primarily involved in subsistence farming. Poor tenant farmers were prone to disaster both from natural events, and from economic events and often found themselves in need of assistance from whatever source was available. The system of tenant farmers existed for decades in the southern and western states, and produced many welfare policies for the protection of farmers. Post-war agricultural problems in the south and west were largely responsible for elevating the Department of Agriculture to a Cabinet level department of the Federal government in 1889.

For business leaders, the decades following the Civil War were a time for making fortunes. Industry boomed in the north, and the south was in the midst of reconstruction. Westward expansion was virtually complete and railroad systems reached into every corner of America. The acquisition of fertile farm lands and the discovery of valuable minerals and ores had created vast new markets for national as well as international trade. The world had become a marketplace to take advantage of.
Few fortunes were acquired however without a high cost to others, and in the late 1800s and early 1900s, the price was often paid by factory workers, including huge numbers of women and children. According to the 1940 United States Census (as cited in Axinn & Levin, 1975), in 1900 the American workforce of nearly twenty-nine million persons included more than two million children aged ten to fifteen years and almost five million women over the age of fifteen. Child labor laws were practically non-existent, and the plight of child workers showed few signs of improvement. Working conditions for children were described in 1906 thus: “The air...was laden with lint, glass particles, sawdust, alkaline dust, and particles of coal. The other hazards...included dyes, poisonous lead-based paints, and phosphorous poisoning, as well as extremes of temperature and humidity.” Spargo (cited in H. Gensler, 1996), continued, “No publisher would dare print the language current in an average factory.” (p. 38) In addition to difficult working conditions for children, the traditional roles of woman as wife and mother were becoming less well defined as more women joined the urban work force.

Reform issues regarding child labor were adamantly rejected in the south and in the west, where child labor could make the difference between a successful harvest or no harvest at all. Although many of the southern states publicly stated that their objections to compulsory school attendance were related variously to poverty — the kids couldn’t afford school clothes, or to racism — Negroes had no need for education, or to a general feeling that illiteracy was at home in the south, Drew (1996) cites a post-World War I study by the National Child Labor committee (NCLC) that stated “...cotton production, for example, involved plenty of light work for children, such as planting the cotton seed
and weeding the fields. Children, moreover, were nearly perfect cotton-harvesting machines because cotton is light to carry and because the plant grows close to the ground. While an adult might be able to carry a heavier sack, he or she would also be forced to stoop to pick the cotton. A child could harvest cotton standing up.” (pg. 164). Tobacco, the second largest cash crop in the south, similarly depended upon child labor. The NCLC report goes on to say about tobacco, “As in cotton farming, tobacco production was ‘family labor.’ Once again, children were used everywhere: “Children commonly work as many hours as do the older persons - from sunrise to sunset- planting, hoeing, cultivating, worming, suckering, topping, cutting, spiking, housing, and stripping.” (pg. 165).

According to Drew, whatever guise the southern farmers put on their objections, it was very evident that their real goal was to keep children working in the fields, no matter what.

Organized labor was also in a state of flux during the late 19th century, as numerous organizations, including the Knights of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the American Federation of Labor fought to gain control of labor unions. Labor leaders believed that workers should share in the huge fortunes that were being made at their expense. A great deal of animosity existed between labor and management, and the labor strike had become the weapon of choice for labor leaders attempting to improve the position of the American worker. Blacks were seldom permitted or trained to perform skilled craft or trade jobs that could provide a living wage and they continued to be excluded from most welfare programs. As a group, they were further disengaged from the general public as industry managers often took advantage of their plight and used them as strike breakers and low-cost scab workers. At the beginning
of the 20th century, America was ill-suited for modern governance (Showronek, 1982; Robertson & Judd, 1989), and during this time of social upheaval, military veterans were about the only group not in turmoil.

At the end of the 19th century, the federal government was not yet a major player in social welfare programs and the responsibility for citizen welfare was still in the hands of state, local, and private organizations. Three distinctly different, but interrelated groups were at the forefront of welfare reform, and their efforts were to have far-reaching effects on the American welfare system.

The three groups — big business, organized labor, and women's advocacy groups—all wanted a degree of social security for their respective groups, but their relationships were often antagonistic. As a result, the selfish promotion of their individual interests resulted in disjointed and often contradictory welfare programs — a practice that continues into the late 1990s in America. According to Noble (1997), welfare programs in America today would be vastly more fair (and more generous) if these three early reform groups had been enlightened enough to combine their political weight at the polls.

The first influential group, big business, is described by the CDC Model from Table 2. Like a large part of society in the mid-1800s, big business generally believed that if people were poor, it was their own fault for not working hard enough. Big business was experiencing one of the most productive and lucrative periods in American history, and with few exceptions was not particularly concerned about what it took to keep their production lines going. Industrialization had provided the means and methods for corporate officers to expand beyond their own locality and, for the first time, to view the
entire world as a potential marketplace. Business had become larger and incredibly more complex, and, according to Berkowitz & McQuaid (1988), the provision of social welfare became more difficult. Business and industry generally cared more about production than about worker's rights and had developed a reputation of exploiting the working class, particularly women, children, and immigrants. To a large degree, exploitive business practices of the late 1800s and the ever-widening gap between managers and workers gave rise to the second influential reform group of the progressive era—organized labor.

Organized labor, described by the ERR Model from Table 2, believed that people were poor because there were too few jobs that paid too little money, and that capitalist societies were basically unfair. Organized unions had learned to use the labor strike very effectively against business and industry, and even though public sentiment and legal opinion in the early 1900s were generally against organized labor, the economic impact of a prolonged labor strike could not be ignored. Politicians took seriously the disruptions that a union could cause, and even such radical events as Chicago's Haymarket Square riot in 1886, in which a bomb suspected of being planted by the Knights of Labor killed 7 policemen and wounded 70 others could not dissuade popular opinion against the growing inequities in the workplace. President Grover Cleveland was moved to comment "...[t]he gulf between employers and the employed is constantly widening, and classes are rapidly forming, one comprising the very rich and powerful, while in the other are found the toiling poor." (G. Grob as cited in Berkowitz & McQuaid, (1988). pg. 13). Unions vigorously promoted worker's rights, safe working conditions, shorter working days, more benefits, higher pay, and retirement pensions. The twin concepts of "social
insurance”, and “minimum standards” were common themes of reform groups and were forerunners in workmen’s compensation programs and minimum wage laws. Although early minimum wage programs failed to achieve their objectives, workman’s compensation continued to be a major issue for organized labor, and their concerns were echoed by public sentiment. In the colonial days of America, under the concept of noblesse oblige, the master of a servant had the legal responsibility of continued care if the servant was disabled while in service to the master. This concept had largely disappeared in the early days of the industrial revolution, but became one of the cornerstones of the workmen’s compensation movement, as business and industry managers continued to deny their responsibility for the care of injured workers. By the late 19th century, courts of law were awarding injured workers huge sums in compensation for work-related injuries (Berkowitz & McQuaid, 1988). As workers began to see this as a way of “getting even” with uncaring employers, injury claims and litigation costs skyrocketed. Business and industry soon realized that self-administered compensation programs were cheaper, and more effective, and by the early 1900s, largely in self-defense, they had become leaders in establishing and providing social welfare programs for their employees. Federal involvement in the issue of workmen’s compensation resulted in the passage of the Federal Employee’s Liability Act of 1906. By 1911 at least ten states had enacted their own workmen’s compensation programs, with the rest of the country soon to follow (Axinn & Levin, 1975).

Perhaps as important as their new leadership in social reforms was the notion that successful private businesses, particularly the railroads, were becoming operational and
administrative models for reforms in the government sector. Scandals in the late 1800s involving bribery, government land sales and business payoffs to government agencies had severely undermined the credibility of the government, and the public was calling for reforms in how the government carried out their responsibilities. According to Berkowitz & McQuaid (1988) large private companies employed far more persons and spent much more money than even the largest and wealthiest state governments. Largely as a result of the Industrial Revolution of the late 1800s, private businesses had learned to successfully operate in huge, vertical bureaucracies, and many of these businesses served as models for government restructuring in the early 1900s.

Women's organizations, the SDL Model from Table 2, were the third influential group of their time, and they believed that people were poor because they had no access to the system, and that the system needed to be changed to allow easier access to services and programs. Women's organizations had become a powerful force in the workplace and sought to ease the terrible conditions associated with child labor, lack of education, care of the elderly and infirm, and other practices that might logically be associated with the nurturing character of women. Ironically, saving the children by accomplishing child labor legislation was one of the principal reasons for the escalation in social services that still make up a large part of late 20th century welfare programs.

The Progressive Era --- 1890s to 1920s

The thirty-year period at the end of the 19th century became known as the Progressive Era and produced more welfare legislation than any previous century. A major
aspect of the social reform associated with the Progressive Era was related, directly or indirectly, to society's desire to curb the evils of child labor, and to enforce compulsory school attendance. Between 1900 and 1920, stricter child labor legislation resulted in the most significant reductions in the numbers of child laborers in American history. Non-agricultural workers, ages 10-15 years old dropped from 686,000 child workers in 1900, to 414,000 in 1920 (Drew, 1996).

In addition to child labor reform, and some historians believe that because of changes in child labor laws, some form of social insurance was required for widows and single mothers. Throughout most of the 19th century, children had continued to work in factories and businesses, and the money they brought in, meager though it may have been, kept many families out of the poorhouse. Historian Robert Bremmer (cited in Gensler, H. 1996). remarked "One of the major difficulties of child labor reform in the early twentieth century was the cultural and economic gap between middle-class reformers and working-class parents. The reformers...may have underestimated the economic necessity of child labor among large segments of the working class." (p. 59).

Largely as a result of women's group activities, and the dismal reputations of almshouses and poor-farms, public sentiment was beginning to reflect the belief that keeping families together was important, and one of the best ways to keep a family together was by providing public assistance for single mothers with dependent children. Mother's Assistance programs and Widow's Pensions were issues that women's groups had been struggling to achieve and in 1911 Illinois enacted the Funds to Parents Act, which provided public funds for the care of dependent children in their own homes. By
1913 twenty states had passed similar programs, and by 1921, forty states had public assistance programs for mothers with dependent children. The importance of these welfare programs cannot be underestimated. Even though the federal government would not become a major provider for many years, it was the beginning of a major social movement to shift responsibility for public assistance away from private charities into the public domain.

With the accomplishments of worker’s compensation programs and Widow’s Pensions, social reform movements slowed considerably. America entered World War I in 1917 and the country’s attention was drawn to outside events. Pressure for social reform had been further reduced by the virtual lack of immigration in the 1920s. During and immediately after the war, social reform, for the first time in decades, was almost non-existent.

Creating the Modern Welfare State --- 1920s to 1990s

For most of America, the 1920s were a time of prosperity and growth. Credit and installment buying brought Americans numerous consumer goods and despite a recession in 1921, the standard of living went up for most people. Automobiles, radios, home electricity, silk stockings, and motion pictures captured America’s attention and business was booming. Poverty, most felt, was becoming a thing of the past. The cure was not in welfare payments, minimum wages, or social insurance, but in participation in business. What was good for business was good for the country (Axinn & Levin, 1975). The public sentiment was that scientific management would cure the ills of business, and social
workers, using the new psychoanalytical methods of Sigmund Freud would reform personality defects. The 18th Amendment to the Constitution established prohibition in January, 1919.

In 1917 the federal government, with the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act had quietly displayed its new attitude toward funding public welfare programs, when it allocated federal funds for vocational education programs. The act had been criticized by some congressmen as a threat to local self-sufficiency, since education programs had typically been funded by state and local agencies. After the war, veteran’s programs were increased to meet the need of returning veterans when in 1918 the government once again funded vocational rehabilitation programs, and infant / maternal hygiene programs. Thus began the Federal government’s official transition into the public welfare business.

Great Depression and the New Deal.

Despite the generally good economic times of the 1920s, ominous warnings about future disaster were present in the American society. Not only was the stock market inflated, but Americans had vastly overextended their ability to pay their debts by purchasing on credit, and very few families had saved any money. In 1929, one of the richest years in history, a study by the Brookings Institute found that almost 6 percent of American families made less than $1000 per year, and nearly 80 percent of all American families made less than $3000 per year. Nearly 40 percent of all American families had no money saved, and when the stock market crashed in October of 1929, they had no reserves to fall back on (Axinn & Levin, 1975). Unemployment, which had stabilized at 4
percent in 1929, quickly escalated, and by 1933 nearly 25%, 13 million workers, were unemployed. The 12 years that followed have never been equaled in American history for the kinds of changes that were brought upon society.

One of the most significant changes which occurred was how people viewed poverty. By and large, poverty in America had generally been viewed as a result of laziness, or a lack of motivation (refer to table 2, CDC model). But suddenly, for millions of citizens poverty was a reality. It was happening to them, and they were helpless to prevent it. They were victims of the system, and poverty was no longer viewed as laziness, but as a system gone wrong. Welfare programs under the SDL Model in Table 2 are designed to create work programs and pass legislation that allows equal access to the system.

In the early 1930s President Hoover, a Republican, was reluctant to actually provide funds or institute major welfare programs, and was largely involved in orchestrating cooperative welfare programs between state and private organizations. In 1933, however, Democratic President Franklin Roosevelt, felt no such need for governmental restraint, and promptly began to provide federal public work programs such as the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) and the Public Works Administration (PWA). The PWA, designed as a temporary measure to get through the Depression, provided an average of 2 million jobs between 1935 and 1940 (F. F. Piven & R. A Cloward, cited in C. Leman, 1980). Public aid programs were not popular with business—it meant higher operating costs for them, nor with organized labor—price fixing and a relaxation of anti-trust laws threatened union membership. It became necessary to pass legislation in order
to get cooperation from both groups and in June 1933, the National Recovery Act (NRA) was passed.

Business resisted governmental influence in business and successfully created the Business Advisory Council (BAC) to oversee corporate interest in the national recovery. Organized labor was adamant about being involved in restructuring society because it offered a golden opportunity to increase union membership, and in 1933, as a way of pacifying labor unrest, the government created the National Labor Board which eventually became the National Labor Relations Board.

The NRA had allowed private business to administer social welfare programs, particularly to the most important segment of the working population—the industrial workers—but despite the highest caliber professional management, the NRA failed to maintain sufficient levels of social welfare, and by early 1935, wracked by disorganization and in-fighting, the NRA had been virtually dismantled (Berkowitz & McQuaid, 1988). Failure of the NRA left a vacuum in the social welfare system, and the government was forced to become the major provider of public welfare. Their answer to the problem was the Social Security Act of 1935. The Act was to become one of the most significant reform acts ever passed in America, and put the Federal government at the forefront of providing for the public welfare.

According to Berkowitz & McQuaid (1988), the fourth program, old-age insurance was the most revolutionary, because there was virtually no private or state involvement in the administration of the program. Payments to the aged were handled
completely by the Federal government, and based on the idea that old people, not unlike military veterans, had fought hard for survival, and deserved respect for their efforts.

Table 3

**Social Security Act of 1935**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title II</td>
<td>Federal Old Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance Benefits (1935, 1939, 1956).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title III</td>
<td>Grants to States for Unemployment Compensation Administration (1935).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IV</td>
<td>Grants to States for Aid to Dependent Children (1935).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Title X  | Grants to States for Aid to Blind (1935).  
| Title XIV | Grants to States for Aid to Permanently and Totally Disabled (1950)*                                           |
| Title XVI | Supplemental Security Income for the Aged, Blind, and Disabled (1972).                                              |
| Title XVIII | Health Insurance for the Aged (1965) and Disabled (1972) --- Medicare.                              |
| Title XIX | Grants to States for Medical Assistance Programs (1965) --- Medicaid.                                          |
| Title XX  | Grants to States for Social Services (1975).                                                                       |


*Superseded or amended by later titles of the Act.

Table 3 shows the numerous titles of the Social Security Act, which essentially established four major departments;
1. a federal-state unemployment system in which federal grants were provided to individual states to maintain unemployment insurance,

2. federal grants to be given to states in order to provide assistance for needy dependent children, the blind, and elderly citizens,

3. funding for state programs of vocational rehabilitation, infant and maternal care, crippled children programs and public health programs,

4. established a system of old-age insurance.

By far the most significant aspect of the Social Security Act of 1935 was the idea that welfare and social insurance were no longer a privilege, but had become a right of citizenship. The American people now believed they were entitled to protection, and the system has never been the same since.

Despite the enactment of landmark legislation in the middle and late 1930s, large government welfare expenditures were not a major concern in the early 1940’s. America’s entry into World War II also served to draw public attention away from welfare programs. During World War II, Federal expenditures for social welfare dwindled to nearly nothing, and for a time, social aid reverted back to the private sector. The most significant legislation of the era involved, not surprisingly, military veterans. The Serviceman’s Readjustment Act of 1944 — the famous GI bill — reaffirmed America’s commitment to providing for military veterans (Axinn & Levin, 1975). Despite minor recessions in the 1950s, standards of living generally improved. Business was good again, and union membership was at an all time high. Business was happy, organized labor was happy, and government was happy. The problem of poverty, however, had not disappeared. It had
only been pushed aside as the economy improved and a renewed social awareness spoke of better things to come.

**President Johnson’s “War on Poverty”**:

In the 1960s, business was eager for increases in production and according to Keynesian economics, the best way to increase consumption was to cut taxes (Noble, 1997). Partly as a result of war production increases and partly as a result of a changing mood in the south, post-war southern states had wholeheartedly embraced mechanization. The size of white owned farms increased dramatically while black owned farms barely survived. The widespread use of machines had put many southern black farm workers out of work. Jim Crow Laws had been outlawed by federal legislation, and by the early 1960s, the south was in the midst of massive changes. Thousands of blacks migrated to the cities of the north and west, looking for work. Black urbanization became a phenomenon unequaled in black history, as blacks continued to settle in urban ghettos in most major American cities. President Kennedy, a Democrat, had cut taxes in order to stimulate consumption, and while consumption increased, the tax base that paid for social welfare programs decreased, straining the ability of government to maintain the programs. In 1964, President Johnson had declared what turned out to be a largely unsuccessful and hugely expensive “War on Poverty”. He increased the amount of social welfare spending in an effort to lift people out of poverty (Hallman, 1977). Social unrest in the black population across the nation, and high employment in black urban areas focused public attention on the plight of the black population. Blacks were seen as victims of the system,
and according to the SDL Model in Table 2, work programs, increased benefits and legislation were the cure for the black poverty problem. By the mid 1960s Social reformers had numerous incentives to demand increased welfare benefits, civil rights was a constant issue, and fears of tax increases to finance the war in Vietnam, all made for general unrest in the American population.

**Increases in the Welfare Population, 1960s-1990s.**

Governmental programs sought to end poverty or at least give poor people the tools to get out of poverty. President Johnson’s War on Poverty had resulted in the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act and creation of work programs for the disadvantaged. Job Corps, VISTA, Upward Bound, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Head Start and Operation Mainstream were some of the work programs created during Johnson’s tenure in office.

Black urbanism problems reached a peak in the early 1960s. Not only did young black men not share the work ethics of their fathers and grandfathers, but they had found little opportunity for work in the cities. Black migration from the south had become so pervasive an issue that many northern cities attempted to reinstate residency requirements for all welfare applicants. Civil rights legislation enacted in 1964 was largely an attempt to allow minorities equal access to the system (refer to the SDL model in Table 2).

In the late 1960s and early 1970s welfare debate centered on guaranteed income programs for welfare recipients and whether a or not a negative income tax (NIT) plan would reduce welfare roles (Epstein, 1993). Essentially a negative income tax program set income thresholds below which people would not have to pay taxes. Once the person
passed the threshold, income taxes would be paid on a sliding scale based on the amount of income made over the threshold. There was much concern among welfare reformers that a guaranteed income would exacerbate dependency among welfare recipients. Large scale tests in Seattle and Denver confirmed their fears of increased dependency when data clearly showed that welfare recipients and the working poor actually worked less or sought work less when they knew the income would be there whether or not they worked. Among the test group, husbands reduced their work hours by nine percent, wives reduced their work hours by twenty percent, and young unmarried males reduced their work hours by as much as 43%. Not only did labor participation decline dramatically, but the test group experienced longer periods of unemployment and a 40% increase in marriage dissolutions (D.E. Schansberg, 1996. As cited in H. Gensler (Ed.).

Federal efforts to lift people out of poverty resulted in increased governmental welfare spending during the 70s, 80s and 90s continued to escalate (see Figure 2.).

![Figure 2. Social Welfare Expenditures Under Public Programs, 1970-1993.](image)
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But far from lifting people out of poverty, welfare roles actually increased as eligibility was widened, benefits became more accessible, medical treatment became more comprehensive, and cash payments rose in response to new social programs which still viewed the poor as victims of the system. Despite all the good intentions to help the poor, Murray (as cited in H. Gensler, 1996), said of welfare programs in the 70s, 80's and 90s, "We tried to provide more for the poor and produced more poor instead. We tried to remove the barriers to escape from poverty, and inadvertently built a trap." (p. 252).

Current State of the Welfare System

The Changing Welfare Population

The liberalism of the early 60s resulted to a large degree from the New Deal and Great Society political environments that viewed the poor as victims of the system. In the late 1960s and early 1970s however, Americans began to look at poverty and welfare recipients with a renewed skepticism. Partly as a result of civil rights legislation the majority white population began to believe that the black population had achieved equality and now had as many, if not more opportunities than the white population (Hochschild, 1997, cited in C. Noble). As such, anybody, particularly blacks who remained poor were poor because they were victims of the system, but because they were lazy. By the early 70s, most whites had stopped worrying about the condition of blacks and started thinking of the impact of compulsory and compensatory policies on themselves. Most Americans began to view welfare not as legitimate care of the needy, but as handouts for the shirkers (Noble, 1997).
In addition to the shift in public perception about the poor, the changing face of the welfare recipient was having an effect on the public. Welfare roles, once made up mostly of old people and widows, had begun to reflect significant changes in American demographics. Seniors made up nearly 50% of welfare roles in the early 1950s, with single mothers, young unemployed men, and the disabled making up the other 50%.

By the late 1950s and early 1960s the majority of welfare recipients were young single men, and single mothers. Since the 1960s, single mothers with dependent children have continued to be the largest group consistently receiving welfare benefits, particularly cash payments authorized by the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC).

As a group, single mothers with dependent children receive from 50% to 70% of all cash payments made through the AFDC, which was nearly $12 million in 1980 and by 1996 had reached more than $20 million (US Census Bureau, 1998). AFDC (Aid to Families with Dependent Children), originally named ADC (Aid to Dependent Children) was created by the Social Security Act of 1935 and is but a small part of the welfare system. However, because AFDC involves payment of cash to recipients, it attracts most of the public scrutiny. In the eyes of many, giving a poor person a loaf of bread is acceptable because there is little doubt that the bread will contribute to the receiver’s well being. But giving the same person cash to buy their own bread has quite another connotation. Not only are cash payments often considered “something-for-nothing” but cash payments can be an open door for fraud or misuse of funds if the recipient is inclined instead to purchase alcohol, illegal drugs, fancy cars, jewelry or other things that taxpayers never intended as a use for their taxes.
Welfare Reform

If the American welfare system were simply a matter of providing medical care for sick, aged or disabled persons, or a matter of providing cash payments to single mothers, necessary reform would be relatively easy. Just the fact that periodic reform efforts have been ongoing for nearly three-hundred years speaks loudly about the magnitude and complexity of the American welfare system.

Programs generally not thought of as public welfare, though are in fact part of the welfare system include Social Security benefits, unemployment insurance, food stamps, Medicare, agricultural subsidies, school lunch programs, meals-on-wheels programs and housing assistance. Most of these programs face very little opposition however, because according to Lockhart (1989), these programs are linked to "...dignified efforts at self-help..." (cited in Coughlin, p. 69). Social Security pensions are paid to individuals as a result of their years of working status, unemployment compensation can only be paid after a person has worked for some time, and farmers, no matter how hard they work, may occasionally need assistance because of floods, pest infestations, or other natural events over which they have little control. Political interests of baby boomers, senior citizens, farmers and other groups who benefit from various "dignified effort" programs were often represented by powerful lobbyists. Consequently their welfare programs were seldom targeted for reform. Since the early 1960s, when welfare reform became a perennial political issue, nearly every reform program has, to a large degree, targeted the population least able to defend themselves --- single mothers with dependent children.
Current Reform under the Personal Responsibility Act

The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 had its roots in the welfare programs from the 1930s, 1960s and 1970s. Liberal social views about poverty and about welfare recipients had resulted in an explosion of public welfare programs and significant federal expenditures all the way from the Social Security Act of 1935 to President Johnson’s War on Poverty of the 1960’s, and beyond.

In the 1970s and 1980s, much like the 1670s and 1680s, American society began to view poverty and welfare recipients as basically lazy, and in accordance with the CDC model in Table 2, developed welfare programs to be punitive and to force workers into the workplace.

But in many cases, this newest round of welfare reform has not been taken lightly by welfare recipients and by some social reform groups. Under this program, the federal government plans to save the American taxpayers $54 billion over six years by allowing states to administer their own welfare programs. The Federal government used to give endless amounts of money to individual states so they could maintain their welfare programs. Under this program, the federal government now give the states “block grants”, or certain, limited amounts of money. The block grants total $3 billion, $1.5 billion for fiscal year 1998, and $1.5 billion for fiscal year 1999 (US Department of Labor, 1996). The states can use the amount any way they see fit to administer their welfare programs, albeit with a high degree of federal oversight. At the end of two years, each state must have a certain percentage of their welfare roles participating in authorized work activities (see Table 4), or face possible reduction of federal funding. Successful states are
eligible to share in a $100 million performance bonus. In addition, the block grant is all the states get, and if they don't use it wisely, they could run out of money.

Welfare reform is understandably seen differently by different people, depending on what side of the welfare fence one is on. State lawmakers, politicians, and welfare administrators generally feel that the Personal Responsibility Act is the best thing for the country. Welfare roles have been crashing all over the place (A. Bush, as cited in R. Tammmariello, The welfare revolution, 1997). Nevada state Senator M. Washington exclaimed, "I think you're seeing the tentacles of the New Deal and the Great Society unraveling. I think it's a great thing." (Tammmariello, 1997, p. 2). Those sentiments are echoed by author Thomas Wolfe (as cited in Tammmariello, 1997) who feels that people don't mind helping out once, but they can't continue to feed people every day. At some point the person has to stand up on their own two feet and make their own way. Wisconsin Governor Tommy Thompson is credited with having the toughest state reform program in America, dubbed W-2, in Wisconsin, everybody works, even the handicapped.

"Everybody will get up in the morning, get dressed and punch some sort of clock, just like the real world...Everybody can do something, Everybody should do something. Work is good. the only way you get out of poverty is by working." (p. 2).

On the other side of the welfare argument, many welfare recipients, some social reform groups, and some civil rights groups believe that states have gone too far in their efforts to reduce welfare. The impetus is so strong for individual states to reduce their welfare roles that many states, particularly New York and Wisconsin, have been accused
of perpetuating the return to slavery (Krueger & Seley, 1996). Not only do opponents feel workfare is akin to slavery, but the kinds of entry level jobs welfare people get don’t pay the bills. Many workfare participants are demanding the same pay and benefits that non-welfare employees get for the same job (Jacobs, 1997). In addition, once welfare recipients get a job, regardless of how little it might pay, they will also face the loss of other federally subsidized services, particularly day care and food stamps. That will very likely move welfare recipients into the “working poor” class, which by most accounts is far worse off than welfare recipients (Albelda, 1996; Miranne & Young, 1998; Uchitelle, 1997).

Another issue of the Personal Responsibility Act is that of enforcing child support payments. According to some sources, in 1997, over $34 billion in child support was never collected from non-custodial parents (NCPs). While new funding exists specifically to identify and train non-custodial parents, mostly fathers (Focus on fatherhood, 1998), those non-custodial parents are not going to come forward to get training money if it means that their wages will be garnisheed for child-support.

Of particular note in the welfare controversy is the number of former, full-time workers who have been and will probably continue to be put out of work or have their hours reduced regular. In new York City, stories abound of health care and hospital workers having their hours and benefits reduced, or even being replaced altogether by unpaid welfare workers (McFadden, 1998). Self-esteem could become an issue for (former) full time employee who have seen their good jobs radically changed to accommodate welfare recipients (Uchitelle, 1997).
Still, despite the controversy surrounding welfare reform, there does appear to be some success stories. In addition to many small employers hiring welfare recipients (Meckler, 1998), large employers including United Airlines, United Parcel Service (UPS), and Marriott Hotel have hire thousands of people off the welfare roles. According to managers in those companies, retention is around 75% and the workers come prepared to work, and are often more ambitious than the regular employees (Welfare-to-work employees, 1998). Roger Dow, vice-president and general sales manager of Marriot Lodging, said his company’s success with welfare employees can be directly related to how people are treated. Their mission statement was condensed to one line, “Every guest leaves satisfied.” (LaGow, 1998, p. 2). Marriott’s actions in hiring welfare workers could be compared to Goll’s (1996), concept of Management by Values, and illustrates that the relationship between guests and employees is a cause-and-effect relationship, and that relationship could be logically extended to managers and employees as well. Managers need to be proactive and lead with care. “Seventy percent of our welfare-to-work hires are still with us after a year, and 73 percent of those are with us after two years...” (p. 2).

Characteristics of Welfare Recipients

Helplessness

During their lifetime most people, at one time or another will find themselves in situations where events are largely uncontrollable. Being fired from a job, losing a loved one, getting divorced, or experiencing a traumatic natural event can all produce high levels of stress which could lead to lack of control (Selye, 1976). While many people might
experience helplessness, it is generally of a temporary nature and can prove to be a valuable lesson in how to avoid or quickly resolve similar situations. People who have the desire and the capability to change unpleasant or undesirable conditions in their lives can generally act in ways that allow them to control, more or less, what happens to them. For other people, however, helplessness can become a long-term condition from which there is little hope of escape. During the course of researching this project, a comment often heard about welfare recipients was (to the effect of) "Why don't they just go and get a job? I had a lot of obstacles to overcome in my life, and I have a good job. I did it, so they should be able to do it too!" (see Appendix K). It is easy to ask such questions about welfare recipients, and the questions should be as easy to answer, but they are not.

For a woman who suddenly finds herself single and responsible for her own, and perhaps her dependent children's, welfare after years of being dependent upon a provider, husband or otherwise, the stress may be overwhelming. Not only because of the lack of financial support, but as much for the psychological affects. Cataclysmic change can have overwhelming consequences. J. Irwin (as cited in Louis A. Zurcher, Jr. 1977), says of change, "Not only does the world seem strange; the self loses its distinctiveness. Not only does the person find the new setting strange and unpredictable, and not only does he experience anxiety and disappointment from his inability to function normally in this strange setting, but he loses a grip on his profounder meaning, his values, goals, conceptions of himself." Though Irwin is speaking of his parole from prison, his observation can be extended to other types of change, including divorced, widowed, or abandoned. People associate certain actions with certain roles, and when the role ends,
the actions may thereafter be inappropriate (Zurcher, 1977). Irwin continues, “In this situation, planned purposeful action becomes extremely difficult. Such action requires a definite sense of self, a relatively clear idea of one’s relation to other things, and some sense of one’s direction or goal. All of these things tend to become unraveled in a radical shift of settings.” (pg. 54).

In part, helplessness is defined as ...the state of being incompetent, ineffective, or powerless (Guralnik, 1985). Extensive studies by Seligman (1975) are particularly appropriate in explaining how helplessness can develop in humans and how difficult it can be to overcome. Helplessness, according to Seligman is “…the psychological state that frequently results when events are uncontrollable…” (p. 9).

Seligman’s tests, covering a four year period from 1965 to 1969, were conducted primarily on dogs, mice, rats and other animals that have the capacity to “learn” a behavior. Seligman generalized his findings to humans, since we also have the capacity to learn behavior. As a part of the tests, dogs and other animals were forced to endure brief exposures to mild or moderate electrical shocks from which they could not escape. The shocks were administered randomly, and there was no device or behavior on the part of the animal that would stop or lessen the shock. Initially all the animals resisted and fought vigorously to escape, but as the tests continued the animals learned that despite their best efforts they were powerless to escape, and powerless to control the shock. Nothing the animal did brought relief, and soon the animal stopped resisting and simply endured the pain. When the animals were put into other situations that they could have escaped from or could have controlled, they didn’t attempt to escape. Seligman theorized that the
animals had learned to be helpless, and were now helpless in other situations that, in fact, they could control if so desired.

Subsequent experiments on human subjects (Hiroto, D, cited in Seligman), using loud noise instead of electric shocks yielded similar results. Like the test animals, human subjects stopped resisting as soon as they believed themselves to be powerless to control the situation. A significant aspect of both Hirotos’s and Seligman’s tests was that once a subject became helpless, not only was it helpless when faced with the original situation, but they were also helpless in situations that were completely unrelated to the original incident.

Seligman observed three consequences associated with experiences of uncontrollability. The first consequence was motivational—helplessness in the face of uncontrollable events undermines the motivation to initiate voluntary responses to control other, unrelated events.

The second consequence was cognitive—once a subject, human or animal, had experienced uncontrollability, the subject had difficulty learning that a voluntary response can succeed, even when it has actually been successful. In other words, uncontrollability distorts the perception of control.

Seligman’s third consequence was that experiences of uncontrollability often lead to emotional disturbance. When a traumatic event first occurs, a person often feels a heightened sense of stress or emotion which they may associate with fear. This state continued until the person either learned they could control the event, in which case the
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fear usually subsided, or that they could not control the event, in which case fear was often replaced with depression or anxiety.

A logical extension in the discussion of helplessness may reveal why some children of welfare recipients continue to live on welfare, when, in fact they may have the innate ability to be self-sufficient. Rather simply put, children learn from their parent(s). Families in poverty, welfare families, often face debilitating circumstances, and lacking the social and emotional skills to provide good parenting only seems to make the problems worse. The ability to take appropriate care of one's self and one's family requires that one sees himself or herself as being able to do so (Neal, 1996). To be effective, one must have an image of himself/herself as an effective person. Conversely, if one sees himself/herself as helpless, they will be helpless.

Being raised in a welfare family certainly does guarantee that the children will depend on welfare, but the odds are much higher than for children of non-welfare families. Studies by Levy (cited in Duncan, 1983) and by the University of Michigan (Holden, cited in Coughlin, 1989) indicate that for heavily dependent families, probabilities ranged from 20% to 40% that the children of those families would also be dependent on welfare.

Dependency

Next to the "something for nothing" argument which generally always disturbed welfare opponents, the issue of dependency has also been a topic regularly associated with welfare debates. Dependency is defined in Webster's Dictionary (1985) as "...reliance on another for support or aid..." Historically, the best way for a woman to avoid being
dependent on public kindness was to marry a man who could support her, and her children. In Title 1, section 1, paragraph 1, sentence 1 of the Personal Responsibility Act (1996), Congress made the following finding: “Marriage is the foundation of a successful society.” (p. 6). This is a far cry from the social view in America’s early days. When a family was poor, it was thought that they should be separated so the children didn’t learn the parent’s poor habits (Axinn & Levin, 1975). In the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) the father was kicked out of the home, lest the mother’s benefits be cut off. Another example of splitting up the family, and in essence making women dependent on public welfare. It should be no surprise to anyone that many single American mothers are dependent on welfare. In addition to welfare laws that generally punished welfare mothers for living with a man, increased welfare benefits in the 1960s and early 1970s swelled the welfare roles in America. After years of promoting dependency, politicians are now trying to end dependency and reduce the welfare budget (Besharov & Gardiner, 1996).

Many proponents of welfare reform believe that unwed teenage motherhood is the single biggest reason for welfare dependency. While that may be pretty much the truth, there are some other reasons for dependency.

Substance abuse has become a major issue with single parent families over the past decade, and substance abuse programs that, historically were designed to handle male substance abusers find themselves in uncharted territory. Typically, only one percent of federal drug intervention money has been spent on programs designed for women (Azzi-Lessing & Olsen, 1996), and less on pregnant or single-mother programs.
Lack of education is another reason that dependency occurs. The typical welfare recipient has no more than a high-school education. Formal schooling is important, but just as important is the fact that many welfare observers believe training programs don’t work as they were intended. Too often the people who most need the programs are the ones who are least likely to take advantage of them. Training needs to be appropriate to the specific job someone will, or does have.

Rector (1997), set forth seven principles that he believes will reduce dependency and accomplish effective welfare reform. The seven steps are:

1. Set the right goals — reduce the welfare case load, and reduce the illegitimacy rate (out of wedlock births).
2. Focus on caseload, not welfare exits — exits are not a good indicator of welfare use. Counsel against entering the system. Let people know that welfare is degrading and dehumanizing.
3. Establish work requirements — they reduce welfare applications. Work must be immediate and continuous to dissuade entry of new applicants.
4. Avoid education and training — the best training for a job is a job.
5. Focus work on the most employable recipients first — restrict welfare to those who truly need it. Focus work requirement first on two-parent families and mothers who do not have pre-school children.
6. Establish pay-after-performance incentives — the Personal Responsibility Act is a “work-first” program; no benefits until work is done.
7. Put the bureaucracy on performance incentives — don’t pay the administrators until they have accomplished performance criteria.

Single parent households

By all accounts, single parent households, particularly single mother households comprised the largest segment of welfare recipients in the United States in the late 1990s. Although there are many single father households in the United States, their number is far overshadowed by the number of single mother households (see Figure 3.).

Figure 3. Single-parent Households by Gender 1970 to 1995.

Studies show that family composition changes are the single biggest reason for receiving welfare, primarily AFDC. One study by Bane and Ellwood indicated that 75% of all AFDC entries resulted from family composition changes, 45% due to divorce, separation, or widowhood, and 30% from having a child out of wedlock (S.B. Collins, cited in S.W. Carlson-Thies & J.W. Skillen, 1996). Although married fathers often become single parents for some of the same reasons, single fathers rarely become part of the American welfare system. Kissman & Allen (1993) state that while 50% of mother-headed single parent families live below the poverty line, only about 8% of father-headed single parent families face the same situation. Not only are men financially more able to provide for their children, but Greif (1989) explains that when the American man, for whatever reason, has custody of dependent children, he is often seen as extraordinary, that he must be incredibly dedicated to his children and that the children must be equally dedicated to him. He is often seen by society as a good role model and by single women as an excellent candidate for marriage. After all, he must be a good father if he can work, cook, keep house, teach his children, and do all those things traditionally attributed to the mother. Greif goes on to say that, on the other hand, the single father is seen as someone who needs help. Often the perception is that he cannot know how to cook, clean house, wash clothes or explain the facts of life to his teenage daughter, and so family and friends offer him help. Unfortunately, the same scenario rarely exists for the single mother. Poor single mothers, though becoming more and more a fixture in American society, are often viewed as the heart of the welfare problem. According to Devore & Schleisinger, (as cited in R.A. Scagnelli, 1996), "Poor single parents are stigmatized and quite often
treated as if they are society’s least important people.” (p.12). And from Katz (as cited in R.A. Scagnelli), “The stigmatization follows the presumption that single parenthood no longer gives credence to being affiliated with the impotent, deserving poor.” (p. 12).

Because single, custodial fathers are seldom considered a significant part of the welfare system, this study leaves the discussion of single-fathers to their role as non-custodial parents.

While the lack of income may be the most immediate problem for single parent families, it is often the psychological environment that produces long-lasting effects for members of the single-parent family. The transition from a two-parent family to a single-parent family tends to create a very stressful environment in which all family members can be negatively impacted to the point where individual members, or the entire family can become dysfunctional. Kissman & Allen (1993) point out that in addition to the severe economic deprivation which may lead to loss of the home, neighborhood, friends and status, many family members suffer a real or imagined sense of incompetence in their personal lives. Redefinition of individual roles, greater demands on personal time, and increases in responsibility usually accompany the dissolution of two-parent families.

Young children may be asked to take on burdens for which they are poorly suited, such as baby-sitting siblings, cooking, cleaning, or even holding down a job. Nearly every aspect of one’s life can be disrupted and meaning lost.
Teenage Pregnancy

To early Americans, unwed adolescent pregnancy, at least in the context of a viable marriage was not necessarily a problem. Though both partners might experience some changes in life plans, as long as the husband was able to provide economic stability, neither person really suffered greatly, and society didn’t have the burden of public support. Secondary education was generally available to all whites, and urban blacks, and most finished their formal education by about 15 or 16 years of age. Premature pregnancy had little affect on the woman’s chances of gainful employment, because most women, busy being full-time wives and mothers, seldom worked outside the home (Degler, 1980). Since few couples ever divorced, adolescent pregnancy was not associated with marital dissolutions (Griswold, 1982). In the years following the Civil War changes in the definition of youth, changing roles of women, and relaxed attitudes about premarital sexual activity combined to make marriage a less attractive solution to adolescent pregnancy (Harari & Vinovskis, 1991).

In the late nineteenth century, social reformers established homes for unwed mothers as an alternative to the forced marriages which had been the accepted cure for adolescent pregnancy. The reformers did not charge the girls, but they often attempted to get some remuneration from the father of the baby. Many women gave up their babies for adoption (Brumberg, 1985), but as social attitudes about single parenthood continued to change, the number of unwed mothers rose, as did the social cost of welfare.

During the 1940s continuing increases in the number single mothers and divorced or separated women provided impetus for social welfare changes, and in 1950 Congress
amended the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) and renamed it Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). While the ADC had for years provided welfare for underage children only, the AFDC now provided support to the custodial parent of dependent children. In effect, the AFDC encouraged mothers to stay home to care for their children. Studies by Ross & Sawhill (1975) and Moore & Caldwell (1977) concluded that women didn’t have babies in order to be eligible for welfare, but that welfare did provide more options about what women could do about a non-marital pregnancy. Since they could meet their financial, and often, housing needs, they were not pressured to have an abortion, place the child for adoption, or marry an unlikely prospect.

As part of the 1960s War on Poverty, Congress established Medicaid in 1965, and passed other laws which expanded housing assistance, and established the food stamp program. In addition, individual states began to increase cash welfare benefits, and also began to accept more applicants for welfare programs (Garfinkle & McLanahan, 1986).

**Absentee Fathers and Non-Custodial Parents**

According to Zinn (1986), teenage pregnancy is often seen as the heart of the larger problem of long-term welfare dependency. What Zinn sees as problematic is not that women are dependent, for women have always been viewed as dependent—first on their fathers, then on their husbands --- but that they are not supposed to be dependent on public income support. In fact, the real issue behind teenage pregnancy and welfare dependency is single parenting, that is, single mothers living and surviving economically without men. Although public policy, supposedly, is concerned with providing long-term
fiscal support to single-parent families, the real emotional steam behind the issue is the specter of single-parent families existing without the need of men living in the household (Weitz, 1984). Teenage pregnancy is usually seen to be both the result and the consequence of the lack of fathers or male role models in children’s lives (Wilson, 1987; Anderson, 1989). For most of American history, the forces of society have been concerned with, and have attempted to deal with adolescent pregnancy as the responsibility of the woman. After long periods of scholarly neglect, social scientists, have only recently began studying the effects of the father’s influence on his children. Recent studies have shown, for example, that children who live with their biological fathers in long-term relationships benefit the most from the strong bonds with inside fathers. Youths who were strongly attached to their fathers were twice as likely to have entered college or to have found stable employment after high school, were 75% less likely to have become a teenage parent, were 80% less likely to have been in jail, and half as likely to have experienced multiple depression symptoms (Furstenberg & Harris, 1991).

A young father can take responsibility for his child in many ways. While the most accepted way is still to marry and live with the mother, a young man can assume significant obligations in other ways. Young fathers can provide valuable support, both financial and nonfinancial, for their acknowledged offspring. Contrary to stereotypical descriptions of young unwed fathers, recent reports from the National Center for Health Statistics indicate that nearly 42% of teenage fathers are married to the child’s mother by the time the baby is born, and that another 20-24% marry within the first year after the birth. While direct financial support and nonfinancial support, such as baby-sitting,
providing food and clothing, taking a child to appointments, providing transportation, etc. are important, there are other, legal, ways to act responsibly for the benefit of one’s offspring. The most significant act of responsibility for young fathers is to acknowledge paternity. While this may result in legal requirements for child support, more importantly it establishes certain legal rights for the child, such as Social Security payments, veteran’s benefits, workman’s compensation, access to medical history, and legal rights of custody, visitation, and adoption.

While society should continue to insist that young men accept personal responsibility for the children they father, it should also help them to fulfill that responsibility and recognize its own obligations to young families. “Children having children” (Height, 1985) has been a key phrase in describing what is perceived to be an insurmountable epidemic of teenage pregnancy in America. “Children having children” is a phrase, that --- intentionally or not --- excludes perspectives that view pregnant and parenting teens as adults, and can preclude the kinds of solutions that empower. When we start treating these children as adults instead of trying to keep them children, we can begin to solve the problem.

Displaced Workers

Over the past two decades a number of changes have evolved in the way America, and indeed the world, does business. Downsizing, outsourcing, and restructuring have become common buzzwords used to describe business management. As companies search for cheaper and more efficient production methods, they often venture overseas and may
end up closing American plants and production facilities in favor of cheaper labor forces in Asia, Africa or South America. For a large part of the American workforce lifetime employment based on loyalty and commitment to the job is becoming a thing of the past -- replaced by the concept of lifetime employability based on competitive skills and continually updated learning.

Displaced workers are not a significant part of the American welfare system, but as a group they do contribute to the number of welfare recipients regularly counted by the government since 1984. Though displaced workers may certainly be unemployed, there are some distinctions between displaced workers and unemployed workers. Bureau of Labor Statistics analysts define displaced workers as “...those who, through no fault of their own, have lost jobs in which they have several years tenure and a considerable investment in skill development.” (Falim & Sehgal, cited in T. Moore, 1996. pg. 18, 19).

Not generally included as displaced workers are persons unemployed as a result of seasonal jobs, self-employed business failures, workers dismissed for cause, and workers who voluntarily quit their employment.

Another major difference between unemployed workers and displaced workers is that while an unemployed worker will probably soon be able to find suitable employment in the same line of work, very often the displaced worker has very little chance of being recalled by his former employer and will either have to relocate to find similar work, or will have to be retrained in a new discipline (Leigh, 1989).

Displaced workers, like regular unemployed workers are generally entitled to a maximum of 26 weeks of Unemployment Insurance (UI), and like other workers, the
majority will return to work prior to the end of the benefit period. A minority of displaced workers, however, will be unemployed far longer than other workers, and will consume many more benefit dollars in Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) re-training programs. In essence, this small percentage of displaced worker will very likely collect welfare benefits far longer than the thirty-month criteria which defines the hardest-to-employ.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The previous chapters discussed in detail the American welfare system and recent welfare reform legislation designed to reduce welfare roles by getting welfare recipients back to work and off welfare. Because many welfare recipients face multiple barriers to employment, the question arises about how they get off welfare if they can’t work. In fact most welfare recipients could work if the barriers were removed. The goal of this project was to explore barriers to employment from the welfare recipient’s viewpoint, and to ask employers if they would be willing to assist in the removal of any barriers. In addition, the study attempted to establish the needs of employers and welfare to work participants and how each group might meet the needs of the other.

Research Questions

This project was an exploratory study designed to answer the following questions:

1. What kinds of workplace accommodations do workfare participants feel they need in order to keep a job and achieve self-sufficiency?

2. What kinds of workplace accommodations are employers willing to provide in order to increase the probability of success for workfare participants?
3. How do employers perceive welfare recipients as a group, and as potential employees?

4. How do welfare recipients view themselves as a group, and as potential employees?

Research Design

The main model used for gathering data for this project is shown in Figure 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Define the Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Identify the Sampling Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>Select a Sampling Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td>Select the Sample Elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5</td>
<td>Determine the Sample Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 6</td>
<td>Collect the Data From Sample Frame</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Six Step Procedure for Drawing a Sample.

Defining the Population

Churchill (1995) defines population as "... the totality of cases that conform to some designated specifications. The specifications define the elements that belong to the target group and those that are to be excluded." (p. 574). Because answering the primary research questions involved two separate but obviously related populations, it was necessary to not only select the major populations, but to identify specifications common to both groups. If not common to both groups, specifications from one group which would either affect the other group, or which would require some sort of action from the other group.

Employer Group.

The first population was identified as housekeeping related managers and supervisors who could provide entry-level jobs that might accommodate the often limited skills and abilities of many welfare recipients. Entry-level jobs can be found in almost any industry, for instance, car dealers need people to wash cars and clean the parking lots; mining industries use unskilled labor to "muck-out" mine shafts; furniture manufacturers need warehouse people; and the list goes on and on. Entry-level jobs are defined as those which would allow a low-skilled, uneducated, or novice worker to enter the workforce. The job would typically require a relatively high level of physical activity, often with only a few repetitive tasks, would require few verbal or communication skills; and could usually be accomplished through a minimum of interaction with co-workers. For this study, managers in housekeeping positions were selected not only because the service industry
abound in entry-level jobs, but also because it was believed that the researcher’s close involvement with that particular segment of the service industry would both facilitate access to a large population and increase the response rate for interviews and survey questionnaires.

Having identified the larger population, the specifications for selection were further narrowed to include executives and/or managers in housekeeping related positions who;

1. could hire, or cause to be hired, persons who had been referred by state or federal welfare agencies,
2. were generally autonomous enough to provide, or to influence the provision of workplace accommodations which could assist welfare-to-work participants in their transition into the workplace, and
3. had some experience with welfare workers or the welfare system as it relates to employer incentives for hiring welfare recipients.

Welfare Recipients.

The second population was identified as current welfare recipients who would be subject to conditions established by passage of the Personal Responsibility Act. The Act particularly targets a segment of the welfare population known as the “Hardest to Employ” (HtE). The HtE group was identified by the Department of Labor (1996) as being the approximately twenty percent of the total welfare population who meet the following criteria;

1. long-term recipients of TANF/AFDC for at least 30 months,
2. poor work history,
3. requires substance abuse treatment for employment, and
4. no high school or GED.

As much as practical, the above criteria were designated as specifications for being included in the population sample for this study. Additional specification for inclusion in the study was that the welfare recipients had to be accessible through one of the four local welfare offices in the Las Vegas metropolitan area which includes Henderson, Nevada.

**Sampling Frame**

Once identification of the population(s) was complete and specifications were established for inclusion or exclusion, the sampling frame was determined. This step determines which units of the population will actually have the opportunity to be selected for the final sample. In order to minimize systematic sampling error, three considerations were key to this step (Fowler, 1993):

1. The sampling frame must be comprehensive. That is to say, the frame must be representative of all members of the population of interest. A frame is not comprehensive if it excludes potentially important members of the population. Sampling from lists may not be comprehensive if the list does not include a cross-section of the entire population.

2. The sampling frame must offer the possibility of calculating the chance of selection for each member. The frame is inadequate if some members have a zero-chance of being selected, since each member should have a known, (non-zero)
chance of selection (Churchill, 1995; Czaja & Blair, 1996; Fowler, 1993; Frey, 1989). All members don’t have to have the same chance, just a chance.

3. The sampling frame must be efficient. This relates primarily to the opportunity to identify eligible respondents. If the sampling frame includes a lot of units that don’t meet the specifications, the frame will not accurately reflect the characteristics of the population.

**Employers.**

For the IEHA survey, the ideal sampling frame would have been a list of all persons in the United States who were employed as managers or supervisors in housekeeping-related positions, but time and money made that impractical. Also considered as a sampling frame were all the eligible persons in Las Vegas, employed as supervisors or managers in housekeeping related positions. Time constraints, again, made compiling such a list impractical, and more significantly, it was believed that despite having such a list, a relatively small sampling frame would have resulted. .

Because the researcher was a registered member of the International Executive Housekeepers Association, it was ultimately decided to use the organization’s trade magazine *Executive Housekeeping Today* as the sampling frame for the study. The magazine was monthly publication, and according to the magazine publisher, had a subscriber list of approximately 6200. It was believed that the subscriber list would provide an adequate sampling frame, subject to restrictions commonly associated with organizational lists (Fowler, 1993; Frey, 1989). For example, some members of the
IEHA organization might not have been magazine subscribers, in which case they would not have had an opportunity to be included in the survey. Another possible form of sample frame bias was that some subscribers of the magazine were undoubtedly vendors, equipment and supply manufacturers, or uniform suppliers. As such, they did not meet the eligibility requirements for inclusion since they might not have been in a position to hire welfare workers or to provide workplace accommodations. Because there was no way of knowing who should have been excluded, the researcher arbitrarily assumed, a priori, that everyone in the sampling frame was an eligible respondent.

For this study, the employer sampling frame was considered a convenience sample, in that access to the population resulted in a sampling frame that was not chosen in a strictly random fashion. Tenants of proper survey techniques dictate that in order to make generalizations about a population, the sample must be a randomly selected sample in order to be statistically representative of the population. Fowler (1993) & Frey (1989) in their explanations of sampling frame selection, explain that the sample is in reality representative of the sampling frame. Therefore if the frame is limited to a list of subscribers, the actual sample can only represent those units on the list. Unless the researcher knows exactly how the list was compiled, there is no way to be sure how accurately the list represents the true population. For purposes of this study, it was assumed that the selected sampling frame generally represented the larger population.
**Welfare Recipients.**

The sampling frame for the welfare survey consisted of four Nevada State Welfare Division offices—three in Las Vegas, and one in Henderson, Nevada. Once again, in order to make generalizations about American welfare recipients, a more representative sampling frame would have been required, larger even than just the welfare recipients in the State of Nevada. As in the case of the employer survey, easy access and limited resources dictated that the welfare sampling frame also be considered a convenience sample rather than a more desirable random sample. For this study, the assumption was made that Las Vegas welfare population was generally representative of the larger American welfare population.

**Sampling Procedure**

Each type of survey administration effects the resources of the researcher. After considering the strengths and weaknesses of each method the telephone survey was ruled out for both groups of interest not only because of the researcher’s lack of resources but, more importantly, because it was believed that a fair number of welfare recipients may not have telephones. This would have presented a problem with systematic error, since the ones with phones might have had quite different characteristics than those without phones.
Personal Interviews.

The researcher selected personal interviews as the primary method of communicating with welfare administrators, service providers, and welfare community activists. Personal interviews not only allowed for the expansion of the researcher's limited knowledge by asking complex questions about welfare, but the researcher also believed that establishing a more personal relationship with members of the welfare community would facilitate gaining access to the larger welfare population. In essence the interviewees would function as gatekeepers for their respective organizations.

Mail Survey.

A mail survey was the survey method of choice for employers group since they received the survey printed in the magazine. The main reason for using a self-administered mail survey for this group was that it minimized the cost to the researcher. On the other hand, preparing the survey for publication and waiting for a response took a lot of time (see Figure 5).

Face-to-face Intercept Survey.

For reaching the welfare population, the final decision was to utilize a face-to-face intercept survey. According to welfare administrators, response rates to mail surveys was very low for this group. The population was reluctant to fill out and return even self-addressed stamped envelopes, perhaps because they had trouble reading or understanding some questions, or perhaps because they didn’t see the value of their participation.
contacting them face-to-face while waiting in line was more likely to enhance participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Advantage</th>
<th>Major Disadvantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little Time to Implement</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Control</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Personnel Requirements</td>
<td>Can't Use Visual Aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Low Cost</td>
<td>Mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unobtrusive</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Time to Implement</td>
<td>Inability to Probe or Expand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Time to Implement</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Clarify or Probe</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Personnel Requirements</td>
<td>Can't Identify Subpopulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can Ask Complex Questions</td>
<td>Personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can Select Elite Population</td>
<td>Cost, Personnel Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can Select Elite Population</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socially Desirable Responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5. Comparison of Interview Techniques**


**Sample Size**

Determining the appropriate sample size can be a challenging and confusing endeavor. While the general notion is that larger sample sizes are better, that is, more
representative of the population, that may not always be the case. Sampling frames that are properly set up to give random selection would usually include a representative cross-section of the population. Some researchers prefer a method that takes into account the size of the population, while others believe that the size of the population is irrelevant (Fowler, 1993).

While there seems to be differences of opinion about the need to know the population size, there seems to be very little disagreement about the importance of the amount of precision desired in a sampling frame. For most researchers, sample size is determined by the amount of precision they are willing to accept in the results. Whichever method is ultimately used, there are other things that a researcher should be aware of when determining a sample size. Are 100 respondents enough, are 500 too many? The answer to the question is it depends largely on the kind of study and the purpose of the study (Churchill, 1975; Fowler, 1993).

Exploratory studies which commonly use convenience or non-probability samples are somewhat less dependent sample size than are probability or random samples. Unlike exploratory studies, probability studies seek to generalize to larger populations, and to generalize in an effective, statistical, manner, the sample must have been selected in a random fashion. Probability studies might require larger or more heterogeneous samples, and would not be able to tolerate substitution of respondents. For example, if a probability study was designed to include certain members of a household, the interviewer could not arbitrarily substitute just anyone who answered the door or picked up the phone. For probability samples, substitution could be a problem. For non-probabilities,
substitution is not nearly as critical an issue in terms of generalization, although substitution could still increase the amount of bias, or error in a sampling frame.

Another significant issue in determining sample size is the confidence lever that the researcher requires is the results. Confidence level refers to the concept that any results of a survey will turn out the same in x number of cases. For example, if the confidence level is set at 95%, the researcher can be comfortable in predicting that out if the survey was given 100 times, 95 of the surveys would generate the same results. If a researcher determined the need for a 99% confidence level, a larger sample size would be required in order to provide adequate results.

For this study, sample sizes for the IEHA survey and Welfare survey were determined with a confidence level of 95 %. The housekeeping survey used a precision level of + / - 5 respondents, while the Welfare survey used a bound of estimate (precision) of + / - 10 respondents.

**IEHA Survey.**

In order to determine a representative sample size (n) from the population of 6200, the following method was used (Churchill, 1995):

\[
n = \frac{N\sigma^2}{(N-1)\frac{B^2}{A} + \sigma^2}
\]

Where: \(N = 6200\)

\(A = \text{Confidence level @ } .95 \ = 1.96\)

\(B = \text{Bound of Estimate} = +/- 5\)

\(\sigma^2 = \text{Population Variance} = 1550^*\)
(Since there was no previous study to emulate, and the population variance was unknown, this number is estimated by dividing the range (6200 -0) by 4, the number of standard deviations into which the number would fall, according to Chebychev’s Theorem).

Then for the IEHA survey:

\[ n = \frac{6200(1550)}{(6199)\frac{25}{196} + 1550} = \frac{9,610,000}{8061888} = 1192, \text{ or a sample size of 120.} \]

**Welfare Survey.**

Again, as in the case of the IEHA Survey, a random selection process was not developed for administration of the Welfare Survey since this project was primarily an exploratory study, and as Churchill (1995) notes, “...exploratory studies are characterized by flexibility with respect to the methods used for gaining insight and developing hypotheses....Exploratory studies rarely use detailed questionnaires or involve probability sampling plans.” (p.149).

Calculating sample size by this method was largely determined by the bound of estimate --- B --- the researcher was willing to accept. Using the same value of B for the welfare study that was used in the IEHA study --- +/- 5 --- would have required a sample size of approximately four times larger (Churchill, 1995). Because the resources for the project were limited the larger sample size would have been difficult to achieve. The researcher believed that a smaller sample size would be acceptable for an exploratory study, therefore the bound of estimate--B-- value for the welfare sample was changed from 5 to 10. The sample size (n) was once again estimated by using the formula:
\[
  n = \frac{N\sigma^2}{(N-1) \frac{B^2}{A} + \sigma^2}
\]

Where:

\[N = \text{Population} = 27,500\]

\[A = \text{Confidence Level @ .95} = 1.96\]

\[B = \text{Bound of Estimate} = +/- 10\]

\[\sigma^2 = \text{Population Variance} = 6875^*\]

*(Since there was no previous study to emulate, and the population variance was unknown, this number is estimated by dividing the range (27,500 -0) by 4, the number of standard deviations into which the number would fall, according to Chebychev's Theorem.)*

Then sample size for the Welfare survey was calculated as:

\[
  n = \frac{27,500(6875)}{(27,499)^{100} + 6875} = \frac{189,062,500}{140988520} = 134.097, \text{ or a sample size of 135.}
\]

**Sample Elements**

For both the IEHA survey and the Welfare survey, questions which specifically address attitude and perception about being on welfare, about welfare recipients, and about the welfare system generally were derived from a study conducted in 1978 by Leonard Goodwin and used as a basis for his textbook "Causes and Cures for Welfare." Goodwin's entire survey is presented in Appendix I.

**Questionnaire Design**

**IEHA Survey.**

The first survey, called the IEHA Survey is shown in Appendix E and was a self-administered mail-in questionnaire consisting of fifteen questions designed to gather data about housekeeping related employers.
Questions 1 through 8 asked about demographic and job-related issues that might be used to describe the respondent’s work environment, including, job title, type of organization, budget, number of full-time and part-time employees, ethnic make-up of staff, budget, and hiring practices.

Questions 9 through 15 were designed to gather data about the respondent’s experience, knowledge, and perceptions about welfare recipients and the welfare system. Ask how service industry employers perceive welfare-to-work participants and the degree to which employers would be willing to accommodate welfare to work participants in the workplace.

**Welfare Survey.**

The second survey, called the Welfare Survey is presented in Appendix G (English version), and Appendix H (Spanish version). The Welfare Survey was a self-administered intercept questionnaire made up of twenty-four questions intended to gather data about welfare participants, their perception of local welfare agencies, and about workplace services (accommodations) they believe would help them to keep a job once they have found one.

Because part of the purpose of this study was to compare attitudes and perceptions of both employers and of welfare participants as potential employees, both surveys share a number of the same questions, albeit in slightly altered presentations. For example, the same question—#15 on the IEHA Survey and #16 on the Welfare Survey—was presented in each survey as a five-level Likert scale Agree / Disagree question. The
IEHA survey had the question worded "Most people on welfare are probably just lazy" while on the welfare survey the question was worded "Most people on welfare are probably not lazy." To some degree, the question was changed to minimize alienation of the welfare respondent from the remainder of the survey questions, but also to observe how the respective groups would agree or disagree with the same idea when presented in a different format.

Data Collection

Data collection for this study began in February 1998 with the researcher attending monthly meetings of the Southern Nevada Private Industry Council (SNPIC). The SNPIC held public meetings at 9:00 AM on the second Wednesday of each month, and occasionally called ad-hoc public meetings to discuss important issues or resolve conflicts. Meetings lasted sometimes as long as three hours, and were attended not only by the SNPIC appointees, but also by local business owners who desired to provide life-skills training and employment support services for the local welfare population. In addition, numerous community activists and welfare recipients attended and presented their thoughts and observations during the public segment of the meetings. Prior to attending these meetings, the researcher's knowledge about the American welfare system was minimal, and the idea for the study was still very broad. As the meetings progressed month to month from February 1998 to February 1999, many details were revealed about the complexity of the welfare system, about the difficulty of reforming the system, and about the workings of governmental agencies in general. PIC meeting minutes were the...
initial source of information about welfare reform, and directed later actions regarding selection of a specific, narrow research problem.

Secondary data, particularly related to historical perspectives, were gathered through traditional research methods including library search, and by accessing the Internet. Historical data presented in Chapter 2 were presented to not only demonstrate the complexity of the American welfare system, but also to show how deep the social and cultural issues are regarding public assistance, and why reform can be so difficult.

Administration of Instruments

Prior to any administration of instruments, all forms, questionnaires, and requirements for study of human subjects were submitted for approval to the Office of Sponsored Programs, University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Approval for the study was granted on May 8, 1998, and is presented in Appendix A. Sample letters of introduction, variations of interview questions and a consent to tape-record form are presented in Appendices C and D.

Personal Interviews.

Five personal interviews were conducted with various community activists, WtW service providers, and PIC members to get their opinions about welfare reform generally, about their role in welfare reform, and about the probability of successful welfare reform as it pertains to H.R.3734, The Personal Responsibility Act. Respondents for personal interviews were solicited during or immediately following the monthly SNPIC meetings.
Approximately one week prior to the actual interview participants received a copy of the questions they would be asked, along with the Informed Consent disclosure, and a notice that they would be asked to sign a Consent to Tape Record form prior to beginning the interview. Face-to-face personal interviews were conducted with participants at their place of business. Interviews usually lasted at least an hour, with the longest almost two hours. The tape recorder was placed directly in front of and in plain view of the participant, then the questions were read from a copy of the original letter of introduction. Information was later compiled to identify several major themes in the Welfare-to-Work concept. The personal interviews were transcribed and are presented in Appendices J, K, and L. In the actual transcripts, specific sentences or paragraphs which address major themes are printed in **bold** type. All personal interviews and questionnaire designs were conducted as much as possible using guidelines presented by Dillman (1978), Fowler (1993), Fowler & Mangione (1990), and Frey (1989).

**IEHA Survey.**

As a member of the International Executive Housekeeper’s Association, an agreement was made between the researcher and the publisher of the trade magazine, *Executive Housekeeping Today* to publish the IEHA survey at no cost to the researcher, in exchange for a future article presenting the results of the survey (see Appendix F). The survey was submitted to the publisher in November 1998, and published in the January 1999 issue of *Executive Housekeeping Today*. The magazine staff were conducting their 1999 salary survey and added six of their own questions to the original IEHA Survey.
The magazine publisher offered a $10.00 cash value incentive for everyone who sent in a completed survey by February 10, 1999. Respondents were asked to fax or mail their completed survey to the magazine headquarters.

**Welfare Survey.**

Surveying the welfare population was a more complicated process than was the IEHA Survey, since the welfare population, to a large degree was thought to be a protected group not only in the sense of potential harm to identifiable subjects, but in their willingness to answer the survey questions. At the time of this study there were approximately 27,500 welfare recipients in Nevada (Vogel, 1998) and the initial research design called for utilizing a mailing list from the Nevada State Welfare Division to set up a sampling frame and send a survey questionnaire to randomly selected names from the list. However, after discussing the mailing list approach with several welfare office managers it was decided that conducting face-to-face intercept surveys with welfare recipients waiting for service in the offices would be more productive. Subsequently a formal request was sent to the State capitol and permission requested to conduct the survey inside the Nevada State Welfare Division offices. Additionally, a completed copy of the Welfare Survey and a copy of the Human Subjects approval were sent to the Deputy Administrator, Programs and Field Operation in Carson City, Nevada, and after brief telephone discussions of the survey, permission was received to do the survey. The researcher’s request letter and the Deputy Administrator’s response are both presented in Appendix B.
The Welfare Survey, particularly the Spanish language version, was pre-tested for clarity and context with nine participants, all of whom were either bi-lingual or native Spanish speakers. In addition, three of the participants had been, though were no longer, welfare recipients. As a result of the pre-test, several changes were made to the question order, syntax, grammar, and response categories. Having received permission from the Deputy Administrator to conduct the survey on state property, the researcher visited each of the four local office managers in order to set up the survey process in their respective offices. Actual administration of the surveys was conducted over a five day period in April, 1999, generally beginning about 8:00 AM and lasting until about 4:00 PM. The researcher arranged with each office manager to utilize a section near the appointment counter in the waiting area. As recipients entered the building, the researcher observed and greeted each person. Generally, if the person had an appointment slip in their hand, they were not approached until after they had confirmed their appointment with the social workers. As the person left the counter the researcher approached, introduced, and solicited cooperation in completing the survey. In some cases, if there was a long waiting line, the subjects were approached as they waited in line, regardless of their appointment status. If the subject agreed to participate, they were given a pen or pencil and a blank copy of survey in the appropriate language. They were asked to return the completed survey to the researcher before they left the building.
Data Analysis

Statistical Tests

For both the IEHA Survey and the Welfare survey all question responses were coded and input into SPSS data files. Measurement of scale determined which statistical tests were applied to the data. For the lowest level of data, categorical or nominal data only frequency tables were used. Non-parametric tests, such as Chi-square, were not conducted on the ordinal data.

On higher level data of at least interval scale, Means and Standard Deviations were conducted. Data was viewed in terms of histograms and boxplots, and one-way ANOVA was completed only on the fourteen "perception" variables from both surveys. In addition to ANOVA, the perception variables were tested using Correlations and simple regression.

Post-Hoc, multiple comparison tests, such as Tukey's HSD, or Newman-Keuls were not conducted. The purpose of multiple comparison tests is to compare sets of means to see which ones differ from the others. Multiple comparison tests require at least three sets of means with which to run comparisons, and since there were only two sets in this study, the tests were not done.

Validity

An important objective for most research studies is to be able to make inferences about a large population by collecting data and making observations about the characteristics of a sample of the population. When making inferences from a sample, one should be sure that the measuring instrument used to collect data did, in fact measure the

For this research study, validity, in terms of Cronbach’s Alpha was examined using inter-item correlations only for the perception variables on the IEHA and Welfare surveys.

Summary

Chapter 3 presented the methodology used to collect and analyze research data for this study. Research questions were listed, and the research design was set up to answer the questions. The six steps of research sampling were;

1. Define the population,
2. Identify the sampling frame,
3. Select a sampling procedure,
4. Select the sample elements
5. Determine the sample size, and
6. Collect the data.

The chapter clarified the importance of each step and explained step by step how each phase was completed. Upon completion of step six, data was coded, input and analyzed according to the appropriate scale of measurement. Categorical data was presented in frequency tables, while ordinal level data was presented in Means & Standard Deviation tables, as well as one way ANOVA and Correlation matrices.

Finally, the chapter discussed the importance of validity in research studies.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of highlights of personal interviews with various agencies or persons affected by the 1996 passage of The Personal Responsibility Act. The first section of this chapter highlights and paraphrases interviews with five people. While statistical analysis was not feasible on the personal interviews for this study, interviews did provide significant data about the research topic. Barton and Lazarfeld (as cited in N. Sinn, 1995) posited that conclusions in qualitative studies are not based on quantified data such as statistics, and that this kind of interview technique is particularly appropriate to exploratory studies.

Statistical analyses of survey questionnaires are presented in subsequent sections. Frequencies and means/standard deviations of demographic and perception variables appear first, followed by ANOVA, and correlation coefficients.

In addition to the five personal interviews, responses for the self-administered survey questionnaires were:

- IEHA survey: 93 completed surveys.
- Welfare survey: 166 completed surveys.
Concerns Expressed in Personal Interviews

Common Concerns

Across all three of the groups that were interviewed --welfare administrators, service providers, and welfare recipients / community activists--several common themes emerged, and in addition, each group expressed individual concerns relative to their association with the welfare system.

The most prevalent concern for all three groups was that the wheels of government turn slowly. While certainly not a revelation about the workings of a large bureaucracy, the difference in this case is that the Personal Responsibility Act not only established a five-year lifetime maximum eligibility period for receiving cash assistance from Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF), but also required that certain percentages of welfare recipients in each state be engaged in approved work activities by the end of two years. The Act also allowed the individual states to set their own time limits which could be shorter than, but could not exceed the five-year federal maximum. Many states, including Nevada, set a two-year time limit for receiving benefits. In reality, Nevada recipients can still receive benefits for a five-year lifetime maximum, but the state system dictates two years on / one year off routine (M. Florence, in E. Vogel, 1998, April 30).

In Nevada, for recipients approaching their expiration dates, time was of the essence, since in the collective opinion of the interviewees, the organization and implementation of employment programs between welfare recipients and potential employers have been stifled by political debates, individual agendas, committee in-fighting, and lack of understanding on the part of the Southern Nevada Private Industry Council.
Table 4 shows the required participation rate by type of recipient.

Table 4

Welfare-to-Work Participation Rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All Families</th>
<th>Two-parent Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rate(%)</td>
<td>Hours p/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Annual participation rate as required by US Department of Labor.


It was of particular importance because the Act assigned oversight and administrative responsibility to the individual PIC boards in each state. Since the PICs hold the purse strings for the Welfare-to-Work programs, a continued lack of efficacy could result in some welfare recipients losing their current benefits before they can find suitable work or alternative means of support.

The second concern common to all three groups was how the hardest-to-employ (HtE) recipients will maintain subsistence once they have exhausted their time limits.
Four possibilities about the fate of the hardest-to-employ regularly surfaced in the interviews. Hardest-to-employ welfare recipients could;

- drop out of the system altogether,
- turn to relatives or friends for subsistence,
- resort to criminal activities, or
- get a job.

Welfare administrators, community activists, and service providers all spoke of personal experiences with the first two possibilities and doubts about the fourth possibility. Concern about the third possibility exists as a significant concern for the future, but at the time of this study, no documentation was available that conclusively linked an increase in crimes with welfare termination as a result of the Personal Responsibility Act.

The final theme common to all three groups was that the existing system is ill equipped to fulfill the requirements of the Act. All the participants expressed, to some degree, the need for updated training programs, individual assessment, and innovative methods of identifying and meeting the employers needs. A significant concern was that many of the current training and/or employment programs show a lack of understanding as to the needs of the welfare recipients, as viewed from the recipient’s point of view. For example, Life Skills is a part of nearly all employment programs and generally addresses such things as resume writing, interview skills, dressing for success, budgeting, time management, organization, and similar tasks which could contribute to the welfare recipient’s ability to find and keep a job. Participant’s comments about life skills ranged from the fact that ‘...the reasons that a person ends up on welfare don’t develop in five weeks, and it’s just unrealistic to think that those problems can be solved by a five week
program...’ (Appendix K), or more emphatically, ‘...for a welfare mother who has to feed three children, pay rent, and take care of utilities all on $500.00 a month, she doesn’t need life skills training. Believe me she already has it!’ (Appendix L).

Probably the single most important concept mentioned by all participants is (the lack of) individual assessment of welfare participants. Case workers are overburdened and too often unable to spend the time necessary to make a definitive assessment of the kinds of programs or services that will best suit the individual needs. The respondents feel that, in many cases, welfare agencies or workers are more concerned about following the required sequence of steps than about how they (the workers) might go out of their way, even a little bit, to help an individual recipient.

**Individual Concerns of Interview Participants**

**Welfare Administrators.**

The lack of innovative delivery systems was of primary concern for welfare administrators. One high-ranking administrator indicated that we ‘don’t have to deliver the baby the same old way.’ Administrators interviewed for this study believe that employers no longer want the welfare agencies to provide applicants who have been trained in a certain manner prior to coming to work. Often times the training is inappropriate, and if hired, the applicant will usually receive training specific to the company. Administrators indicated an unwillingness to spend $3000 on a five-week computer class, when in fact the company could train the same person for less money, and get exactly the kind of training required. For example, if a welfare recipient was trained in
the word processing program Word 6, but the company uses only WordPerfect on their computers, the previous training doesn’t make much sense (Appendix K).

PIC members also believed that employers are the final judge of what they want in an employee. Rather than send a welfare recipient and pay the private company, it makes more sense to ask the employer what they want and then subsidize the employer training. Obviously there might be some commercial training companies that would object to that system because they might go out of business. In order for welfare reform to really work, to get the welfare recipient into unsubsidized work, the employer really has to be involved.

Service Providers.

Service providers interviewed for this study expressed concern that not all providers have been treated the same (Appendix K). Some current providers, because they are members of the “good ol’ boy” network, have seldom been required to meet performance standards which are necessary for new providers, or ‘outsiders’. Providers were concerned that, for year after year, some companies have gotten funded just because they knew someone in the government.

Welfare Recipients.

Without exception, the welfare recipients interviewed expressed the viewpoint that being on welfare was a degrading and inhuman experience. They complained of a lack of concern by social workers and welfare administrators (Appendix J, & Appendix L), and believed that they were generally treated like ‘animals’. For the most part welfare
recipients saw themselves not as lazy, but as victims of the system, and thus deserving of better treatment by social workers and by the welfare system.

Survey Results

The goal of this research was to answer four questions:

1. What kinds of workplace accommodations or services would employers be willing to provide in order to increase the probability of the success of welfare-to-work participants?

2. What kinds of accommodations or services do welfare-to-work participants feel are important to their successful transition from welfare to work?

3. How do housekeeping related employers view welfare recipients as a group, and as potential employees?

4. How do welfare recipients view the system, and how do they view themselves as a group and as potential employees?

In order to formulate appropriate answers to these questions, survey results from both groups were subjected to statistical procedures deemed appropriate for meaningful comparison of the two groups.

Response Rate

Response rates for both surveys were calculated using the formulas from Frey (1989). Frey presented two methods of determining response rate:

1. \((\text{Number of Completed Interviews} / \text{All eligible respondents}) \times 100\).
2. \[ \left( \frac{\# \text{ of Completed Interviews}}{\# \text{ in sample} - (\text{ineligible} + \text{unreachable})} \right) \times 100. \]

Results of both methods are presented in Table 5.

**IEHA Survey.**

For the employer survey there was no good way to determine the number of ineligible respondents. The survey was printed in the magazine *Executive Housekeeping Today* and the researcher had no way of knowing how many people who received the magazine were actually eligible. Churchill (1975) and Frey (1989) indicate that acceptable response rates are 75% or higher. An arbitrary percentage of subscribers could have been selected as ineligible, but even estimating ineligible respondents at 30% didn’t increase the response rate to acceptable levels. Therefore, the response rate for the IEHA survey was calculated on the entire sampling frame of 6200. The resultant calculations were:

\[ \left( \frac{\text{Number of Completed}}{\text{Eligible}} \right) \times 100 = \left( \frac{93}{6200} \right) \times 100 = 1.5\% \]

**Welfare Survey.**

Response rate for the welfare recipients was calculated using Method 2 of Frey’s presentation. The researcher had some knowledge about the demographics of the welfare sampling frame and made the following assumptions and calculations;

1. The sampling frame is 27,500, but only 70% of those people reside in the Las Vegas, Nevada metropolitan area, thus the number of eligible respondents was reduced to 19250 (27,500 x .70).

2. Welfare recipients may have used any one of the four offices, which reduced the number of eligibles to 4813 (19250 / 4).
3. Welfare recipients could have gone to the office (survey site) on any one of five days, further reducing eligible respondents 963.

The researcher was in each office for only one day, so any welfare recipient who could have used the office they day but didn’t was considered as ineligible. The final calculations for response rate using Method 2 were:

\[
\text{Completed Surveys} / \# \text{ in sample} - (\text{ineligible} + \text{unreachable}) = (166 / 963) \times 100,
\]

for a response rate to the Welfare survey of 17%.

Table 5

Response Rate for IEHA and Welfare Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Eligible</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IEHA</td>
<td>Method 1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>6200a</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>Method 2</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>963b</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Adapted from Survey Research by Telephone, by J. Frey. 1989, p. 50.

aEntire sampling frame eligible.

bRestrictions for ineligible and unreachable. Original sampling frame = 27,500.

Validity

A goal of most research studies is to be able to generalize, or infer behavior of a large group by observing the behavior of a sample of the members of the population.
To a great degree, inference or generalization is based on the validity of the study. Validity refers to the concept of really measuring what was set out to be measured. Validity is typically measured in three ways; criterion validity, content validity, and construct validity, and of the three measures, construct validity is the most meaningful when referring to whether, or not, a study is valid (Carmines & Zeller, 1979). Validity can be determined using several methods, including:

1. retesting --- which involves repeating the study at a later time and comparing results between the first and second surveys,
2. alternative forms --- testing the same subjects with an alternative form of the original test,
3. Split-halves --- wherein the total number of measures/questions is split into two equal parts and compared to each other, and
4. internal consistency method --- which uses statistical tests to assign numerical values to survey questions. The higher the value, the more stronger the measure of validity.

**Cronbach’s Alpha.**

A common method of measuring internal consistency is known as Cronbach’s Alpha, and is accomplished by analyzing results of inter-item correlations between survey questions or other appropriate measures. Correlation is a measure of the relationship between two variables (Hinkle, Wiersma & Jurs, 1998), and can range between -1 and +1. Correlations for the IEHA study are shown in Table 19, correlations for the Welfare study are shown in Table 47.
Using Cronbach’s formula (Cronbach, L. J. 1979, as cited in E.G. Carmines & R. A. Zeller Reliability and Validity Assessment.):
\[ \alpha = \frac{N \bar{p}}{1 = \bar{p}(N - 1)} \]
to compute internal validity the perception variables (question #16) in the Welfare survey produces a Cronbach’s Alpha of .411. The same formula used for the perception variables (Question #15) in the IEHA survey produces an alpha coefficient of .357.

Statistical Results

The following sections present frequency analyses, means & standard deviations, ANOVA, and correlation matrices for both the IEHA and the Welfare surveys.

IEHA Survey

The most prominent job title in the employer survey was Executive Housekeeper, although significant potential exists for overlap among job titles. Depending on the size of a property, the same person may actually be responsible for all areas, regardless of job title. “Other” responses included; general manager, project manager, director of services, safety & Security manager, and motor vehicle department manager.
Table 6

**Frequency Analysis--JEHA Question 1: Job Title**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Housekeeper</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Services Manager</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Maintenance Manager</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundskeeping Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* $n = 93.$

Table 7 shows the overwhelming majority of respondents were employed in health care facilities that offered both short-term and long-term care. “Other” responses included college/university, cleaning contractor, and retirement home. If a respondent’s answer was not listed as a choice and didn’t fit logically into one of the categories it would have been coded as other, but if they answered “retirement home”, that would have been counted under Care Facility.
Table 7

**Frequency Analysis—IEHA Question 2: Type of Organization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Organization</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Motel/Apartment</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital/Nursing Home/Care Facility</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/School/Church</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 93.*

Table 8 shows that nearly all respondents made their own hire / no hire decisions. It was important to the study that respondents were in a position to actually hire welfare recipients.

Table 8

**Frequency Analysis—IEHA Question 6: Final decision to hire or not hire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final decision to hire or not hire</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I do</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department head(not GM/CEO)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other / Group decision</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 93.*
Nearly two-thirds of all respondents experienced difficulty finding qualified workers for the positions they had available (see Table 9), and the most frequent reason employers felt they had difficulty was because the local economy was good (see Table 10). Survey answers varied somewhat when listing reasons for difficulties, and some respondents listed three or four reasons. When multiple answers were listed, they were coded as "combination" in Table 10.

Table 9

Frequency Analysis—IEHA Question 7: Have had trouble finding workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 93.
Table 10

Frequency Analysis--IEHA Question 8: Reasons for trouble finding workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low unemployment locally</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low wages or benefits</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of education or skills</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time work only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location or transportation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty of job</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of 2 or more above</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, but no explanation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 93.

Table 11 indicates that 63% of respondents did not have welfare referrals working in their department at the time of the survey. Respondents may have had prior experiences with welfare workers however, because Table 12 shows that comparisons of welfare workers to non-welfare workers resulted in a relatively even distribution of opinion about welfare workers compared to non-welfare workers.
Table 11

**Frequency Analysis—IEHA Question 9: Currently have welfare workers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 93.*

Table 12

**Frequency Analysis—IEHA Question 10: Compare welfare workers to other workers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better than other workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same as other workers</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not as good as other workers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 93.*
Table 13

Frequency Analysis--IEHA Question 11: Services currently provided by employer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child care assistance</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible scheduling</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal services</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as 2nd language</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family counseling</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site medical services</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse counseling</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation assistance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life skills training</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended probation period</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing assistance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (nonspecific)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 93.

*Totals might exceed 100% since each respondent could answer multiple items.

In Table 13, Flexible Scheduling, Family Counseling, and Drug Abuse Counseling rated highest as the services most frequently offered by employers.
Table 14

Frequency Analysis—IEHA Question 12: Services employer is willing to provide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child care assistance</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible scheduling</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as 2nd language</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family counseling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site medical services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse counseling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation assistance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life skills training</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended probation period</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing assistance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the above</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 93.

'Totals might exceed 100% since each person could mark multiple items.

Table 14 reveals that employers would be most willing to provide Child Care and Transportation Services. These two services are also considered important by welfare recipients, as shown in Tables 44 & 45.
Table 15

Frequency Analysis--IEHA Question 13: Influence of wage subsidies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence of Wage Subsidies</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very influential</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat influential</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very influential</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not influential at all</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 93.

According to Table 15, most employers are not concerned about governmental subsidies when hiring welfare workers. According to employer responses, they usually hire who the applicant they believe is most qualified regardless of their welfare status.

Table 16 examined the idea that employers might feel some responsibility for the worker’s success. The largest single response category was that employer and employee are equally responsible --- 50 / 50 --- but as a cumulative total, most employers (74%) still believe employees are more responsible for their own success in the workplace.
### Table 16

**Frequency Analysis—IEHA Question 14: Responsibility for workplace success**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer %</th>
<th>Employee %</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 93.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Scheduling</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Counseling</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse Counseling</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Probationary Period</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as Second Language</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care assistance</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Skills Training</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Assistance</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site Medical Services</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Assistance</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 93.

*aScale of measurement was 0 or 1; 0 for not provided, 1 for provided. Value range for Means was 0.0 to 1.0.

Table 17 shows, in descending order, the number of employers that currently offer various employee services.
Table 18

**Means & Standard Deviations—IEHA Question 12: Services willing to provide**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child care assistance</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Scheduling</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Assistance</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the Above</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Skills Training</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Probationary Period</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse Counseling</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as Second Language</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Counseling</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site Medical Services</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Assistance</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the Above</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 93.

<sup>a</sup>Scale of measurement was 0 or 1; 0 for not provided, 1 for provided. Value range for Mean was 0.0 to 1.0.

Table 18 shows, in descending order, how many employers would be willing to provide various employee services.
Table 19

Means & Standard Deviations--IEHA Question 15: Most people on welfare are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most people on welfare:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are men</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are White</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speak English</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are unwed mothers</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are poorly educated</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are not very healthy</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are probably just lazy</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>could work if they wanted to</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don’t mind being on welfare</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>know how to manage money</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have substance abuse problems</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would probably make good workers</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are to blame for their own problems</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stay on welfare less than six months</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 93.

aMeasurement scale was 1 through 5; 1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree.

Table 19 shows employer perceptions of welfare recipients as a group.
Table 20

**Correlation Matrix for JEHA Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>W1</th>
<th>W2</th>
<th>W3</th>
<th>W4</th>
<th>W5</th>
<th>W6</th>
<th>W7</th>
<th>W8</th>
<th>W9</th>
<th>W10</th>
<th>W11</th>
<th>W12</th>
<th>W13</th>
<th>W14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.75</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* W1 = substance abuse problems, W2 = blame for own problems, W3 = could work, W4 = well educated, W5 = speak English, W6 = good workers, W7 = generally healthy, W8 = are lazy, W9 = are men, W10 = don't mind being on welfare, W11 = know how to manage money, W12 = receive benefits less than six months, W13 = unwed mothers, W14 = are white.

*a* = 93.
Welfare Survey

In Table 21, the highest number of respondents to the welfare survey — 37.6% — have been living in Las Vegas for over ten years with another 11.5% indicating Las Vegas as their birthplace. Together, these two categories make up nearly half of the respondents to the survey. The other half of respondents began arriving during the economic boom periods of the 1980s and 1990s.

Table 21

Frequency Analysis—Welfare Question 1: How long lived in Las Vegas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months but &lt; 12 months</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 months but &lt; 3 years</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years but &lt; 7 years</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 years but &lt; 10 years</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years or longer</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in LV / All my life</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 166.

Table 22 shows that nearly 80% of all the welfare recipients in Las Vegas arrived from other areas of the country or the world. The majority or respondents arrived in Las...
Vegas from the northeast, southeast, and midwestern states, with only a few being from neighboring states like Utah, Arizona or California.

Table 22

Frequency Analysis--Welfare Question 2: Country or state born in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas or Nevada</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States (not LV or NV)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico/Latin America</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean Islands</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 166.

According to Table 23, most people were not actually receiving welfare benefits, but had just applied for benefits at the time of the survey questionnaire. The second highest response was 12 to 24 months. Numerous respondents had collected benefits for a time, stopped collected benefits, then started again. Those responses were coded as “off/on” but no specific length of time.
Table 23

**Frequency Analysis—Welfare Question 3: How long receiving benefits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Just applied</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than six months</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months to 11 months</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 months to 24 months</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 months to 60 months</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 60 months</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-specific / Off &amp; On</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** n = 166.

In Table 24, Food Stamps was the most commonly noted benefit. Because the possibility existed that each respondent could have been receiving one or some or all benefits, the totals in Table 24 could exceed 100%. Medicaid benefits were just as likely to be received by the survey respondent as by a dependent of the respondent.
Table 24

Frequency Analysis—Welfare Question 4: Benefits currently receiving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TANF (cash payments)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food stamps</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing assistance</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 166.

*Totals might exceed 100% since each person could receive multiple benefits.

In Table 25, the majority of respondents were not working, but were looking for a job. In the Not working, not looking category, if a respondent classified his/her answer at all, they were most likely counted in the classified category or retired, or student.
Table 25

**Frequency Analysis—Welfare Question 5: Currently working**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time (at least 32 hours)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time (less than 32 hours)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working, but looking for a job</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working, not looking</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired or Full time Student</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** n = 166.

Table 26

**Frequency Analysis—Welfare Question 6: Kind of work you are doing now**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager/professional</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/sales/administrative</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision production</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator/fabricator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** n = 166.

Table 26 shows what kind of work the respondents were currently. In the largest category, Service, most responses reflected positions like maid, food server, dishwasher,
porter or the like. In the next largest category, technical/sales/administrative, responses were most often retail clerk, restaurant cashier, or clothing sales.

Table 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Work</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager / Professional</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical / Sales / Administrative</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision / Production</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator / Fabricator</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed (nonspecific)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n=166

Welfare survey question # 7 asked what kind of work the respondent would do if they could do any work they wanted. Expected responses included doctor, lawyer, politician, astronaut, movie star, etc. Respondents most answered in the Service category, and investigation of their answers revealed the respondents would most like work as Guest Room Attendants, Porters, Housemen, Utility Porters and the like.
It is of interest to note that while survey respondents most wanted to work in low level service jobs, Table 28 reveals that they wanted their children to work in high level professional jobs like doctor, lawyer, etc.

Table 28

Frequency Analysis—Welfare Question 8: Work would you like to see your children do

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager / Professional</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical / Sales / Administrative</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision / Production</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator / Fabricator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government / Military</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whatever makes them happy</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 166.
Table 29

**Frequency Analysis--Welfare Question 9: Number of people in household**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Just me or 1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 people</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5 people</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 8 people</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* \(n = 166\).

Table 30

**Frequency Analysis for Welfare Survey Question #10: Age of youngest child in household**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months to 1 year</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1 and 6 years</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 6 and 12 years</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 13 and 18 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 18 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* \(n = 166\).

Tables 29 and 30 show that most respondents lived in households of three to five occupants, and the age of the youngest child was between one year old and six years.
old. Children of six can attend school all day, but most children younger than six can’t attend public schools and are more likely to need day care services. Dependent children older than 18 years of age are not eligible for cash welfare payments, though if disabled can receive other welfare benefits.

Table 31

Frequency Analysis—Welfare Question 11: Marital status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married, living with mate</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married, separated from mate</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with someone, but not married</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 166.

Table 31 mirrored the national trend for welfare recipients to be single, whether from not being married, or from being widowed or divorced. Together, all unmarried categories made up nearly 75% of welfare recipients in this study.
Table 32

**Frequency Analysis—Welfare Question 12: Have completed special training**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 166.*

In Table 32, nearly 61% have not taken any special training that would help them to get a job. Specific types of training were not part of the response selections for the question.

Table 33

**Frequency Analysis—Welfare Question 13: Highest level of education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 years or less</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 to 12 years</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 166.*
Almost 70% of all respondents in Table 33 had a high school education or less. Respondents with college degree may seem surprising, but welfare recipients are often widows or divorcees. Having a college degree doesn't preclude the possibility of using welfare agencies.

Table 34

Frequency Analysis—Welfare Question 14: NV State Welfare doing all they can

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, no explanation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat me as individual</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be more sympathetic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be faster / more efficient</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer more programs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 166.

The large majority of respondents believe that Nevada State Welfare Division is doing all they can for welfare recipients. Of those in Table 34 who don't feel well treated, the largest part neither offered an explanation about why they felt that way, nor offered any suggestions for improvement.
Table 35

**Frequency Analysis--Welfare Question 15: Degree of employer concern for welfare recipients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Concern</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very concerned</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat concerned</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very concerned</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not concerned at all</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 166.*

Most respondents felt that employers were at least somewhat concerned about the condition of welfare recipients, as Table 35 shows. The range of answers to this question was pretty evenly divided across all respondents.
Table 36

**Frequency Analysis—Welfare Question 19: Sex**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *n* = 166.

Table 36 confirmed that the majority of welfare recipients in this study were women. For all the men who responded, the most common form of benefit received was food stamps.

Table 37

**Frequency Analysis—Welfare Question 20: Race**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental/Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *n* = 166.
Table 37 shows the ethnic breakdown of the Welfare survey respondents. Black respondent lead the list, followed by White, then Hispanic.

Tables 38 and 39 indicate the year born and age of survey respondents. The question of age was not on the survey, but was configured from the “year born” question.

Table 38

Frequency Analysis--Welfare Question 21: In what year born

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990 or later</td>
<td>1 * .7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 to 1989</td>
<td>5 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 to 1979</td>
<td>59 39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 to 1969</td>
<td>47 31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 to 1959</td>
<td>20 13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940 to 1949</td>
<td>12 8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1940</td>
<td>5 3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 166.

* This response was from a parent collecting Medicaid for her disabled child.
### Table 39

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 15 years old</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19 years old</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 years old</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29 years old</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 34 years old</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 39 years old</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 44 years old</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 44 years old</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Age, based on year of birth from Welfare Survey question #21 and categorized according the US Census Bureau guidelines, 1996, Table 601, p383.

\( n = 166. \)

*This response was from a parent collecting Medicaid for her nine-year old disabled child.*
### Table 40

**Frequency Analysis—Welfare Question 22: How much money made last year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$500 or less</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$501 to 1500</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1501 to 5000</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5001 to 10000</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10001 to 15000</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15001 to 20000</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $20000</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** n = 166.

### Table 41

**Frequency Analysis—Welfare Question 23: Compare this year to last year, financially**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** n = 166.

Most welfare recipients, according to the responses in Table 41, believe that this year will be financially better for them than last year.
Most welfare recipients, according to the responses in Table 41, believe that this year will be financially better for them than last year.

Table 42

**Frequency Analysis—Welfare Question 24: Tell an employer one thing about yourself**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m not lazy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat me with respect</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m a good worker</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give me a chance</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing / wouldn’t mention</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 166.*

In Table 42, only five respondents indicated they would not mention their welfare status to an employer. It was not determined whether they felt stigmatized about being on welfare, or if they just thought it was not an important issue.
Table 43

Means & Standard Deviations—Welfare Question 16: Most people on welfare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most people on welfare:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are men</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are White</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speak English</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are unwed mothers</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are poorly educated</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are generally not healthy</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are probably just lazy</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>could work if they wanted to</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don’t mind being on welfare</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>know how to handle money</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have substance abuse problems</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would make good workers</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are to blame for their own problems</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stay on welfare less than six months</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 166 for all variables.

*aScale of measurement was 1 to 5; 1 was strongly disagree, 5 was strongly agree.

Table 43 shows the welfare recipients perceptions of themselves as group. The three highest means (agree) were that: 1. welfare recipients could work if they wanted
too, 2. they would make good workers, and 3. they were mostly unwed mothers.

Table 44

Means & Standard Deviations—Welfare Question 17: Importance of services to workfare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child care assistance</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible scheduling</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal services</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as 2nd language</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family counseling</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site medical services</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse counseling</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation assistance</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life skills training</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended probation period</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing assistance</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJT for promotion</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 166 for each attribute.

*aScale of measurement was 1 through 6; 1 was least important, 6 was most important

In Table 44, welfare respondents indicated that they believed that child care was the most important service and employer could provide to enhance the welfare worker’s chance of success in the workplace.
### Table 45

**Welfare Question 18: Three most important services to welfare.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most important</td>
<td>Child care</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second most important</td>
<td>OJT for promotion</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third most important</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** N = 166 for each item.

*Number of times the item was ranked as 1st, 2nd, or 3rd.

*Might not total 100% because number of responses was different for each item.

Table 45 reinforces the results from Table 44 --- Child Care is the most important issue to welfare workers.
Table 46

ANOVA--Perception of Welfare Recipients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$F^*$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people on welfare:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are men</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.71**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are white</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.62***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speak English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.81*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are unwed mothers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.43**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are poorly educated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are not healthy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.93*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are lazy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>could work if they want</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don’t mind being on welfare</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.50**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>know how to manage money</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have substance abuse problems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.81**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would make good workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.32***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are to blame for their own problems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on welfare less than six months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.04*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 46 (continued)

**Analysis of Variance for Perception of Welfare Recipients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welfare Recipients</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>*&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEHA Survey</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>**&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Comparison between IEHA Survey responses (n = 93), and Welfare Survey responses (n = 166).

*a* *P* < .05. **P** < .01. ***P** < .001.

Table 46 is the ANOVA table in which the opinions of employers were compared to the opinions of welfare recipients on the 14 perception variables. While both groups differed significantly on most variables, the ones which they agreed upon were that welfare recipients could work if they wanted, that welfare recipients were poorly educated, that welfare recipients were lazy, and finally, that welfare recipients were to blame for their own problems.
Table 47

Correlation Matrix for Welfare Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable*</th>
<th>W1</th>
<th>W2</th>
<th>W3</th>
<th>W4</th>
<th>W5</th>
<th>W6</th>
<th>W7</th>
<th>W8</th>
<th>W9</th>
<th>W10</th>
<th>W11</th>
<th>W12</th>
<th>W13</th>
<th>W14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W11</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W14</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. W1 = substance abuse problems, W2 = blame for own problems, W3 = could work, 
W4 = well educated, W5 = speak English, W6 = good workers, W7 = generally healthy, 
W8 = are lazy, W9 = are men, W10 = don’t mind being on welfare, W11 = know how to 
manage money, W12 = receive benefits less than six months, W13 = unwed mothers, 
W14 = six months of welfare.

aN = 166
Table 47 (Continued)

**Correlation Matrix for Welfare Survey**

*In the original survey questionnaire, these questions were asked in the inverse, for example, W8 was on the questionnaire as “most are not lazy” but responses were recoded and values in this table assume the question was actually presented as “most are lazy.”*
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents a summary of the research study, particularly as it related to the reason, or justification for the study, the methodology used to collect research data, and finally to examine and interpret the results of data coding and statistical testing. Analysis and interpretation of the data collected were used to arrive at conclusions, not only about specific research questions related to the populations of interest, but also about the overall effectiveness of the research design and survey administration. Finally, the chapter presents recommendations for areas of further academic investigation, as well as the researcher's view of the future of the research topic.

Summary

In August 1996, President William Clinton, in an attempt to "end welfare as we know it" (Tubessing & Steisel, 1997) signed into law the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. This 502-page Act contains nine titles and is considered by many to be the most significant welfare reform act since the American welfare system was officially instituted by passage of the Social Security Act of 1935. The research interest in this topic was that the Personal Responsibility Act established a five-year lifetime maximum that welfare recipients could collect cash benefits from
Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF). In 2001, as the 60-month time limits begin to expire, recipients will be removed from the TANF welfare roles and essentially will be responsible for their own subsistence. The vast majority of welfare recipients receive benefits for about three years, so the Act poses no significant or immediate threat. The Personal Responsibility Act was specifically designed to target the nearly 20 percent of the welfare population that has become identified with chronic and severe dependence on welfare as a way of life. The bottom 20 percent of the welfare population, known as the Hardest to Employ (HtE), faces multiple barriers to employment, including lack of education, poor work history, substance abuse, and long-term welfare dependence.

In order to facilitate employment of this segment of the welfare population, employers may have to provide them with extraordinary workplace accommodations, particularly in the early part of the work experience. To overcome the multiple barriers associated with this group, accommodations or services would be designed to not only get the worker to work, but to keep the worker at work once there. Such accommodations or services could include: child care assistance, transportation assistance, housing assistance, substance / domestic abuse counseling, legal services, medical services, and life skills training.

Research Questions

The researcher, having been in a position of employing welfare recipients in housekeeping related positions, was familiar, in an anecdotal sense, with the employer’s side of this issue. Not only did the researcher want to compare experiences with other housekeeping related employers, but also wanted to investigate the issue from the welfare recipient’s viewpoint. The goal of this exploratory study was to answer four specific
questions that could provide information about the likelihood of successful transition from welfare to work for long term recipients. Two major research questions were deemed essential to the study. They were:

1. What accommodations or services do welfare recipients feel are important to facilitate their transition from welfare to work?
2. What accommodations or services are employers in housekeeping related positions willing to provide in order to facilitate the welfare recipient’s transition to work, and eventual self-sufficiency?

Two additional questions were asked that could provide insight about the major objectives, but, in themselves were not believed to be critical to the study. The two minor questions were:

1. How do housekeeping related employers view welfare recipients as a group, and as potential employees?
2. How do welfare recipients view the welfare system, and how do they view themselves, as a group, and as potential employees?

**Data Collection**

In order to answer these questions, the research design incorporated the following processes:

1. Literature review --- regarding the historical genesis and evolution of the American welfare system, political and social theories of poverty, characteristics of welfare recipients, and finally the current state the welfare system. A review of the literature provided a sense of the depth and breadth of the American welfare system, and
welfare recipients, and finally the current state the welfare system. A review of the literature provided a sense of the depth and breadth of the American welfare system, and set the stage for exploring current welfare reform legislation. The review of literature for Chapter 2 included traditional library research methods, on-line research through the Internet, and other electronic data resources, particularly related to government and statistical web-sites, and to observation of current public opinion expressed in daily or weekly newspapers, or published in relevant periodicals.

2. Personal observation --- between February 1998 and March 1999, the researcher attended monthly public meetings of the Southern Nevada Private Industry Council in Las Vegas, Nevada. These observations not only provided a knowledge base for subsequent questionnaire design, but also provided an opportunity to observe the participants in their natural "environment" by observing interactions between welfare administrators, business leaders, and welfare recipients. (Bunker Pearlson, & Schulz, 1995, as cited in N. Sinn).

3. Personal interviews --- with members of the SNPIC board, with business leaders, and with welfare recipients. Five semi-structured and undisguised (Churchill, 1995) interviews provided unique perspectives from several viewpoints about how welfare reform is affecting various groups, and also provided information about what's good and what's not so good in the welfare system. Complete transcriptions of the each interview are presented in the Appendices section.

4. Survey questionnaires --- one for employers, called the IEHA Survey, and one for welfare recipients, called the Welfare Survey. The IEHA Survey was a mail-in survey which had been published in the trade magazine Executive Housekeeping Today and the
Welfare-Survey was an intercept survey handed to welfare recipients as they waited in the lobbies of state welfare service offices. These self-administered surveys were designed to collect both demographic data on each group, as well as data specific to each group. Both surveys, which included closed, forced-choice questions, open-ended questions, and multi-level Likert-scale questions, were approved by the UNLV Office of Human Subjects, and administered in a fashion consistent with approved survey methods.

Statistical Methodology

Statistical methods utilized in this study were designed to make meaningful comparisons between the two groups, and also to establish the degree to which the study could be considered valid and reliable. The statistical package SPSS, versions 6.1, 7.5 and 8.0 were utilized for all the analyses in the study.

For the IEHA survey, 93 completed surveys were received and analyzed, while 166 Welfare Surveys were completed. Responses on all questions were coded, counted, and input as SPSS data files. Once the files were complete, each question on both the IEHA Survey and on the Welfare Survey was subjected to a frequency analysis. Histograms, stem & leaf plots, and boxplots were used to determine the distribution of responses. One-way ANOVA was utilized to compare the employer’s perception of welfare recipients and the welfare recipient’s response to the same question. In addition, several questions in both surveys were subjected to simple regression to try and predict certain relationships between variables.
Validity

Reliability in a survey instrument concerns the extent to which the instrument would yield similar results when administered under similar conditions. To that end, this study would probably meet the criteria for reliability. Validity, which was discussed in detail in Chapter 4, was a bigger concern for the researcher than was reliability. Using the formula presented in Chapter 4, construct validity was tested only for the 14 perception variables, using inter-item correlation to calculate Cronbach’s Alpha.

Cronbach’s Alpha for IEHA Survey was: .357. (Barely a moderate relationship)

Cronbach’s Alpha for Welfare Survey was: .411. (A moderate relationship)

Generalizability

This study used convenience samples rather than probability samples to collect data about the populations of interest. The exploratory nature of the information, along with the small sample size and restricted sampling frame used for the study should be considered anecdotal. Researchers making any generalization to larger populations should do so with great care.

Conclusions

Personal Interviews

1. Interviewees were very concerned about welfare reform, since the Personal Responsibility Act was such a significant reform measure. They all believed that the Southern Nevada Private Industry Council has a difficult job, and has shown a significant lack of understanding about the Act and about their own responsibility as the
Southern Nevada Private Industry Council has a difficult job, and has shown a significant lack of understanding about the Act and about their own responsibility as the administrative arm of Welfare-to-Work. Additionally, they believe the PIC board, for mostly political reasons, has accomplished very little progress in establishing the link between employers and welfare recipients.

2. They were all dedicated to their respective causes, but there seemed to be little cooperation about getting things done as a group. Just like the three major groups mentioned in Chapter 2, each group wanted to protect their own interest, even if sometimes it seemed antagonistic toward other groups.

3. A lot of confusion surrounded the articles of the Personal Responsibility Act. It contains nine titles in 502 pages of findings, conditions, exceptions, and legalese. It is a very complicated law and will undoubtedly take a long time to determine its true effects on welfare reform and on welfare recipients.

4. Welfare activists interviewed for the study believed that they were victims of the system and that difficult times were ahead for all welfare recipients. They believed the welfare administrators and social workers didn’t really care about the people they are supposed to be helping. In their opinion, many State Welfare Division employees act like this welfare reform act is just another in a long line of welfare reform legislation, and that all that the employees have to do is hang on, do the minimum required to get by, and this too, shall pass.
Research Question #1

Answering research question #1; What services or accommodations do welfare recipients feel are important in helping them keep a job and become self-sufficient?

1. Child care --- not surprising since, by all accounts, local, state and national, child care was the single most desirable service by working moms, welfare recipients or not.

2. On-the-job training for promotion --- a significant issue to welfare recipients, many of whom believed that current welfare-to-work programs were akin to slavery. Entry level jobs are usually only good if it leads to something more rewarding, not only monetarily, but also as a way to boost self-esteem. Recall Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs Theory that says once the lower level needs are met, human nature seeks to accomplish higher level needs(Milkovich & Boudreau, 1990, as cited in T. Jones).

For welfare recipients forced into public works jobs cleaning up trash from public parks or sweeping streets and gutters for less than minimum wage, it is almost more rewarding, at least monetarily, to stay on welfare. Welfare recipients and social reform groups across America are protesting current welfare reforms.

3. Transportation Assistance --- The third most important service according to the welfare survey and one which promises to be an expensive and difficult service for welfare agencies, or employers to provide.
Research Question #2.

Answering research question #2; What services or accommodation are employers willing to provide in order to help welfare recipients in their transition to work and self-sufficiency?

1. Flexible scheduling is the service currently offered most in this study (53%). The researcher believes the high values for this service could be due to the high number of respondents from hospitals and health care facilities --- nearly 61% of survey respondents. Flexible scheduling may be the most offered service not because it benefits the employee, but because it benefits the company. Of the companies that don’t currently offer flexible scheduling, only 26% were willing to provide it in the future.

2. Day Care; according to welfare recipients is the most important of all the services presented in this survey, yet only 15% of employers surveyed currently offer any kind of day care services. In addition, survey results show that only 36% of employers would be willing to offer day care in the future. The researcher’s personal experience with Las Vegas hotels is that employer’s might promise to provide day care in order to attract new employees, but in the end seldom actually provide day care. Not that employers are intentionally misleading employees, but more that the employers may not know the real difficulties and expense involved with providing employee day care

3. OJT for promotions received unexpectedly high ranking as the second most important variable. This would not come as a surprise to followers of the welfare system, since a major argument against the Personal Responsibility Act was that it
created slave labor. Cleaning parks, sweeping streets, filing papers and other similar jobs don’t offer the welfare recipient much hope for rising to a level of self-sufficiency. Often, welfare recipients felt they were being forced to take menial jobs just to get them off welfare.

The statistical analysis was not favorable for employers providing services to accommodate welfare-to-work participants. Based on the researcher’s personal experience, it was not unreasonable to conclude that numbers could have been so low on this issue because;

1. Employers still maintain the idea that they are not primarily responsible for success in the workplace. All the training, all the services, all the programs they offer are not going to make a bad worker into a good worker. I believe most employers feel that if someone is poor, it is their own fault. And even if there are employers who believe otherwise, most businesses are not “islands unto themselves” that can do whatever they want in the business. Bottom-line profit could be a more powerful motivator for general managers and CEO’s, than is the need to do social good by hiring too many welfare workers. Chapter 2 spoke about the Puritan idea of giving a little, but not too much. Giving a little shows proper concern, but giving too much could lead to a breakdown in the work ethic and even more dependence on welfare.

2. Programs are expensive to offer, and even though the Personal Responsibility Act provides subsidies for such programs, the government is not going to fund those programs neither indefinitely, nor for non-welfare workers. Part of the problem could be that American law generally prohibits discrimination
in the workplace, and if the programs are there for welfare workers, they have to be there for the non-welfare workers. In the end, workplace accommodation could become an ever-increasing spiral of services and accommodations that someone has to pay for.

3. Employers have the idea that they have the job and will hire whoever is most qualified. They want applicants who are already trained, or at least minimally qualified, and even with an unemployment rate of 4.5%, there are usually enough qualified people for the entry-level positions presented in this study.

4. The final reason for the low response to this question could be because the survey instrument was not as valid as it might have been. The question of willingly providing services had the highest degree (46 of 93) of missing data than all other questions. Item non-response could have been the result of poor question wording, or because the question was confusing, or otherwise difficult to interpret. Another possibility is that although the employer/respondents were autonomous enough to hire their employees, they might not have been in a position to offer opinions about the provision of extraordinary programs or services. This would be a systematic sampling error.

Research Question #3.

Answering Question #3; How do employers perceive welfare recipients as a group and as potential employees? Statistics indicated that the employers who acknowledged some past experience with welfare workers rated them as being worse than non-welfare workers, and although only a small number of employers had experience with welfare workers, it seemed to have been bad.
acknowledged some past experience with welfare workers rated them as being worse than non-welfare workers, and although only a small number of employers had experience with welfare workers, it seemed to have been bad.

The second part to the question can be answered by looking at the perception variables in question 15 of the IEHA Survey. Statistically, comparing the 14 attributes, employers tended to agree more than welfare recipients agree that welfare recipients were: lazy, poorly educated, and English speaking. On the 11 other attributes, welfare recipients had a more negative attitude about themselves than did the employers. Whether these differences have any practical significance is not known.

**Research Question #4.**

In addressing research question #4; How do welfare recipients see themselves as a group, and as potential employees?

According to the highest number of responses to each question in the Welfare Survey, the average Las Vegas, Nevada welfare recipient was:

A single Black female, between the ages of 25 and 29. She was born in the United States and had been living in Las Vegas for over ten years. She had been on welfare for about two years, and collected mainly food stamps and Medicaid. She was not currently working, but was looking for a job. When she did work, she did service work, mostly housekeeping or kitchen work. She will most likely continue to do that kind of work but would like to see her children work as a doctors, lawyers, or in some other professional field. There were three to five people living in her house, and the youngest child was less than six years old. She made less than $500.00 last year, and that may be partly because
she only had a high-school education and had not completed any special training to help her find work. But she was optimistic that this year would be better than last year because Nevada State Welfare Division was doing all they could for her and if she just had some day care for her children, she believed she would do well on the job because she was a good worker.

Her perceptions of welfare recipients generally was that nearly all welfare recipients were unwed mothers like herself, who were not just lazy, who didn’t like being on welfare and could work if they wanted too. Typical welfare recipients, in her opinion, didn’t have substance abuse problems, they knew how to handle money and were not to blame for their own problems.

IEHA Profile.

Based on the most frequent answers to the IEHA questionnaire, the average respondent was (see Tables 1 - 19 in Chapter 4): An Executive Housekeeper employed in a health care facility, making between $30,000 and $40,000 per year. This executive employees 8 part-time employees, 52 full time employees, and runs their department on an annual budget between $600,000 and $800,000. The staff was 47% white, 26% Black, 18% Hispanic, 4% Asian, 2% European, 1% American Indian, and the final 2% could be Jamaican, Polynesian, Native Alaskan, or Russian. This executive hired his/her own staff, but over the past six months has been able to fill only two of every three jobs available, and the reason, it seemed was that the local economy was so good that there were just not enough workers for all the jobs. Currently there were no welfare-to-work participants in the department, and it may be related to the fact that in the supervisor’s experience,
enough workers for all the jobs. Currently there were no welfare-to-work participants in
the department, and it may be related to the fact that in the supervisor’s experience,
welfare workers are not as good as non-welfare workers. It was unlikely that this
supervisor would hire welfare workers and said that government wage subsidies were not
at all important to the hiring decision. In addition, the supervisor felt little responsibility
in whether or not the employee was successful in the workplace.

Workplace accommodations or services were limited since the employer neither
currently provided, nor was willing to provide any of the benefits listed except flexible
scheduling. The supervisor’s perception about a typical welfare recipient was that she is a
poorly educated, English-speaking minority, who was as likely as not to blame for her own
problems, but who was probably not lazy, would probably be a good worker, and
definitely could work if she wanted to. She probably didn’t have substance abuse
problems and was in relatively good health. The perception was that this unwed mother
didn’t mind being on welfare, and that’s probably why she’s been on welfare longer than
six months.

Recommendations

Future Studies

A primary purpose of exploratory studies is generally to provide new insights into
problems about which little is known. At the outset, exploratory studies should not offer
hypotheses to prove or disprove, but a properly conducted exploratory study should, in
the end, should provide the researcher with sufficient knowledge to make hypotheses
about the subject.
Hypotheses.

Based on information gained from this study about welfare reform generally and more specifically about the relationship between employers and welfare recipients, it is not unreasonable to offer the following hypotheses:

1. Welfare reform will probably continue to be a serious legal and emotional issue for the American public. Long-term solutions to welfare reform could be a mixture of political and social interactions.

Future study in welfare reform could include a long-term, perhaps five to ten year longitudinal study into effects of the Personal Responsibility Act. Case studies of several individuals might be particularly revealing about how reform issues affect different people.

2. Employers generally continue to operate on short-term profit practices and most employers feel no particular responsibility to include social responsibility in their management practices. Unless employers are enlightened to the long-term benefits of social responsibility, and dedicated to its performance, they will probably not play a significant role in welfare reform.

3. Welfare reform will likely change the workplace in ways not yet known. The cultures and subcultures of the workplace could be seriously affected by hiring welfare recipients to do jobs once done by skilled, well-educated workers. Lack of acceptance of welfare workers by non-welfare employees may cause self-esteem and control issues among the regular workforce.
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Industry Study.

Investigating those hypotheses could be accomplished by enlarging this study and more closely examining issues raised in this study, specifically:

1. Enlarging the service industry employer sampling frame to a much larger population. The American Hotel & Motel Association and the American Restaurant Association could be good places to start. The membership of those organizations far exceeds the sampling frame used in this study, and could offer a much more accurate picture of the hospitality industry. Using just those two organizations exclusively could result in systematic sampling bias, but the larger population would probably provide the opportunity for the researcher to select a probability sample through random selection process. The random selection process would allow for a much more statistically accurate picture of the industry. Expanded statistical analysis on a large sample would also allow for much more generalizeable results.

Workplace Study.

Expanding the study into the workplace and concentrating on the employer’s side of welfare reform could be revealing. Employers like UPS, United Airlines, Marriott Hotels, as well as smaller employers could be studied and surveyed about their self-perceived role in welfare reform. In addition, employers could be studied in terms of company and individual values, norms and roles as related to the Management by Values theory discussed in Chapter 2 (Goll, 1996). Managers will probably have a difficult task in integrating welfare workers into the workplace if their presence causes conflict with other employees. Conflict and loss of self-esteem could result with some non-welfare
employees who may have had their work and compensation reduced in order to accommodate a less qualified worker. Managers who hire welfare workers because of governmental hiring incentives but say they're doing it out of social responsibility could be creating their own conflict, and are hiring welfare workers for the wrong reasons. Under those circumstances, it seems unlikely that the Personal Responsibility Act would function as it was designed.
DATE: May 8, 1998

TO: Terry K. Jones
M/S 6021 (HTLM)

FROM: Dr. William E. Schulze, Director
Office of Sponsored Programs (X1357)

REF: Status of Human Subject Protocol Entitled:
"An Exploratory Study of the Role of the
Hospitality Industry in the Welfare to Work
Programs of the Late 1990s"

OSP # 604s0598-033

The protocol for the project referenced above has been
reviewed by the Institutional Review Board Secretary in the
Office of Sponsored Programs and it has been determined that
it meets the criteria for approval under the Multiple
Assurance Agreement for the UNLV Human Subjects
Institutional Review Board. This protocol is approved for
a period of one year from the date of this notification and
work on the project may proceed.

Should the use of human subjects described in this protocol
continue beyond a year from the date of this notification,
it will be necessary to request an extension.

If you have any questions regarding this approval, please
contact Marsha Green in the Office of Sponsored Programs at
895-1357.

cc: G. Goll (HTLM-6021)
OSP File

Office of Sponsored Programs
4505 Maryland Parkway • Box 451037 • Las Vegas, Nevada 89154-1037
(702) 895-1357 • FAX (702) 895-4242
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March 30, 1999

Mr. Terry Jones  
c/o William F. Harrah  
College of Hotel Administration  
Department of Hotel Management  
Box 456021  
4505 Maryland Parkway  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89154-6021

Dear Mr. Jones:

This letter serves to provide the Welfare Division’s approval of your request to conduct a survey of welfare recipients in the Las Vegas area as a part of the doctoral program within the University of Las Vegas (UNLV) college of hotel administration.

As I indicated in my conversation with you Friday, March 26, 1999, I do not see how some questions you have proposed to ask will achieve your stated goal “to ask welfare recipients what they feel will help them be successful in the work place.” However, you indicated they are questions from other studies you have seen and would like to see Nevada’s comparable data.

I will remind you the survey is completely voluntary. If a welfare applicant/recipient chooses not to answer your questions, they will not be pressured to do so. Also, your work in the local office lobbies needs to not disrupt the office’s business and activities.

I am sending a copy of this approval letter to each office manager in the Las Vegas area as follows:

Dave Wallace, Social Welfare Manager, Belrose Office 486-1600  
Liliam Shell, Social Welfare Manager, Owens Office 486-1800  
Barbara Clark, Social Welfare Manager, Charleston Office 486-4701  
Paula Petruso, Social Welfare Manager, Henderson Office 486-1201
Mr. Terry Jones  
March 30, 1999  
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You will need to contact them to make arrangements to conduct your survey.

Sincerely,

Michael J. Willden  
Deputy Administrator, Program and Field Operations

cc:  Dave Wallace, Social Welfare Manager, Belrose  
     Liliam Shell, Social Welfare Manager, Owens  
     Barbara Clark, Social Welfare Manager, Charleston  
     Paula Petruso, Social Welfare Manager, Henderson
August 15, 1998

Mr.
Community Activist
Southern Nevada Welfare to Work Program
N. Las Vegas, NV 89030

Dear Mr.:

Thank you for taking a few minutes after the recent SNPIC meeting to talk with me. I am writing to explain a bit more about my research project, and to formally request your participation in the study. Since I don’t have your phone number, I respectfully request that you call me at home, 452-7232, or at my work 383-4764 to discuss a time and place for our interview.

As a doctoral student at UNLV’s College of Hotel Administration, I am exploring the relationship between the hospitality industry and welfare reform legislation recently enacted by the Clinton Administration. The hospitality industry can provide a large number of the kind of “entry-level” jobs sought by workfare providers. From your position as Community Activist, you can share a unique viewpoint about what barriers exist for service providers and/or for welfare recipients in the Welfare to Work program.

I anticipate a rather informal interview which may last about one hour, and I would appreciate your comments on the following questions:

1) On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being “very bad”, and 10 being “very good” how would you rate welfare agencies in Southern Nevada at providing services to the people who need them the most. Please explain your answer.

2) As a Community Activist for the Welfare to Work Program, what role, if any do you play in deciding what services are provided to assist welfare recipients in finding and keeping a job?
3) Do you have suggestions about how the Welfare to Work programs should be administered or implemented in order to overcome the kinds of barriers faced by Welfare recipients?
Mr. ........, with your permission, I would like to tape record our interview for transcription at a later date, and will have a consent form for your signature. Additionally, in compliance with UNLV’s policy on research involving human subjects, I am required to explain the following:

a) your participation in this interview is voluntary and you may quit at any time.
b) your identity in regard to specific comments will be kept anonymous, though your answers will be presented in aggregate with other study participants.
c) the only cost/risk to you is the time required for the interview.
d) no monetary or other compensation is provided for your participation, though a complimentary copy of the completed study will be provided at your request.
e) for information on the rights of research subjects, you may contact UNLV’s Office of Sponsored Programs at (702) 895-1357. For information on this specific project you may contact Dr. Gerald Goll, UNLV, College of Hotel Administration, 895-3124.

Thank you for your participation in this study. I believe your comments, along with those of other participants will help design affective programs to aid welfare recipients in their transition to self sufficiency, and may assist the hospitality industry with a new source of competent and dedicated workers.

Sincerely,

Terry Jones
APPENDIX D

INFORMED CONSENT & PERMISSION TO TAPE RECORD
CONSENT TO AUDIO-TAPE RECORD

In compliance with the University of Nevada’s policy on research involving human subjects, the following information presents guidelines under which our interview will be audio tape recorded.

a) Audio tapes will be kept in a secure place until no longer needed, at which time they will be destroyed.

b) Your participation in this interview is voluntary, and you may quit at any time.

c) Your identity in regard to specific comments will be kept anonymous, though your comments will be presented in aggregate with other participants.

d) The only cost/risk to you is the time necessary to complete the interview.

e) No monetary or other compensation is provided, but a complimentary copy of the completed survey is available at your request.

f) For information on the rights of research subjects, you may contact UNLV’s Office of Sponsored Programs at (702) 895-1357. For specific information on this project, you may contact Dr. Gerald Goll, at UNLV, William F. Harrah College of Hotel Administration (702) 895-3124.

I have read and understand the above, and by my signature authorize the

interviewer, ______ Terry Jones _______, to audio tape record this interview.

(Interviewee) ____________________________ (Date)
1996 welfare laws say that welfare recipients have to find work or face a loss of benefits. The service industry can offer many entry-level jobs to welfare recipients, and your voluntary participation in this survey will provide information about how service managers perceive welfare-to-work participants, and how managers can help reduce barriers to employment for welfare recipients. Please answer candidly. Your responses will remain strictly confidential.

1. Job Title (Circle all that apply)
   a. Executive Housekeeper  b. Environmental Services Manager  c. Facilities Maintenance Manager
   d. Groundskeeping Manager  e. Laundry Manager  f. Other ______________________

2. Type of Organization: (Circle the ONE most appropriate category)
   a. Hotel/Motel/Apartment  b. Hospital/Nursing Home/Care Facility  c. Laundry
   d. Industrial Complex/Airport  e. Office Building/School/Church  f. Other ______________________

3. Approximate number of employees in your department?
   a. Full-time (32 to 40 hours p/week)  b. Part-Time (Less than 32 hours p/week)

4. What is your annual budget?
   a. Less than $200,000  b. $200,000 - $399,999  c. $400,000 - $499,999
   d. $500,000 - $699,999  e. $700,000 - $2,000,000  f. More than $2,000,000

5. From the list below, please mark a percentage for each group that best describes the ethnicity of your staff. The total amount must equal 100%.
   a. Caucasian ______________%  b. Black ______________%  c. Hispanic ______________%
   d. Asian ______________%  e. Eastern European ______________%  f. American Indian ______________%
   g. Other (please explain) __________________________________________________________________________

6. In your department, who makes the final decision to hire or not hire?
   a. I do  b. My department head (not GM/CEO)  c. Human Resources Department
   d. General Manager / CEO  e. Other

7. Thinking back over the past 6 months, have you had difficulty finding workers to fill available jobs in your department?
   a. Yes  b. No  c. Don't know

8. What is your opinion about why you have had trouble finding workers?

9. Do you currently have persons working in your department who were referred to you by a welfare agency?
   a. Yes  b. No  c. Don't know

10. In general, how would you compare your welfare-to-work employees to most of your other employees? Would you say welfare-to-work employees are
    a. Better than most others  b. About the same as most others  c. Not as good as most others

11. From the following list of services or accommodations, please mark ALL that are currently available through your company to assist the welfare participant's transition into the workplace.
    a)____ Child care assistance  g)____ Substance abuse counseling
    b)____ Flexible scheduling  h)____ Transportation assistance
    c)____ Legal services  i)____ Life skills training
    d)____ English as a second language (ESL)  j)____ Extended probationary period
    e)____ On the job training (OJT)  k)____ Family counseling services
    f)____ On-site medical facilities  l)____ Housing assistance
    m)____ Don't know  n)____ Other_________________

12. Now, from the same list, mark the letter of each item that you currently don't have that you would be willing to provide in order to enhance workplace success for welfare-to-work employees.
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13. State or federal government agencies generally provide at least partial wage reimbursement to employers that hire welfare recipients. In your opinion, how influential are wage subsidies in the hiring decision?
   a. Very influential. I always consider wage subsidies when hiring a welfare person.
   b. Somewhat influential. I usually consider wage subsidies when hiring a minimally qualified welfare person.
   c. Not very influential. I usually don't consider wage subsidies when hiring a well qualified welfare person.
   d. Not influential at all. I never consider wage subsidies. I just hire the most qualified person.
   e. No opinion

14. If you could assign to both the employer and to the welfare recipient a measure of responsibility for getting the welfare recipient back to work, how would you divide the responsibility? The two must add up to 100%.

   Employer: __________%  Employee: __________% 

15. For each of the following statements, mark the column which most closely matches your opinion about the statement.

   | Most people on welfare are men. | Strongly Agree | Somewhat Agree | Neither Agree | Somewhat Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Don't Know |
   | Most people on welfare are white. |                        |                |              |                  |                  |           |
   | Most people on welfare speak English. |                        |                |              |                  |                  |           |
   | Most people on welfare are unwed mothers. |                        |                |              |                  |                  |           |
   | Most people on welfare are poorly educated. |                        |                |              |                  |                  |           |
   | Most people on welfare are not very healthy. |                        |                |              |                  |                  |           |
   | Most people on welfare are probably just lazy. |                        |                |              |                  |                  |           |
   | Most people on welfare could work if they wanted to. |                        |                |              |                  |                  |           |
   | Most people on welfare don't mind being on welfare. |                        |                |              |                  |                  |           |
   | Most people on welfare know how to manage money. |                        |                |              |                  |                  |           |
   | Most people on welfare have substance abuse problems. |                        |                |              |                  |                  |           |
   | Most people on welfare would probably make good workers. |                        |                |              |                  |                  |           |
   | Most people on welfare are to blame for their own problems. |                        |                |              |                  |                  |           |
   | Most people on welfare stay on welfare for less than six months. |                        |                |              |                  |                  |           |

Thank you for your participation. Watch for survey results in future issues of Executive Housekeeping Today.

Your may return your completed survey directly to the William H. Harrah College of Hotel Administration, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, 4505 Maryland Parkway, PO Box 456021, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89154-6021. FAX (702) 895-4872.

You may also return your completed survey to Executive Housekeeping Today, 1001 Eastwind Dr., Suite 301, Westerville, OH 43081-3361, FAX (614) 893-1248. Attention: Beth Risinger, Publisher
APPENDIX F

LETTER OF AGREEMENT TO PUBLISH IEHA SURVEY
October 15, 1998

Ms. Beth B. Risinger, Publisher
Executive Housekeeping Today
1001 Eastwind Drive, Suite 301
Westerville, Ohio 43081-3361

Dear Ms. Risinger,

Thank you for taking a few minutes to speak with me last Tuesday about placing a survey in Executive Housekeeping Today. I’m writing to tell you a little about myself, and about the survey.

I’m currently the Executive Housekeeper at the Stratosphere Hotel & Casino in Las Vegas, while at the same time pursuing a Ph.D. degree at UNLV’s Wm. H. Harrah College of Hotel Administration. One of the requirements for this doctoral degree is a research project which could be of interest to the hospitality industry, and it seems a natural opportunity to investigate welfare reform legislation recently enacted by the Clinton administration.

Housekeeping, with many “entry level” jobs, is a logical place to integrate welfare recipients into the workplace, and because I’ve had the opportunity to interview and hire (as GRA’s) a number of persons referred by local welfare agencies, I’m familiar with some of the difficulties these individuals face. Typically, the major responsibility for job success is placed on the welfare recipient, but I believe that accommodations on the part of employers can be a significant factor in long term job retention for welfare to work participants.

The survey seeks to identify the kinds of accommodations employers currently make for welfare to work participants, and what kinds of accommodations employers might be willing to make in the future. I anticipate about 20-25 questions, though more or less may be appropriate, depending on the format expected for publication. Per your instructions, I’ll have the survey to you on or before November 15th, in order to get into the January issue.
Ms. Risinger, we also spoke about the possibility of doing the survey from a membership mailing list. From a research standpoint, a random sample of a mailing list might be more appropriate, but for now I’d like to proceed with the magazine survey. If it seems the publication format might be restrictive, we can discuss a mailing list. As agreed, in exchange for your publication assistance, I will provide a completed copy of the survey data. I’ll be happy to present the completed survey in a future article, but I expect the data crunch and analysis to take some time after I receive them.

Thanks again for your assistance. If you require more information about the research project, you may contact my research chair, Dr. Jerry Goll, at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, telephone 702-895-3124, or contact me at the Stratosphere Hotel & Casino, 2000 Las Vegas Blvd. South, Las Vegas, NV, 89104. In addition, you should have my home address and phone number in your membership files.

Sincerely,

Terry Jones
In August 1996, welfare reform laws were enacted that limit the length of time that some people can receive public assistance. As a result, many current recipients are seeking employment, perhaps for the first time. This survey is being conducted by a doctoral student at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, to examine the kinds of services or programs that you feel could make it easier to keep a job. Your participation is voluntary and you may quit at any time. Your specific answers will remain confidential and anonymous. Your name won't be on this form anywhere, so please say what you really think. Thank you for your participation.

1. About how long have you lived in Las Vegas? ____________________________

2. What country / state were you born in? ____________________________

3. About how many months or years have you been receiving welfare assistance? ____________________________

4. Which types of assistance are you currently receiving? (Circle ALL that apply)
   a. TANF (Cash payments)
   b. W.I.C. (Women. Infants. & Children)
   c. Food Stamps
   d. Housing Assistance
   e. Medicare / Medicaid
   f. Other ____________________________

5. Are you currently: (Circle one)
   a. Working a full-time job (at least 32 hours).
   b. Working a part-time job (less than 32 hours).
   c. Not working, but looking for a job.
   d. Not working and not looking for a job.

6. If you are currently working, what kind of work are you doing? ____________________________

7. If you could do any kind of work you wanted, what would it be? Why? ____________________________

8. What kind of work would you like to see your children do? ____________________________

9. Including yourself, how many people live in your household? ________________

10. How old is the youngest child in your household? ________________

11. Are you now:
   a. Single
   b. Married, living with mate
   c. Married, separated from mate
   d. Living with someone, but not married
   e. Widowed
   f. Divorced

12. Have you completed special training or vocational programs that would help you get a job?
   a. Yes. I have completed training.
   b. No. I have not completed such training.

13. What is the highest level of formal education you have obtained?
   a. 8 years or less
   b. 9 to 12 years
   c. Some college
   d. College degree

14. Do you believe that Nevada State Welfare Services are doing everything they can to help you?
   a. Yes
   b. No. What more do you feel they could do? ____________________________

15. To what degree do you believe most employers are concerned about helping welfare recipients get a job?
   a. Very concerned. I'm sure most employers want welfare recipients to have a job where they can make a living.
   b. Somewhat concerned. Probably most employers would like to see welfare recipients making their own living.
   c. Not very concerned. Most employers don't care whether or not welfare recipients have a job.
   d. Not concerned at all. Employers only want what is best for their business, and could care less about welfare recipients.
   e. I have no opinion about this question.
16. For each of the following statements, mark the column which most closely matches your opinion about the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most people on welfare are men.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people on welfare are not white.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people on welfare don’t speak English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people on welfare are unwed mothers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people on welfare are well educated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people on welfare are generally healthy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people on welfare are probably not just lazy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people on welfare could work if they wanted to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people on welfare don’t mind being on welfare.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people on welfare know how to manage money.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people on welfare have substance abuse problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people on welfare would probably make good workers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people on welfare aren’t to blame for their own problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people on welfare stay on welfare for less than six months.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. The following is a list of services that employers could provide to make it easier for welfare recipients to keep a job once they have returned to work. Please rate each service somewhere from 1 to 6, according to its importance to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child care assistance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible scheduling</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal services</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a second language (ESL)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the job training for promotions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site medical services</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse counseling</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation assistance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life skills training</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended probationary period</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family counseling services</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing assistance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Now, from the same list in Question 17, select the three services that are most important to you, and rank them from 1 to 3, with 1 being the most important, and 3 being the least important.

1. (most important) ________________________________
2. (second most important) ________________________________
3. (third most important) ________________________________


21. In what year were you born? _________________________

22. Without considering any taxes, about how much money did you make last year? _________________________

23. Financially speaking, how do you expect this year to be compared to last year?
   a. Better   b. Worse   c. About the same

24. If you could tell a potential employer only one thing about yourself as a welfare recipient, what would it be?
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APPENDIX H

WELFARE SURVEY --- SPANISH VERSION
En Agosto 1996, el Congreso paso reglas que afectaron reforma de asistencia publica (A.P.), y por alguna gente, limitó a dos años el tiempo para recibir beneficios de A.P. De resulta hay muchas recipientes buscando trabajo, tal vez por la primera vez. Este cuestionario esta conducido por un estudiante doctoral del Universidad Nevada, Las Vegas para examinar servicios o programas de patrones que Ud. cree hacerlo mas facil a continuar un trabajo. Su participacion es voluntario, y puede cesar cuando quiera. Sus respuestas quedara confidencial y anonimo. No aparecera su nombre, y puede contestar francamente. Este cuestionario no es asociado con Nevada State Welfare Division. Gracias por su asistencia.

1. Aproximadamente cuanto tiempo ha vivido en Las Vegas? ____________________________________________________________

2. En que pais / estado nacio Ud.? _____________________________________________________________________________

3. Aproximadamente cuantos meses / anos tiene Ud. recibiendo asistencia publica? ________________________________________

4. Cuales beneficios esta recibiendo actualment? (Marque todos que aplican)
   a. TANF (Pagos en efectivo)                      d. Asistencia de casa
   b. W.I.C. (Mujeres, Infantes, y Ninos)            e. Medicare / Medicaid
   c. Estampillas para comida                        f. Otra ________________

5. Actualmente se encuentra Ud.: (Marque solamente uno)
   a. Trabajando tiempo completo (a menos 32 horas semanal)   c. No estoy trabajando, pero buscando trabajo.
   b. Trabajando tiempo parcial (menos de 32 horas semanal)   d. No estoy trabajando, ni buscando trabajo.

6. Si Ud. esta trabajando actualmente, que tipo de trabajo hace?__________________________________________________________

7. Si Ud. pudiera hacer cualquier tipo de trabajo, que trabajo quisiera hacer? ¿Porque?______________________________

8. Que tipo de trabajo le gustaria para sus hijos?____________________________________________________________________

9. Ud. incluido, cuantas personas viven en su hogar?________________________________________________________________

10. Cuantos anos de edad tiene el mas joven en su casa?________________________________________________________________

11. Sea Ud.:
   a. Soltera/o                                           d. Viviendo con pareja, pero no casado.
   b. Casada/o, viviendo con su pareja                    e. Viuda/o
   c. Casada/o, separada/o de su pareja                  f. Divorciada/o

12. Ha Ud. completado entrenamiento especial or programa vocacional que ayudara en conseguir un trabajo?
   a. Si. he completado entrenamiento especial.          b. No. no he completado entrenamiento especial.

13. Cual es el nivel mas alto de su educacion formal?
   a. 8 anos o menos                                      c. Un poco de colegio
   b. Entre 9 a 12 anos                                   d. Titulo de colegio

14. Cree Ud. que el estado de Nevada esta haciendo todo lo que puede para ayudarle?
   a. Si                                                  b. No. Que mas pudieran hacer?________________________

15. A cual extremo cree Ud. que patrones esten preocupados por ayudar recipientes de A.P. a obtener un trabajo?
   a. Muy preocupados. Estoy cierto que la mayoria de patrones desean que recipientes de A.P. tengan buenos trabajos.
   b. Un poco preocupados. Probablemente la mayoria de patrones gustarian ver recipientes de A.P. haciendo su propia vida.
   c. No muy preocupados. La mayoria de patrones no les importa si recipientes de A.P. tienen trabajo o no.
   d. No preocupado para nada. Patrones solo quieren lo mejor para sus negocios y les importa poco recipientes de A.P.
   e. No tengo opinion acerca esta pregunta.
16. Por cada declaración siguiente, marque la columna que expresa mejor su opinión.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A.P. / asistencia pública)</th>
<th>Acuerdo Fuerte</th>
<th>Un poco Acuerdo O</th>
<th>Ni Acuerdo</th>
<th>Un poco Desacuerdo</th>
<th>Fuerte Desacuerdo</th>
<th>No Se</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casi todos en A.P. son hombres.</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casi todos en A.P. no son Blancos.</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casi todos en A.P. no hablan English.</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casi todos en A.P. son madres no casadas.</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casi todos en A.P. están bien educados.</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casi todos en A.P. teienen buena salud.</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casi todos en A.P. probablemente no son perezosos.</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casi todos en A.P. podían trabajar si quisieren.</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casi todos en A.P. no les molestan de estar en A.P.</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casi todos en A.P. pueden administrar su dinero.</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casi todos en A.P. tienen problemas con abuso sustancias.</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casi todos en A.P. probablemente ser buena trabajadores.</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casi todos en A.P. no tienen la culpa por sus problemas.</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casi todos en A.P. recieben beneficios por menos de seis meses.</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. La siguiente es una lista de servicios que patrones pudieran probar para hacer más fácil el regreso a trabajar para recipientes de asistencia pública. Por favor, marque cada servicio desde uno a seis, acordando a la importancia a Ud.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Servicios</th>
<th>Muy Importante</th>
<th>No muy Importante</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Servicios de cuidar niños</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horario flexible</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servicios legales</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inglés por la idioma segundoa (ESL)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrenamiento para subir en trabajo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servicios médicos</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consejo para abuso sustancias</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asistencia de transportar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrenamiento en habilidades de vida</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiempo de prueba mas extendida en trabajo nuevo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servicios de consejo familiar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asistencia de hogar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Ya, de la lista en Pregunta 17, marque los tres servicios más importante a Ud. y ponga en la orden de más importancia a menos importancia. Uno es el mas importante, dos. segundo, y tres. el menos importante.

1. (mas importante) 
2. (segundo mas importante) 
3. (tercero mas importante) 

19. Es Ud.: 
   a. Hombre 
   b. Mujer 

20. Es Ud.: 
   a. Cauésico/o 
   b. Negra/o 
   c. Hispanica/o 
   d. Oriental 
   e. Nativo Americano/o 
   f. Otra/o 

21. En que año nacio? 

22. Sin impuestos. Que tanto dinero gano Ud. en el año pasado? 

23. Pensando financieramente, como va ser este año comparado al año pasado? 
   a. Mejor 
   b. Peor 
   c. Casi lo mismo 

24. Si Ud. pudiera decirle a un patron potential solamente una cosa de Ud. como un recipiente de A.P., que seria?
teens might be significant predictors of economic independence and marital disruption. For example, the single item "a man can't think well without a job" (item 14) has a specific meaning that might predict economic independence. Hence, it was kept among the final predictors of economic independence and was significant in predicting independence for black WIN fathers and marital disruption among WIN fathers.

It is not possible to determine the reliability of a single item by the scale used in this study. Further studies could undertake that task or top several other items that would cluster with the single item and one its predictive power.


| PART I: Different people have different ideas of what makes for a good or not very good way of life. Listed below are statements about different ways of life. Please circle the number next to each statement which best reflects your own opinion on how good a way of life it would be for you. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Losing home felt lonely when you were lonely | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2 | Having a job helps | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3 | Having your children make many friends in your neighborhood | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4 | Having welfare | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5 | Having a husband who supports your and your children | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6 | Having children go to a good school | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7 | Having a girl meet and be kind to a husband who helps support you and your children | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 8 | Having a job helps | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 9 | Having a single parent has a family | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 10 | Having a good job | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 11 | Working at home helps you | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 12 | Having a family who takes part in | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 13 | Being able to have some pleasure | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 14 | Having many friends | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 15 | Having many friends | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 16 | Having a husband who supports your children | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 17 | Not having a job | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 18 | Having a good job helps you | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 19 | Having a job helps you | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 20 | Losing home felt lonely when you were lonely | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 21 | Losing home felt lonely when you were lonely | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
## Causes and Goals of Welfare

Recent people have different opinions about work and family life. Listed below are a number of statements about work and family life. Please circle the number next to each statement which best gives your opinion as to how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are less than 10 years old and a mother should feel free to go out</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a family to get along with a single but hard working mother</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A young lady should only be with child, but not with a single mother</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A single mother should not have been out of the house</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A single mother should not have been out of the house</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need to slow down in our spending money</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need to slow down in our spending money</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A slow and steady family makes a better family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A slow and steady family makes a better family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A slow and steady family makes a better family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A slow and steady family makes a better family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Appendix C

If you are about paying or doing something, please answer questions in the box below. Otherwise use Part III.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are less than 10 years old and a mother should feel free to go out</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A family to get along with a single but hard working mother</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A young lady should only be with child, but not with a single mother</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A single mother should not have been out of the house</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A slow and steady family makes a better family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A slow and steady family makes a better family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A slow and steady family makes a better family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A slow and steady family makes a better family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Part III

Please give your own opinion as to how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about work and feelings about yourself by circling one number next to each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are less than 10 years old and a mother should feel free to go out</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A family to get along with a single but hard working mother</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A young lady should only be with child, but not with a single mother</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A single mother should not have been out of the house</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A slow and steady family makes a better family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A slow and steady family makes a better family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A slow and steady family makes a better family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A slow and steady family makes a better family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A slow and steady family makes a better family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A slow and steady family makes a better family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Notes

- Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

- I am not able to support my family financially.
- I am not able to support my family financially.
- I am not able to support my family financially.
- I am not able to support my family financially.
## Causes and Cases of Welfare

Please give your own opinion about how much you agree or disagree with each of the following about welfare and unemployment compensation by circling one number next to each statement. This page is reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

### Appendix C

**PART V.** Suppose everyone in your family was out of work. Please circle the number next to each statement which says how acceptable each way would be for you to get money for you and your family if you had to.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptability</th>
<th>Very Unacceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Fairly Acceptable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Very Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART VI.** Suppose you were the head of your household and were on welfare. Please circle the number next to each statement that best says how likely you would be to go out of work if each of these happened.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Fairly Likely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Causes and Cures of Welfare

Appendix C

11. How many months in the past 5 years were you not working but looking for work? ——- ——- ——-
12. How many months in the past 5 years were you not working and not looking for work? ——- ——- ——-
13. How many months in the past 5 years were you receiving unemployment compensation? ——- ——- ——-

Circle the number next to each statement that best applies to how likely you are to be doing that activity at this time next year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High</th>
<th>Fairly High</th>
<th>Fairly Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you expect to be working at a job at this time next year, answer questions in the box below. If not, go to Question 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you expect to be working at a job at this time next year, answer questions in the box below. If not, go to Question 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Causes and Cures of Welfare

Suppose you were receiving unemployment compensation. Please circle the number next to the word that best says how likely you would be to get off unemployment compensation if each of the following occurred:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unemployment Compensation Occurred</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If you get a job offer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you are not able to find a job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are forced to accept a job that you would not accept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You receive a job offer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are not interested in accepting a job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are not interested in accepting a job offer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your family is not living together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your family is living together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We would like to know a little more about the people who have completed this survey. Would you answer the following questions:

- How many people live in your household?
- How many of these people are children: 5 years or younger, 6 to 11 years old, 12 to 17 years old, 18 years old or older?
- How old is the youngest child in your household?
- Are you now (or have you been) working at a part-time job?
- How well are you doing?

### Appendix C

#### 1. How much money do you receive each week from unemployment?
- Yes
- No

#### 2. How much money do you receive each month from unemployment?
- Yes
- No

#### 3. How much money do you receive each year from unemployment?
- Yes
- No

#### 4. How much money do you receive each week from unemployment and other sources?
- Yes
- No

#### 5. How much money do you receive each month from unemployment and other sources?
- Yes
- No

#### 6. How much money do you receive each year from unemployment and other sources?
- Yes
- No

#### 7. Do you feel better now than you did before?
- Yes
- No

#### 8. Do you feel worse now than you did before?
- Yes
- No

#### 9. Do you feel about the same now as you did before?
- Yes
- No

#### 10. Do you plan to stay on unemployment for a long time?
- Yes
- No

#### 11. Do you plan to stay on unemployment for a short time?
- Yes
- No

#### 12. Do you plan to stay on unemployment for the rest of your life?
- Yes
- No

#### 13. Do you plan to stay on unemployment for a couple of years?
- Yes
- No

#### 14. Do you plan to stay on unemployment for a few months?
- Yes
- No

#### 15. Do you plan to stay on unemployment for a few weeks?
- Yes
- No

#### 16. Do you plan to stay on unemployment for a few days?
- Yes
- No

#### 17. Do you plan to stay on unemployment for a few hours?
- Yes
- No

#### 18. Do you plan to stay on unemployment for a few minutes?
- Yes
- No
Causes and Cures of Unemployment

If you have applied for unemployment compensation, answer the questions in this box. If not, go to Question 1.

1. How long have you been on unemployment? Yes No
2. How long have you been receiving unemployment compensation? Yes No
3. Have you ever received unemployment compensation before? Yes No
4. How long have you been out of work? Yes No
5. How much longer do you think you will be on unemployment compensation? Yes No

When I applied for unemployment compensation this time, I felt that:

1. I had a good reason to apply
2. I would lose money if I applied
3. I would be better off in a job
4. I would not lose any wages

I think about how you felt when you applied for unemployment compensation this time. Circle the number next to each statement that best describes how you felt:

When I applied for unemployment compensation this time, I felt that:

1. I had a good reason to apply
2. I would lose money if I applied
3. I would be better off in a job
4. I would not lose any wages

If you have any specific health problems that might keep you from working regularly, circle the number next to each statement that best describes how you felt:

1. How much longer do you think you will be on unemployment compensation? months years

Appendix C

How healthy would you say you are?


1. I am healthy 2. I am not very healthy 3. I am not very healthy

1. How many adults in your household other than yourself are working full time? Yes No

1. How many adults in your household other than yourself are working part time? Yes No

1. How many adults in your household other than yourself are working full time? Yes No

1. How many adults in your household other than yourself are working part time? Yes No

1. How many adults in your household other than yourself are working full time? Yes No

1. How many adults in your household other than yourself are working part time? Yes No

1. How many adults in your household other than yourself are working full time? Yes No

1. How many adults in your household other than yourself are working part time? Yes No

1. How many adults in your household other than yourself are working full time? Yes No

1. How many adults in your household other than yourself are working part time? Yes No

1. How many adults in your household other than yourself are working full time? Yes No

1. How many adults in your household other than yourself are working part time? Yes No

1. How many adults in your household other than yourself are working full time? Yes No

1. How many adults in your household other than yourself are working part time? Yes No

1. How many adults in your household other than yourself are working full time? Yes No

1. How many adults in your household other than yourself are working part time? Yes No

1. How many adults in your household other than yourself are working full time? Yes No

1. How many adults in your household other than yourself are working part time? Yes No

1. How many adults in your household other than yourself are working full time? Yes No

1. How many adults in your household other than yourself are working part time? Yes No

1. How many adults in your household other than yourself are working full time? Yes No

1. How many adults in your household other than yourself are working part time? Yes No

1. How many adults in your household other than yourself are working full time? Yes No

1. How many adults in your household other than yourself are working part time? Yes No

1. How many adults in your household other than yourself are working full time? Yes No

1. How many adults in your household other than yourself are working part time? Yes No

1. How many adults in your household other than yourself are working full time? Yes No

1. How many adults in your household other than yourself are working part time? Yes No

1. How many adults in your household other than yourself are working full time? Yes No

1. How many adults in your household other than yourself are working part time? Yes No
APPENDIX J

PERSONAL INTERVIEW --- WELFARE ADMINISTRATOR
Personal Interview Private Industry Council Member.


q. My understanding of the welfare to work program, especially for the hardest to employ, the HTE's, is that they must obtain work, or at least a promise of work before they can obtain any kind of job training. On the face of it, this seems to be putting the cart before the horse. You are in a unique position in that as an employer, you want to be sure the people you hire are the best available, but as a member of the SNPIC, business subcommittee, part of your responsibility seems to be convincing other employers to hire untrained individuals. How do you feel about hiring untrained people, and how will you convince local employers to hire untrained people?

a. When I first heard that the requirement that you (the employer) had to put them to work before giving them any training, my reaction was equally surprised. Clearly, on the face of it, it seems to be a problem. My sense of it, and I'm not an expert on these regulations, I've looked through them and I attended the presentation, they said the idea is to get them to work first. I mean, they're looking for workable solutions, so in my mind, the idea, or the challenge, or the idea that can work is that if the screening process requires people, before they are selected for the program, to complete something to show that they are making some kind of an effort, and that they have the potential to succeed. In other words, if they're totally blasted on drugs, it is probably not a realistic solution to try to get them employed. But if they have completed some kind of drug program, I'm thinking that if there is something that welfare does that has them show up for something
every day for two weeks, before the program, so that we can cull out the people who are not really willing to make an effort to improve. And I think there are some people, at least in the hardest to employ, that are not interested in making much of an effort, or who are not able to succeed even if they make the effort or if they are interested. Like in most any group, if we can try to identify the candidates who are most likely to succeed, #1 based on their basic skills, and #2 if they are willing to put the effort in. If they are not willing to come part of the way, or even half of the way, probably they are not going to succeed even if we pour tremendous resources on them I don’t see them making it. So we have to have a way to identify those people who are willing, who will make a strong effort to succeed. That said, when those people are identified, I agree that employers in general are not going to want to pay money for people who have no experience. Well, that’s not really true. A lot of the jobs don’t require much experience. There are a lot of entry level jobs in our industry that can be done with a limited amount of experience and relatively short training. Let’s take a porter’s job, a busboy’s job, a dishwasher’s job. You can train people relatively quickly to do these jobs. I think what is reasonable in terms of trying to convince the business community, at least in terms of what we might be able to do at the Venetian, is maybe there is something where they work a certain number of hours in a day. That is really easy to learn, it’s cleaning up, it’s setting up, its something that doesn’t take a lot of time. Then they can get a taste of work. Maybe they start out not with eight hour days, but with, maybe, four hour days with some support at the beginning and the end. And this is where the money from the program will come in, supporting the counseling before the shift, making sure that they are ready to go to work. Maybe for half an hour,
then maybe de-briefing them for an hour after the shift, or maybe incorporating some training after the shift. So it’s not that they just go to work and that’s it. I don’t think that’s realistic. We start them off with a job that is reasonably easy for them to do, and we support them, like at the end of the day we say, “So, how did it go? What happened?” Or, “I had a problem, so let’s react and try to get that taken care of.” I think that’s doable, and the way that we get employers to do this is to identify where the employers needs are. And the employer has lots of needs. And they will in this labor market. In the next year to 18 months there is going to be tremendous need because of the five new properties that are opening. The higher end properties may not want to take chances with people who are, let’s say, “high risks of success”, or I guess, “high risks of failure” would be the better term. But there are going to be other properties that are desperate for people. The labor market is going to be very, very tight and so if the money is available for whichever company or community service organization contracts with PIC, and says “We’re going to help these people get started” and there is a hotel/casino that is desperate for cleaning staff or housekeeping staff, they’ll say, “We’re going to make this pretty painless. We’re going to have a facilitator, a supervisor for these people. We will support their wages in a certain way, or at least their training expenses in a certain way.” I think there are going to be employers who say “We’re pretty desperate and we’ll take a shot.”

At Palace Station we had a group of room attendants who were actually supervised by an outside person. I think they were mentally retarded, slightly. They couldn’t have operated successfully individually, but as a team with a supervisor they were able to be very successful and it worked out well. So I think the possibility is there, it just has to be seen as a solution to a problem by the employer, and then they will buy into it.
q. Recently I spoke with Herman Cain, President of the National Restaurant Association about the service industry’s role in the success of welfare reform. While he agreed that hotels and restaurants will play a critical part, he also felt that the “missing link” was training which could create a bridge between welfare and the workplace. From your unique perspective as an employer and member of SNPIC, do you have any thoughts about the likelihood of employers doing any pre-employment training either at their own expense, or with government subsidies, to facilitate the successful transition of welfare recipients?

a. I think it is relatively unlikely that they will do it at their own expense, and that’s the whole opportunity that we have here with welfare to work and the money that the PIC has to administer. With that money to subsidize it, I think employers will find it interesting, if it is structured in a way that helps them solve their problem, which is getting people to come in and do jobs that they can’t find people to do. The biggest question will be how will we get the right people into those jobs, who are willing to do those jobs. You know, they are not pleasant jobs a lot of times, and it going to be a big challenge. If we get the right people in and they are training, then we need to provide the support that goes with it, and I’m not sure how that’s going to work. Employers will be open to training to get people to do the work.

q. Many people rail against the welfare system and may feel an ethical responsibility to change it, though individually are powerless to do so. In an economic sense, things don’t often change unless there is some sort of return on investment for those persons, or groups who have the resources to make the change. The PRWORA may be an opportunity to make real changes in the welfare system, but it may be costly to potential
employers. Do you feel that employers will act ethically to change the welfare system or will they be more concerned about some sort of financial returns when hiring welfare recipients?

a. I guess you’re asking a question that implies that receiving a financial return for their efforts is not ethical, because you present that as a choice. It’s kind of like that question “When did you stop beating your wife?” The question is not a fair question. I think the issue for us is really how do we take people who are on welfare and help them to succeed in getting off welfare. My personal feeling is that it’s not the employer’s responsibility to act as a community service agency. I think there are some employers who will do it simply because they want to be a good employer, but I don’t think that is a recipe for success. I think any kind of successful program has to be a win-win-win. I mean, the people who are involved have to feel that it’s a win for them, and if you want to say that employers need to do it out of ..., they should just do this. Well, that’s nice for you to say but you’re not the one who is bearing the financial cost. You’re basically positing that someone else should bear the financial cost for your preferences. But realistically speaking, I think the way to make it work is that each shareholder or stakeholder finds benefit in the result. When it’s set up in a way that each stakeholder benefits, then your chances of success are much higher. I would say that what does make sense is to look for the problems that the employers are having and try to find solutions that solve theirs. I wouldn’t say that employers have to see a huge financial return on this. I mean, they wouldn’t say “I’m looking or a rate of return that’s so and so.” I think they have to see that there is benefit in it for them and for the community, and the ideal solution is one that will provide a win-win for the people in the community and for the employer. I think it is
do-able, especially in this environment today. This is a unique, rare opportunity, I think that there will be a lot of job openings with all these new places opening. And there is going to be such a demand that the employer is going to be very in tune to finding people. The jobs don’t require college degree, or even high-school degrees. They require somebody who is going to show up, work hard, treat people nicely and go home. The jobs are decent paying jobs with benefits, and you know, hopefully we can do it here in Las Vegas at this time, because if not it’s uuuuuuh... (voice trails off).

One of the things that I believe in is incenting people for results, and, you weren’t at the meeting, but there was a proposal that one of these other people made, where during the training period they would provide them with transportation, day care, the job, and they would pay them $7 or $8 an hour. And this would continue throughout the training period, 10 weeks. But then, after the 10 weeks the people are not in a position to “make it.” Alright, they have gone that far, but they have really had their hand held. I mean they don’t have transportation and.... I mean, I can understand. I wouldn’t want to go to work if I had to take a bus to the day care center, then get to work. That is a real challenge. So, maybe the way is using money as incentive, or maybe you pay the minimum wage and then if they make it to a certain point, they get a bonus. Then, that’s enough to make a down payment on a car, maybe not a great care, but transportation. And then, maybe there needs to be an incentive for the supervisors of these people, or maybe just pay a specialist from some agency to just supervise.

q. It will be interesting to see how it works out, it will be frustrating...

a. You weren’t there, but at the last meeting, I was really excited and that’s why I wanted to be on the program committee, because I have these ideas that how we’re doing this
makes no sense. At the previous meeting I was asking, "How are you going to decide who gets into these programs?" You’re spending 6 or 7 thousand dollars per person on ‘em once they are in it. But I would rather spend..., you know what the goals for success of the program are? In the original documents, I don’t remember exactly, but the goals were only 10% of the people making it.

q. That doesn’t sound like much. Seems that it should be more. That doesn’t seem very optimistic. Or, on the other hand, maybe that is very optimistic.

a. Maybe it’s optimistic, or maybe it isn’t. That’s a good question. Maybe it is, but the point is that you’re spending all that money on these people with only that level of success, and if that’s the most that you think you can do, then I would rather pick. Out of any group, say one hundred people, you can say that say there’s going to be 20 that will be the best, the hardest workers, then there will be about 60 who are kind of average, then there will be 20 who are just total disasters, and they’re not going to succeed no matter what you do! The question for me is how do you identify those 20? Then, when you have those twenty off, then out of the remaining 80, OK let’s pick the next ones who are the best and invest the money in the ones where you have a chance for success. As I read through some of this stuff it seems..., it is a lot of political stuff. In some ways it is very “boxy” to me. It answers everything, then in some ways they’re trying to allow for more innovation. I think it will take an innovative approach. It may take, really, crossing lines, so that people who are working for the agency working for the employer, maybe supervising those people, maybe that person has an incentive for how many of them “make it”. Incentive for results is putting resources where it works. When you focus on the results and you tell them, then they find a way. When you tell them step one is this, step
two is this, step three is this, step four is this, and then you pay them, they don’t care about results, they just care about steps one, two, three, four. And that is the typical government approach. They mandate, you must do this, you must do this, and so who cares. At the last (PIC) meeting, we had to ask them for their placement results, and they gave them. But after that, so what! Nobody even cared. It’s like - the committee recommended these people—but in my mind I want to know the results. Are these numbers legitimate? They could have given us any numbers they wanted.

q. It seems that there is an array of agendas, even among the committee members.

a. Oh yeah. I just joined. My first meeting was in January, and it’s that all the money that has been given to welfare-to-work has just been since January. We have something like 4 million dollars available for programs just in Nevada. There is 184 million dollars available for anyone to propose a program. They want it to be innovative, they want it to be partnerships. Those proposals have to be given to PIC, the PIC comments on the proposals, then the proposals go to the Department of Labor. Actually, I think they go to the Governor’s office first for comments. That 184 million is available on March 1st, then another in September, then one next year. That money is separate from the four or five million that we’ve got to play with. There is a lot of money that’s there, it just that you want to see something good happen with it. When you spend 6,7,8, you know, 10 thousand dollars on a person, then I think you really have to focus on results.
million that we've got to play with. There is a lot of money that's there, it just that you want to see something good happen with it. When you spend 6,7,8, you know, 10 thousand dollars on a person, then I think you really have to focus on results.
APPENDIX K

PERSONAL INTERVIEW --- SERVICE PROVIDER
Personal Interviews with Welfare Service Providers.

SP1, VP—English as a Second Language Service Provider.

q. Why did you get out in the community?

a. Mainly because of my kids and what I saw going on. Hispanics were taken advantage of, how they were deprived of services because of the language barrier and, there wasn't many Hispanic leaders out there to represent them.

q. How long have you been in business? Do you have a different perspective now?

a. Since January '98. I got into it because I thought it was a good thing. We were helping out the Hispanic community. What I'm disappointed about is the existing organizations that have been getting away with not helping the Hispanic community and their own culture, and waste money and not be accountable for it.

q. (As far as providing service to the community) have they accomplished anything significant?

a. No. Have they accomplished anything? Yes, there will always be...You asked if there is anything substantial. I don't think anything substantial myself, because the people we have been in contact with, black, white, Hispanic, that have told us of the different programs that are out there, are not doing anything. The different life-skills programs you have. Nevada Business Services has a two week life skills program. What can you learn in two weeks?

q. What is a life-skills program?
a. They tell them how to dress for an interview, conduct resumes, they treat everyone the same. They might have a domestic problem and they are in a class with substance abuse problems. They’re not looking at the person individually, they’re saying “This is our program, you have to come and be a part of it whether you need it or not.” I think that’s what’s been wrong with a lot of the programs in town. They’re looking at people as a group and not individuals. And to eliminate their employment barriers, which is what life skills is all about, is to look at the person individually and not put them into a group. And that’s a big part of the problem. The agencies never had difficulty getting money. I don’t think so.

q. What is your responsibility as a service provider for welfare recipients generally, and for Hispanics specifically? And secondly, do you anticipate some sort of return for your investment of time and energy in this program?

a. I’ll answer the second question first. We’re a for-profit program. We have to work harder than the non-profits do. They’re going to get paid either way. We’re not looking to get rich, we’re looking to make a living and to help people. (Name deleted) and I are in it more because there is a need in the Hispanic community. We have 175,000 to 200,000 Hispanics here in Southern Nevada. Not all will need help, a big majority will. We’re looking for a return, not only monetarily. We’re community driven more.

q. People are starting to seek you out as a Hispanic community leader. Do you find that rewarding?

a. Yes, we help people who come in. They may have a landlord dispute, they can’t read a contract, they have an appointment at court, they need an attorney.... But there a lot of things you can do on your own, its just if you know how to do it. A guy calls me up, he
has warrants out and he wants me to help him get them taken care of without getting arrested. I called the city attorney’s office and found out about them and he said “What if I go to jail?” I told him, “I’ll go to court with you, just give me enough notice so I can make arrangements.” I have a busy schedule. He said “I don’t have much money, but I can pay you a little bit.” I said “No, I’m not doing this for money, I’m doing it to help you.” He didn’t believe that I was doing it just to be nice. There are a lot of Hispanics being taken advantage of out there. I want to be known as a leader in the Hispanic community.

q. Are they easily taken advantage of? How can they defend themselves if they don’t speak English?

a. Yes. And you know our culture, “My compadre says..., so I believe him.” Well there are a lot of compadres out there that are ripping of the Hispanics. I get people in here that have signed contracts for 30 percent interest, and they’re just leasing the car! And they don’t even know it ‘cause they didn’t read, or couldn’t read the contract or even look at the numbers. “I know you can’t read it, but you can read numbers. Didn’t you even look at the numbers?” and they go, “Well, my compadre said...” and I’ll go and renegotiate the contract at the car dealer. I’m gettin’ known at the car dealers, so when I come to them they know..., sometimes they are wrong and sometimes they’re right.

I tell these guys, the Hispanics, you’re wrong and the dealer’s right. You have to protect yourself, just because you’re Hispanic doesn’t mean I’m going to side with you. I’m on the side of whoever is right. I try and make them responsible for their own selves. I know my people, we’re apathetic. You know, mañana, mañana.
q. It seems your company has gotten to be more than just a "language" school. You’re providing legal services, etc. Is that what you intended?

a. No. The most important thing to me is integrity, both personal and business, and to do that we have to do what we say we’re going to do. We have to come through. We have to do what the other organizations are not doing.

q. As a grant recipient under the work responsibility act of 1996, do you feel the current PIC board of southern Nevada has been effective in providing services to the local community?

a. No. I think they’re doing a mediocre job and that seems to get them by. I don’t know about other states, but I think the city and county governments get by just because they have been allowed to get by. And I think the PIC council has been allowed to get by just because they are part of that good ol’ boy network. The problem I have with the board is that they are supposedly business and community leaders, but the reason they’re on there is not because they really want to make a difference, but because it looks good on their resume or their boss told ‘em to be there.

q. Do you believe the members have a sense about what goes on in the welfare community?

a. I’ve been there, I’ve been on welfare. My advantage is that I have a huge family, and I have a lot of really good friends. Six years ago, my ex-husband left me when I was seven months pregnant and I also had a 20 month old. My house was foreclosed on, no money, no food, he took both cars. So I had to go on welfare.

q. Is that a fairly common occurrence? I mean is that the kind of situation that puts people on welfare?
a. Yes, it is common. I think a lot of women get in that situation. Their husband leaves and they can’t go back to work ‘cause they have small children, or sometimes they don’t want to go to work, so they go on welfare. I have skills as a 21-dealer so I was able to get a good job fairly soon.

q. How long were you on welfare?

a. Six weeks. Actually a little longer, ‘cause when I started I was just working part time, so I still got some food stamps for a while, probably about six months. And I had Medicaid for about a year after I went back to work.

q. Was it scary being on welfare?

a. It was, but it was more a degrading experience. Those people treat you like an animal. They look at you like....

q. You were married and had skills, you could have gone to work any time. You were not perceived as being lazy or nonproductive. but the second you went on welfare you were stereotyped as a lazy and nonproductive person. Did that bother your?

a. Yes, a lot. And not only that, you’re looked at as sub-human. Unless you have been there you have no idea what it’s like. I’m not the type of person to stay home on welfare. It only made me want to get off even more.

q. Do you think most people who are on welfare are lazy.

a. Yes. But I think some women were using it as temporary assistance. When you’re beaten down emotionally and physically, and mentally, it’s a lot easier to sit there on welfare and get a check every month than it is to go out there and face the world. I think a lot of women are on it just because they got comfortable, and now they don’t want to get off, or they don’t know how to get out. And I think a lot of women are on there just
because they don’t want to work, they’re just lazy, and they just want to take advantage of the system. That’s why a lot of ‘em are upset right now, because it’s gettin’ taken away from them. Welfare was “temporary” assistance, it wasn’t meant to be a lifelong career that your parents were on it, you’re on it, now your kids will be on it. That wasn’t why welfare was made, but people have been allowed to take advantage of it. They have been allowed to take advantage or it because the taxpayers pay for it. There is nothing wrong with using welfare, everyone has problems in their life, but you shouldn’t be treated like and animal when you go down there. And you are treated like and animal. I don’t care that (name deleted) was highly insulted when I said that, because its the truth.

q. Do you think anyone on the PIC board has been on welfare?

a. I don’t think so, but I could be wrong. It’s hard to tell by looking. Nobody knew I was on welfare unless I told them. That’s a problem with the PIC board, they have no idea what it’s like to be on welfare. No idea what its like to have not food in the refrigerator, to be physically and mentally abused. They just don’t have any concept about what its like to be out there on the streets.

q. Would it help to have some (welfare recipients) on the board?

a. Yes. People who understand what’s going on and who really want to help, and not just advertise it. As Christians that’s what were supposed to do, help, but not necessarily advertise it.

q. What will it take to make the board more effective?

a. People who really care about helping and not about their egos and how they look at the meetings. And the thing is that there is a time line here. These people are going to be
taken off welfare without a job, with no income, with nothing. Do you care? No, so what!
Obviously you don’t. This non-custodial thing is an example
of being ineffective. I don’t think that $300,000 should be put into that program.
q. What is non-custodial?

a. It’s the parents whose kids are being taken care of by welfare. You know what it is, its
so they can be trained and put into better jobs so welfare can take more money away from
them. How many people do you know who will get into a program so they can get more
money taken away from them. That’s why they’re on welfare. Most of them could
care less about their kids. And what about the “work first” thing? This reform says they
gotta find a job, then they get training. How stupid is that! They have all these
employment barriers...they’ve been on welfare for a while. Most of these people have
forgotten what it’s like to get up in the morning and go to work. Most have forgotten
what it’s like to have a schedule where they have to be somewhere.

q. Based on your experience as a service provider, do you have ideas about what
employers can do to help welfare recipients keep a job?

a. I don’t think its the employer’s responsibility. I think these people have to be trained
and made accountable for getting a job. I think the law has to be rewritten. Give them the
training first. You have to eliminate these barriers to employment before you can expect
them to hold a job. You have to change their way of thinking. You have to change their
behavior or they just go on and on collecting welfare and never becoming productive
citizens.

q. How do you change their way of thinking?
a. It might be a simple thing, talking to someone like me, who has been abused, physically and mentally.

I’ve been on welfare, I know how to communicate with these people. I think a lot of these people just need direction from somebody that cares and are not looking at them as sub-human, or just as a number. They need guidance, some of them. A lot of them are just misguided, and a lot of them are lazy. Some of them you’re not going to be able to help, but the ones who want help are running into so many roadblocks at these agencies. And all of us could be there. Unless we’re someone like Bill Gates, we could all be there. No one knows what the future will bring.

q. Do you think employers have some responsibility to make it work, to help the welfare recipient make it at work?

a. I think so in the beginning, but the individual needs to be responsible too. But some people, bosses, can be compassionate and caring, but then everything changes and the new boss says you gotta do this and this and this. So everything changes. I also think the person has to have a support system. Our company will help them even after they graduate. If you have problems, not just with language, but with anything, just come see us. We’ll help, no charge. I’m not talking about doin’ it for them, but helping them do it for themselves. You have to make them responsible and accountable. And I think that is what welfare has done - they’ve led these people around, here’s your food stamps, here’s your check, here’s what ya gotta do, and that’s it. Now they’re being told “If you don’t do this, you’re outta here.”

q. Are you optimistic about the eventual success of this reform effort?
a. I'm guess I am, but its just that I know a lot of the organizations out there are trying to get these people into any job, a menial job, a factory job. But don't just lump everyone in the same pot. The was a pit clerk at the Maxim hotel. She had a master's degree, and she had been on welfare, because of circumstances, and she looked two years for a job. All she could find was a pit clerk, then she was transferred to the accounting office. Now she's head of the department. The stereotype is that they're lazy, they don't want to work anyway, so why even give 'em a job. There are plenty of other people out there we can hire.

WA1, Executive Director, A Nevada Welfare Administrator.

q. Is there a residency requirement for applicants who request help from welfare?

a. No, this is a national program, the JTPA, but they have to meet the other criteria like income, dislocated worker, long-term unemployed (15 weeks) back from date of application. Then the reading and math test is administered. Applicants for the job-training program have to test at least at the 8th grade level.

q. Once an individual is accepted, is their progress monitored?

a. Yes, once they are accepted they are placed with a counselor and given a personal responsibility contract, course of action, and referred for further training. Child care services are set up too. Part of our mission, from the federal side, is to minimize those problems. Child care is a big problem, so we set up child care. Or if transportation is a problem we'll provide the bus tokens. If you have a car, we reimburse the mileage.

q. Is that part of welfare to work?

a. No that's just JTPA.
q. Is there a time limit for receiving the benefits?

a. Benefits are available for as long as you're an actual participant, then after you terminate from the program we can give you a level of support services, which are called post-termination services, for up to 12 months.

q. Is there just a time limit or a dollar limit too?

a. It's a time limit. We don't have deep deep pockets. The funds are there, but it's still a first come, first serve basis, but we have a lot of people that come in the door. Right now, July's the end of our fiscal year. We have a lot of people in the first three quarters of the year, then we kind of have to slow down during the last quarter. We have a life-skills class going on. Life skills, in my opinion...it didn't take you five months to develop your life skills, it's a life-long process to get into this situation, therefore you can't be corrected in five weeks.

q. What are life skills?

a. Life skills in this context, generally have to do with issues of responsibility of you as an employee with an employer, to get there on time, to do the work as assigned, and it also gets into how to handle corrective criticism, and interpersonal relationships. Now curriculums are being modified to include a lot of job retention activities. It also goes into resume writing and interview techniques.

q. What requirements do the trainers have?

a. I think all of them have had classroom teaching experience. Generally, requirements are that they have teaching experience or life skills experience or reading, so most of them are teachers, or have teaching credentials.
q. When your new fiscal program opens in July, how many people will you get, do you think?
a. We have to do it by title, so we're looking at about 3000 active participants. Maybe another 1000 who will just come in and we'll just refer out, either because they are not eligible, or their need far exceeds what we're able to provide. Our program is kind of self-directed. They can come in here any time and make phone calls, work on their resumes if they don't have that access at home.

q. So as long as they meet qualification they can use the facilities?
a. Yes, but we wouldn't have a problem with someone who's just unemployed coming in and using the computer, if it's not a lot, especially on the internet.

q. When the new fiscal program starts and you have new applicants, do you take pains to monitor their progress or success ratio.

a. Yes, we have to do that. That's mandated federally, that we have to report on. So if you come in, essentially we have to document something, either we batched you out of the system after objective assessment, or if we spent any money on you, or you didn't return for whatever reasons you may have, or we weren't able to serve you or by mutual agreement we were not the ones for you. What we do is we have a category we determine after objective assessment. It doesn't count in our favor, nor does it count against us. If we spend money on you, we determine you do well, or you didn't do well. Everybody that comes in here is accounted for, one way or another.

q. Then they are directed out, so essentially the end result equals the beginning result?

a. *lots of noise, answer not heard*
q. Are there other programs like yours in town?

a. Yes there are, but some are in different categories called employment and training. They are more self-directed programs because you come in you ask for a referral, and you go out on the interview. Welfare, whether they say so or not, is an employment and training category because they have dollars that they can provide to their participants for their short-term training. And so does employment security. They also have training.

q. All the agencies have the same goals, to get people to work?

a. Yes. Some of the non-profits, like homeless, offer employment type of programs, the bureau of vocational rehabilitation offers employment types of programs, veterans....

q. In Southern Nevada, the area that you’re familiar with, how many people are in the program.

a. Southern Nevada has 77% of the state welfare caseload, so if we looked at the population, there are 4000 families statewide that fit the the category.

q. Then the category is a part of the TANF group?

a. What the federal government did was to amend the Budget Reconciliation Act of 1997, which was part of the whole welfare reform issue, and what they did was to fund what they call a welfare to work program. And the WtW program is specifically designed to address the needs of the bottom one-third of the welfare population. Welfare reform people like to say that when welfare reform hit, one third of the people dropped off anyway. What they’re saying is that that many people encountered the system but they didn’t need that much help so they were able to get out, either voluntarily or with minimal assistance. There is another third, which is kinda the general welfare population, and they are there and they’re managing now as part of their case management load. People are
coming either cooperatively or with a little bit of nudging. They’re kind of working their plan. Then you have this last tier, if you will, where basically because of the issues they have, health or mental or just chronic, it’s the population that you just can’t case manage. It’s not cost effective to do. It’s easier and cheaper to just put the check in the mail than to try and track them down. So this welfare to work that you’re hearing about is this bottom third. It’s money that’s being talked about and how it’s going to be used. It’s targeted at that hard to work group.

q. Are there changes anticipated in the first or second third, or mostly in the bottom third?

a. They’re going to change in the sense that everybody is on time limits. Everybody is playing by the same rules. The time limits, federally are five year lifetime on TANF which is cash assistance. It has nothing to do with food stamps or Medicare, it’s just cash assistance. There is a federal time limit of five years, and Nevada has two. Each state had the option of adopting the federal, or setting their own. Nevada set two years.

q. That’s just for cash assistance?

a. Yes, but food stamps will continue, medical will probably continue. The housing is separate, it’s not welfare. It’s something that you seek on your own through your public housing agent. Housing is always there, it’s just what you have to pay for housing. That might change. You could make as much as you make and still live in public housing, but you’ll pay market rate. And there a lot of people who make good money living in public housing. And because of what I call environmental comfort, paying the market rate rather than moving out and paying what I call open market.
q. If 4000 families in Nevada are on that bottom third, I guess we can assume there are 12,000 families on the welfare roles in the state. They all have every aspect of welfare available to them?

a. Yes, they are all in the welfare system together.

q. As a PIC board member, what problems....(interrupted).

a. I’m not part of the PIC council, but Nevada Business Services is staff to the council. Part of the problem with the PIC, or PIC direction I’ll call it, is one of who’s fueling the engine. We are operating as a developer to seek out of the employment and training act, JTPA now, CETA before JTPA, and CET before CETA, is that our customer market far exceeds welfare. If you’re welfare, you qualify for JTPA by definition, but welfare doesn’t necessarily fuel us. We have other population groups which we are required to service, which welfare happens to be a segment. JTPA requires a minimum of 60% of persons who come through the JTPA must be welfare recipients, but other people are also eligible. When you look at welfare-to-work grant program that we’re talking about currently, that’s why PIC is strongly encouraged to go out and RFP for services so you don’t burden the agency. If we (NBS) were to service welfare-to-work exclusively, that would consume all of our time and we would not be able to focus on other groups. 36% of the economically disadvantaged people in southern Nevada are not on welfare.

q. Is that by choice?

a. We don’t know. They are just not in the system. We don’t know what they’re doing. They’re not depending upon public assistance. Why, we don’t know. Welfare to work’s goal is to reduce their roles. Well 75% of their roles, are not hard to employ, by their definition. There are three components that go into making you hard to employee. One is
tenure in the system - thirty plus months, the other is low reading and math and lack of
high school diploma or ged. Their low math and reading on the welfare to work side is
8.9. The other is substance abuse as a barrier to employment, and the last is a poor work
history, which means you have not worked a consecutive three months in the past 12
months. Now what happens after that profile, is that we’ve asked welfare to take that
4000, or 77% of the 4000 people and you tell us what their characteristics are because you
need to know what service these people are gonna require. Child care is an issue, and
that’s available both on the welfare side and the .... but child care for children with
disabilities is not available, and that may be something that PIC may have to RFP for. If
you’re not working, and 90% of the people in this program who are not working are not
working because they have child care needs that can’t be met by traditional methods.
That would be something that the PIC could RFP for. We think substance abuse is going
to be a big one. People don’t like to hear it, but it’s there, and whether you RFP with
Charter Hospital, Monte Vista, or what do you do. And the answer is, I don’t think so.
In my readings the 7% recidivism rate always pops up. 70% of the population that goes
into rehab ends up going back again. I think what we would be looking at would be more
like substance abuse counseling as a condition of employment. Like most employers have
employee assistance programs, that would be my recommendation. Going to work can be
very enabling in that Johnny goes to work and he can do a lot of other things, and we need
to get him into some type of rehab as a condition for continued employment.

Transportation is always going to be an issue and I don’t see that changing much.
There are systems in place now, and some suggest that employment and transportation
should have a more direct linkage. For example if an employer was considering hiring a
large number of people, then maybe it would justify underwriting the cost for that employer to provide direct transportation, not door to door, but point A to the employment site. If 50% of the people hired come out of one community, it could be a pickup or drop off point. That would a consideration for the PIC when they do RFP’s.

Another critical issue is the concept of job coaching. In the old CETA days, when there was a lot more money in the system, there were job coaches available and they would actually stay with the “customer” especially if they were fragile. “The mind willing the body not” kind of thing. The coach would see that the person got up and went to work. We see a need for that level of help again, coupled with a job retention specialist on the employers side. Even once they get to the job its often not enough. I think Marriot pointed out in their JOBS program that there are a lot of issues that these people are confronted with. It is not enough to say that when you get a job everything else goes away.

Right now we have thirteen people in the Step Up program which is an apprentice program with labor unions and public housing people. The hardest thing for these women is not getting to work or staying at work, but at the end of the day, going back to the public housing environment and facing their peers. The system fails to recognize that, and what you make in one hand the system takes from the other, so there is no net gain. These women are working and making a check, but the system takes it away from them.

q. What about the comments one hears often about welfare people that they don’t want to work?

a. They want to work. We often have philosophical debates with case workers, and it’s not whether they want to work or not want to work, as much as it is that the same values
we operate under are the same ones they (welfare recipients) should be operating under. Like, we have the attitude that you should be so happy that you’re being offered a job. But the employer says “Come here and work for 15 years putting these square pegs in these round holes and we’ll pay you $6.15 and hour.” And that is part of the employers outlook, that we have created this entry level position for you, but these people are incapable of moving up the system beyond that. I’m really fearful of that attitude.

q. The people on the PIC council are mostly business people?

a. By law the board must be made up of at least 50% private sector, the rest of the body is made up from providers such as welfare, voc rehab, community organizations, labor and education.

q. So there are probably some employers who are doing this out of social conscienceless.

a. They are doing it out of social conscienceness, but not really understanding that they need to be doing it for other reasons. Recognize that just because somebody hasn’t worked doesn’t mean that you can put such a low value on them that it becomes counterproductive.

q. Are you optimistic about the success of the program generally?

a. It may be too early to say, but there are already signs of political rhetoric and name calling in the sense that the employer is saying we (NBS or welfare) didn’t send the employer a qualified person. It’s only recently that we’ve sat down with employers and asked what their needs are. We need to develop a partnership with the employer. It’s happening some now, and it is absolutely essential that it continue. And I think the employer needs to be willing to at least step up to the plate. There is no reason to say that we need to continue doing business the same old way. We don't have to deliver the baby
the way we always have. There's no reason to send a person to ABC school of advanced
technology. People can learn other ways, and if the employer wants to do that, we can
reimburse the employer for training

q. Would the labor unions disagree with the employer doing the training?
a. That's another issue, but I think it's something we need to take a look at because
sending someone off to some school is not really giving you (the employer) what you
want. There are a lot of proprietary schools out there who are in business because we're
in business. I don't know if you tell me you have a job description, it can be anyone that
says you need to be computer literate, I don't know that that means I have to send
someone to a $3500 computer class for 14 weeks. I don't think they are going to be any
more literate than they were before they went there, and I can almost guarantee that they
will not be able to do what you want them to do until your people train them. On basic
entry level positions the training they need is very rudimentary, I mean you still have to tell
them what buttons to push and the sequence. NBS doesn't need to spend $3500 for that.

q. Are for profit business doing anything out of social conscienceness, do you think?
a. No they are in it for the money, and they don't really understand the formative process.

Talking about life skills, a life skill doesn't do you any good in the welfare-to-work
program because performance is not tied to life skills. There are three core performances
you will be required to stand up to: 1) placement in unsubsidized employment, 2)
retention, and 3) increased earnings.

q. It seem there are three entities out there who are all involved in welfare to work and
still trying to maintain their own programs, the employer, the service provider, and
government agencies like yours. It doesn't seem there is a lot of progress in the
meantime. What happens in two years when this program ends and those people who are still not at the point, or still don’t meet that criteria?
a. That will be interesting, because they still fall under TANF and the time limits and that is a really big question. What IS going to happen? There are provisions in the law for waivers, but congressional talks at least recognize there needs to be some rethinking about the program. Only to the extent that it effects only those people who really can’t help themselves, not for someone who is trying to abuse the system and who is able-bodied.
q. What about paying the PIC board members instead of using volunteers?
a. There are some incentives for the employer. The council members are hard working group. PICs are a part of the employment training environment and up until the welfare-to-work issue, legally the PIC council had programmatic overview. They would come in once a month, look at the numbers and make sure the business (like NBS) are providing services to the people we identified as our customer, and then they kind of go home and go away. But with the welfare-to-work program, not only do they have program responsibility, they also have fiscal responsibility. I think those of them around the table, the ones who have been around for a while are really uncomfortable with that fiscal responsibility, and they are hedging that responsibility.
q. Who speaks for the welfare recipient in the sense that the council decides what the recipients need?
a. In most cases bureaucrats. It seems that there is an ideology that since they(welfare recipients) are (have gotten themselves in) this position, they are the last group of people to say what’s good for them. WE know best for you and you’re going to do it this way or no way at all. And that’s a big, big issue. When we talk to welfare case managers, they
say the recipient doesn’t know what’s good for them. Or I hear, “I did it. I got a job and worked my way up. I was happy with a minimum wage job, why shouldn’t they be happy?” And we’ve all done it, but you kind of have to think about it in terms of time and place. When we did it we might have been 16 years old and we might have had a support system in place that permitted us to do that. Our acculturation into this concept of work was quite different. We knew the first job wasn’t going to be the only job, and it was more like a rite of passage. Working at McDonalds, or baby-sitting or cutting grass, but we knew that was not something that would be a lifelong career for us. But take the same thing and apply it to a typical welfare person and it’s different. They’re going to be 30 years old, probably head of a household, therefore your view on the job is not lacsidasical, because that welfare persons view on the job is that anything is a success, and its kind of the alpha and the omega. They perceive it that this is what I will be doing for the rest of my life and any change in that, through their own fault or through no fault of their own, doesn’t necessarily represent an opportunity or experience gained, but actually represents a failure.
APPENDIX L

PERSONAL INTERVIEW --- WELFARE ACTIVIST
Personal Interviews With Welfare Community Activists.

CA1. Community Activist and welfare recipient.

Q. Would you say that you're a community activist? Everyone knows you and they raise their eyebrows when they hear you. Is that because you tend to get involved?
A. Yes, 'cause I have a serious problem with this welfare reform, 'cause I knew many children was goin' to suffer behind this.

Q. Have you seen many changes with the people you talk with on the street, since this law passed in 1996?
A. One thing is mothers with a felony, ya know they can't receive aid. They can have they mother to come in and apply for their children. They mother can have 20 felonies and its OK.
q. Would they come under custodial parents?
a. Yep. They would be under custodial parent, but a mother with a felony can't come in and apply for her own children, so if she's just gettin' out of the pen, she can't even apply.
q. Do you find a lot of barriers like this, the mother can't apply, but the grandmother can?
a. Mmhmm. There is a lot of barriers in the way, and I feel like they're splittin' the family when the mother can't have the say in the raisin' of her children. So you're making those lil' gangbangers and those monsters when they growin' up cause they splittin' the family.
q. A lot of the welfare goal is to bring the family back together?
a. Yes, because at one time the father couldn't live in the home, but now the father can live in the home and you can still collect your welfare or whatever your income is. But
you created these little gangbangers and the whole nine yards 'cause you sent the father away from the home, and now they don't have any control. Well now they sayin' that, "Oh, they need a man figure in they life. Bring the daddy back home." but now that you done run the daddy away he been gone 20 years, aint nothin' he can do wid 'em.

q. You’ve been on welfare but you’re working now?

a. Yes, I have been on welfare, and I am working now.

q. Just because someone is working doesn’t mean that they are self-sufficient, that they don’t need some kind do support?

a. And you know what, I do have to have some kind of support! I get a medical card because my job doesn’t provide medical insurance yet, so I still have to have some kind of support.

q. On a scale of one to ten, with 1 being very bad and 10 being very good how would you rate welfare agencies in southern Nevada in providing service to people who need them most?

a. I wish I could rate 'em zero but I see I have to rate 'em 1.

q. Have you been in Las Vegas a long time?

a. I was born and raised here.

q. Do you have experience with agencies in other places?

a. No, just in Nevada.

q. Do you have a lot of experience with this agency?

a. Yes, years and years. And they have never pushed toward employment. When I had my first child I was still in school and all it would be is you turn your paperwork in every 6 months. They didn’t try to say “..you get your diploma or try to better yourself.” But
since this welfare reform done came up they “Ooooh! you know, ‘you got to better
yourself. we got to get you off welfare by any means necessary.” well now, you don’t let
a person sit on welfare 15 years and they aint got no trainin’ and they aint got no.... How
you just goin’ to push them out there in the work force? That aint goin’ to happen.
q. Do you know people who have been on welfare 15 yrs?
a. Yeah, I know, yeah.
q. This young lady you were just talking too, the twenty year old you were telling me
about, does she even know about the welfare reform act of 1996, do you think?
a. Not really, not really.
q. Were you in the welfare system before this law passed in 1996? Have you noticed
more changes like the one you said earlier, like the man coming back into the home?
a. Yes. I noticed that when the welfare reform came in when you would pick up a
application, they would give you 10 job work searches. They didn’t evaluate you, see
what kind of education you had to even go out and get a job. And that’s been me and
(name withheld) biggest fight. Saying “Uh-uh.” You got to evaluate them first and see
what kind of educational background they have before you go sending them to anybody
for a job.
q. Is that one thing that Nevada Business Services needs to do, treat ‘em like individuals
more?
a. Yes. They have to do that ‘cause we have some that’s on drugs. You can’t send ‘em
to go work at the Tropicana Hotel when you know they can’t pass the drug test. So that
means you’re goin’ to have to get them to some kind of drug rehab to get them cleaned up
so they can even hold a job.
q. Is that what agencies can do to help people get out of the system? It seems that once you’re in the system its self perpetuating, its hard to get out, like being a whirlpool.
a. It’s more like a cesspool! I have a caseworker..., I have to come turn my paperwork in every three months. I said “You won’t be here long.” She say “Why you say that?” I say, “cause you too helpful. Anyway that you see you can help a client you go all out and do that. Them aint the kind of caseworkers they want here. You’re too helpful.” They want them caseworkers that’s goin’ to be cut and dry. That’s it, just run ‘em thru the system and get ‘em on out.

q. On those job searches you were tellin me about, did you actually have to go out and look for a job or could you just sit a home and fill out the forms?
a. You were supposed to go out and look for work, but the majority didn’t. They don’t even have enough staff to check on it. If you got a hundred women turning in job searches every week, they aint gonna have enough staff to call each one of those employees and see did they show up.

q. Are there many men on welfare?
a. There is mens on welfare. A few that’s raisin they children, yes they is. Not as many as women.

q. As a community activist in the welfare system, what role do you play, if any, in deciding what services are provided to assist welfare recipients in finding and keeping a job?
a. That’s why I show up at them Nevada Business Service meetin’s ‘cause I know them services are going to have to come thru them. Have they done a survey to see we what we really need? That hasn’t been did. The welfare came and dumped in they lap and they
say, "Ooooh, what we s'posed to do with this baby?" They don't really have a clue and they need to get services that really work.

q. What could they do for that 20-year old woman you were talkin' to?

a. If she's comin' in to see a case worker, the case worker is s'posed to aks her, yo know, "What are you interested in doin?" to get you out the system, and she says she wanna be a hairdresser, "I can do hair, but I just don't have my license." So she needs to say, "Well, let me refer you down here to Nevada Business Services 'cause I know they have money that can help you get that kind of training, to get you out the system." But that don't happen. I mean, I never heard 'em mention Nevada Business Services long as I been dealing wid these people. Even with me needing a certified nursin' assistant (CNA). When I first came in I say, "Well, I done found a job, I start work next week." and I tole 'em what I was doing. Well if my caseworker was a dedicated person and wanted to make sure that I didn't come back through the system, they would have said, "Look, you follow up this with Nevada Business Services so you can go get your certified nurses assistant."

q. Nevada Business Services is a federal and state business?

a. Yes, state and federal.

q. What about children, does she have kids. That twenty year old?

a. Yes, she have two, so she need child care assistance. So with the child care part the welfare department can help her with that. Sso when she have exhausted all that, then she can go back to Nevada Business Service and pickup child care 'til she finish school.

q. Have you got your CNA yet?
a. I'm working on it but I haven't go it yet. With my certification I can make more money. I can go work in the hospital to get it. I can do private home duty with my certification. I can start my own business 'long as I got my certification.

q. Is the system helping you to get your certification?

a. I told you, they never told me, "Well, when you finish here you need to go to Nevada Business Service gettin' your certification."

q. And they never told this other woman either? So that's your role, that's part of what you do?

a. Uh-huh. I told her, "You go in there and ask your caseworker about Nevada Business Service, so you can go to school."

q. Do they know you in Carson City?

a. Most of 'em 'cause they have to come down here, and me and them done had big battles. Like that one (name withheld) standing in the middle of the flo' with them lies she was tellin'! She said they do assessment, and I said no they don't. they didn't do my assessment til the day I walked in and said, "I found a job."

They should have done did my assessment to see what I was interested in, what I wanted to do. They didn't do that, and they don't, and Nevada Business Service know that when they send in the few that they send in. They don't be assessed, they have to do the assessment.

q. You and others (names withheld) have worked and campaigned together, and I get the impression you are working for the same things and as a welfare activist do you feel that you have a responsibility to educate people in the system. Is that something you have taken on yourself?
a. That's something I've took on by myself, cause I feel like this...as long as they was having them welfare reform meetin's, never was a notice posted in this office so women could know that there was a welfare reform meetin' goin' on, and them women needed to be there. Not ever, never did they post a notice that they could attend those meetin's. It was like they didn't want 'em there to put they input in em. So how you gonna put together a welfare reform and here these women that's gettin welfare is no part of the welfare reform.

q. Do think that if they invited them to the meeting they could have said, "Here's what your giving me, but what you're giving me is not what I need. Here's what I need."

a. Yes (emphatic) and if they could have played a part in it then I think the welfare reform would have been did better than it has been did. They did the welfare reform on how they wanted it did, on what they (the state) feel it should be did, not the way that these women who need the services feel it should have been did.

q. When people see you coming they say, "Oh God, here comes Beatrice! Is that because you have a more militant approach to what you do?

a. But how long have I been comin to them meetin's saying "Y'all aint got no clue to what y'all doin. You still haven't figured out what you s'posed to do." and they (PIC members) still haven't figured it out what part they are really playing in it.

q. Might it be effective, instead of coming to the meeting and saying "You guys don't know what your doin'." saying "Here's what we need, give us those kind of things."

a. You know what, no! Uh-uh! Because they sit there, half of them don't want to be there and they sit there like they are not concerned. You know what! All of em, they
need to take a tour of the welfare office, all three of them (offices) and just talk to a few people.

q. After the last meeting I went to the mike and expressed my opinion that after a year of meeting, nothing has happened... (interrupted).

a. And that aggravates me! That angers me that there is nothing happening and that people are not getting the services that they need!

q. Part of the welfare reform act is that after two years people are off. What are they going to do then?

a. They off, thank you! What are they gonna do then...! When these people aint figured out what they supposed to be doin', what part they playin'. So look at those children that's gonna suffer behind them not knowing what they supposed to do. Before they even took on takin' anything to Nevada Business Services PIC board, those people should have took a tour and did interviews with these people sittin' here in these welfare offices and then came back and said, "Do we really feel we can take on this challenge?" That's what they shoulda did.

q. You’re working, you went out and found your own job. How did you do that, did you go to an agency?

a. I am working, I do home health care. I found my own job, networking on the street. This woman I work for, her husband is policeman and I was talkin' to him and he said, "You know, you're out here fighting for people in this community, you need to go on just get you a job and leave it alone." I said, "You know, you 'bout right, I should." So
he told me about his wife had opened up a company, and I went over there and filled out an application and they hired me.

q. So you’re working but you’re still out here bustin’ heads. Is that something you feel you need to be doin’?

a. Yes I do! Yes I do feel is still my responsibility. Just like this lady, she didn’t have a clue that she could go down there (NBS).

q. Have you noticed that you have made changes with people you have talked to?

a. Yes. I still get phone calls. You know, Beatrice, “You know I’m goin thru this, I done got a job and my (case)worker is not trying to help me out.” First of all I have to explain it to ‘em, “If that worker’s not helping you, you get that supervisor and you tell them, ‘This is the barrier that’s in my way.’” because that caseworker is supposed to try to get those barriers outta your way. Employment training first of all is s’posed to get all barriers out the way, but they don’t.

q. What happens when someone is at work and maybe they are going through drug rehab or they suffer from some sort of mental illness and they’re having some sort of crisis at work, can they call the welfare office?

a. No! I hope the job would help them, but first of all they can’t get in because the phone lines..., and they don’t have personal phone lines for caseworkers, and what they shoulda did is when you was coming off the list, they shoulda give you a list of all their providers. You can go to this person, this person, this person. But I aint seen a list that they provide us yet.
q. What happens when a person's benefits run out, particularly TANF (cash payments)? At the end of two years what are they going to do?
a. Crime rate gonna go up. Crime rate gonna skyrocket. Nevada Business Service think they got two little security guards sittin' in their meetin's, they gonna have to have six!
The state welfare meetin's that they have down here, not to often, I don't care if they hold 'em in East Jesus, you gonna have some folks gonna make it up there and those gonna be uglier than us.

q. If welfare recipients would get involved and come to the meeting and say "Here's what we need." do you think that would make a difference.
a. I think so, 'cause right now they got someone from the welfare office sittin' on the (PIC) board, and when she went to talkin and she said, "I thought this is what welfare reform is supposed to do, but I don't see it goin' like that." I said, "She'll be lookin' for a job."

q. If I have the money and I tell you I'm going to give you the money on my terms and I don't really care about what you need, what about that?
a. You know what, the squeaky wheel gets the oil. I can walk in this office and they don't want me to sit in the lobby no more than five minutes. If I have an appointment they aint gonna let me sit in that office more than five minutes, cause they know when I'm done I'm gonna be goin' around the lobby talkin to people, saying, "Do y'all know this, do y'all know this?" I needed nurses clothes. I told em I needed this. I didn't have to wait no three weeks. It was the next day and they had the papers I needed to get my uniforms. I know people who have had to wait three weeks in order to get a sheriff's card. What
place is going to hold a job for you for three weeks while they help you get a sheriffs card! That aint gonna happen!

q. So if more people stand up and make a fuss will things change quicker? Do you see that happening?

a. No, no time soon because they are trying to get them off welfare now by any means necessary. If we got to put ‘em off because they didn’t turn in the right paperwork, oh well. “That’s one we got off. That’s one we don’t have to be bothered with.” If you got a hundred women on welfare, five of ‘em will get all the services they’re s’posed to get. 95 don’t get nothin’. The rest will just drop off and go to a life of crime, you know bustin’ heads open like watermelons, stealing they purse. And they don’t seem to be takin’ this serious. You know if you got a mother who is dedicated to her children when she lose her income she’s gonna go to a life of crime in order to feed those kids. So coming to a PIC meeting, coming through the parking lot, stealing they purse, its not gonna phase ‘em.

q. What about people who don’t speak English?

a. Oh God! They got my sympathy. I was here one day and there was a lady and she didn’t speak good English. They said, “Don’t you have someone with you who can translate for you?” She don’t have to bring nobody to translate. Now that’s one day I did get ugly! I said, “She don’t have to have nobody with her! You s’posed to have someone (staff) to translate for her.” They had to call down to NBS and get someone to translate for her. She was Spanish and they didn’t understand what she was sayin and when I got finished bein’ ugly they had to get NBS to come up here and translate what this lady need. And what’s his name, Fernando? he need to take that suit off and put him
on a disguise and he's gonna see how bad they treat the Hispanics. He need to come sit and see some of them that can't speak English, when they walk up to the counter and see how bad they treat them.

q. What’s the ethnic make up of the welfare population?

a. Lot of Blacks, lot of Hispanics. But you know, the majority mostly white people on welfare. Well not now, because the Hispanics is takin’ over, so now its mostly Hispanics.

q. What about people who come here from other countries?

a. Since the welfare reform, if they come here, like, from Mexico and they not United States citizens, but if they children was born in the United States, they can get aid for the children, but they can't get aid for themself. You got some caseworkers who will take it upon themselves - because they can get it for they children - don’t want to get it for they children cause they scared it will benefit them because they are not United States citizens. And they don’t know what to do. Like if a case worker give them a hard time, they don’t know the next avenue to take, they just drop they head and walk out the door. That’s even with the housing authority. When we go down there to deal with the housing authority and they come to fill out for housing, and the people behind the counter can be rude to them 'cause they s’posed to help em fill out the application. First of all its supposed to be in Spanish but it isn’t...they’ll just take the application and walk on out the door.

q. What kind of aid would someone with no income be getting?

a. If they had two children and theyself, they would get $271 from TANF and $250 in food stamps.
q. You made a comment about a welfare mother not knowing how to manage money, how do you get $500 to last a month?

a. How do you make $300 make it through the month? They don’t need no life skills on how to manage no money. They already know how to do that. And some of those ol’ life skills they comin’ up with, they need to take those and go somewhere else with ‘em, cause if you been a mother on welfare and you done lived on $300 a month and $200 in food stamps you got life skills ‘cause you knew how to manage yo’ money, pay yo’ bills and take care yo’ children.

q. Do you think some of the people on the PIC board don’t have a realistic picture of....(interrupted).

a. No, no! They need to take a field trip to each welfare office and communicate with the people that’s sittin out in the lobby. Ask them some questions and get a feel for what’s goin’ on.

q. How many welfare office are there in Las Vegas? I know they have one on East Charleston....

a. Three. This one, East Charleston and then I call the one Rodeo boulevard, the one that’s on Rancho by the old K-Mart. If you go there the floor is shinin’, you can see your face on the floor and the people who work there are more friendlier than the people who work in this office and that Charleston office.

q. What kind of problems do you see that welfare recipients have. Why can’t they get off welfare?

a. As I was coming here to meet you, I saw this lady gettin’ out her car and she say, “Well, let me take my ring off and my little jewelry, ‘cause I’m fixin’ to go to the welfare
She say, “Everytime I have my ring or my watch on,” she say “the lady look at me like I don’t need no help.” I guess you’re supposed to come in here beat down, raggely, dirty and filthy and that’s what they supposed to help. But how you gonna send a person lookin’ like that on any kind of job interview. You can’t do that.

q. People hear about people staying on welfare, the mom’s on it, the daughter will be on it, the grandma’s on it, (interrupted).

a. And that happens, I’ve seen that. When I was comin up, my mother and father, my mother had never been on welfare. I got on welfare when I had my first son, but I have seen the grandmother, her daughter then her daughters children on welfare.

q. Do you think that’s just become a cycle when kids grow up in that environment, that’s just the way it is?

a. No, ‘cause you got some kids who have seen their mother bring them up on welfare and struggle, and that is not what they want for theyself. But some of them is like that.

q. Welfare queen, what about it?

a. Now they can have all the kids they want, they still don’t get any more money. Not any more. They changed all that.

q. What about the perception that a lot of people on welfare are just lazy and don’t want to work?

a. You know what, that’s not true. Huh-uh, that aint true! You have women that do want to work but they have barriers in they way that got to be removed before they can go out in the work force. If you got a 1 year old, a two year old and a three year old and a four year old, none of them cant go to public school yet. They got to be in day care and preschool. So preschool is only four hours a day. What the kid supposed to do for the
other four hours if the mother is at work for 8 hours? And then you got some people that's alcoholics, that's drug addicts, and they got to be cleaned up before you can send them anywhere. Then you have some that's abused...and that my biggest fight with them! A women that's been battered and abused, they not going to come in here and tell these people their business. And you got a different case worker every six months, you're not going to spill your heart out to this caseworker.

q Just because someone is on welfare doesn't mean they don't have feelings or pride or self esteem.

a. I went to one childcare orientation and I couldn't believe it. Eight women sitting in there and she went to asking one young girl, she had to be about 17 years old, she went to asking her personal questions like, where was she and her boyfriend when she got pregnant? I stopped the whole orientation..."We don't know her and she don't know us and you're not to discuss her business in front of us." We had a big blow up behind that!..But her way of getting back at me, she turned me into investigations, and they show up right after New Year with they badge out. I say "What you all want?" They say "We're here because you're being investigated." Well I never refused to give them nothin' they have asked for. Any income I have got, I have reported.

q. Do they discourage people making noise about the system?

a. Yes. Just like them never posting notices about the welfare meetings. So women has to come, "this is what we'll need to make us whole again." They should have posted a notice, then they come with that story, "Well, we put it in the newspaper." Well if they on welfare gettin' $200 a month, after they pay their bills, how can they pay for a
q. You are a self-proclaimed "grass-roots" activist, and when I look at the PIC council members, I ask myself how their experiences compare with your experiences. From your vantage point, how important to overall success are the diversity of the membership and the experiences of the individual committee members? In other words, how important is it that the committee members understand the needs of the people they are trying to deal with?

a. Absolutely, it's important that they can identify with the background of the people they are trying to help. And on the base level, it would look like that PIC council doesn't have any experience or empathy in dealing with the targeted population. But if you look at some of the members, look at (name deleted), she was almost on welfare. There but for the grace of God..., single, mother who had two children, husband left her, recently divorced and no income. But getting that little small break, (unspecified) she was about to get on welfare. And look at (name deleted). Struggling and Hispanic, trying to make ends meet. But he made it, and I think what happens is that there are some individuals who have been there or close to that, but because it was a painful experience, or frightening experience they have always tried to put it behind them, to get as far away from it as they possibly could. And unfortunately, now that they have been forced to be in a situation where they have to deal with something that is stigmatized. Everyone is talking about welfare and about "lazzy" people(emphasis was CA-2's). It’s hard for those PIC members because everyone of them is employed, and they go to their jobs, and they have
to be accountable to someone. To think that here's someone sitting at home collecting a check and they don't have to do anything, and now I have a role to play to try and get them into the workforce. Figure out how, you know, put the cattle prod to their ass and make them go to work! And that's a false perception and they need to be brought back to understand what's really going on.

q. What about that 30%, the hardest to employ? Aren't they just lazy, can't they go to work if they want? Isn't that kind of the perception?

a. Of course that's the perception. But I think what's goin' to be found out, which is nothin' we're going to find out that there are more barriers than we're even aware of. We're going to find there's a lot of mental illnesses, and there are probably areas out there that we don't even know about and that were not even equipped to deal with. Because if we were, someone would have had figured it out, offered a little unsolicited proposal and got paid to deal with it. So I look at all these vendors coming forth, offering services. There is nothing new that is being offered there. Every vendor who is offering something is the same service that they offered all along to all their other clients. There is nothing unique in what they are offering- not one component. What they are doing is taking that same soup and putting a different label on it so that it looks different, but it's the same. Coors beer and Keystone beer. Coors beer is the same thing as Keystone beer, it's just a different label. They are trying to corner the market on the low end. They have the high end, but they want the low end as well. So, the PIC, I think, is grossly uninformed about what their role is. I think that when you talk about the Personal Responsibility Act that was recently passed, if you take a survey, and ask everyone of them if they had read that, I would be very shocked if you could find five of them who
could honestly tell you they had read that act from one end to the other. I would be very shocked if you could find half the PIC membership who had read the Job Partnership Training Act, which is their Bible, which guides their very responsibility on that PIC.

Well, I don’t really need to read all that, so that’s why we have staff. I just need to know what our basic mission is. Then I’ll just lean on staff to tell us whether we can or cannot do it. How often do you hear the him (President) ask his executive director, “name deleted), can we do this, or can we do that.” And so now you have put all your power basically in the executive director. Now you have to determine whether or not he’s lazy, innovative, a risk taker, or someone who even wants to be bothered.

q. Why do you think most of the PIC members are on the committee?

a. These are individuals who are representatives of their organizations. And not necessarily owners of their organizations, or even presidents of their organizations, so they have been appointed, or delegated to perform that responsibility to serve on the PIC. And everyone knows that is good to serve on some public service... citizen’s committee, whatever. And I don’t mean to be critical of them, but you have to understand the dynamics of who you’re dealing with. And that’s why I constantly prick their conscience, and say “you need to go one step further.” It’s not enough. I know it is a burden on you to come out of your busy schedule, to come to meetings like this. You’re not getting paid, you’re not even getting decent refreshments. The rooms are uncomfortable, you’re being cussed at and threatened by members of the audience, you get flooded with a bunch of paperwork and you don’t understand half of it, but you need to go one step further. Because what you are doing is having an impact on people’s lives. This is not a citizen’s
committee talking about traffic control, or where you’re going to put parks. True, all of those are important, but what we’re talking about now are families. What are they going to do with their lives? Where are they going to..., what’s the impact! And they have shown me time and time again that they don’t understand their role. They don’t understand their tremendous responsibility that has been placed upon them, nor the power that they have to make a difference. And that is evident by their lack of understanding, by the questions they ask, that they should have been able to answer for themselves had they only read their own manuals. They are six months into this process and they are still asking basic questions - “What are we s’posed to do?, How do we do this? Who do we get to do this?” And when you go into the subcommittee meetings, which I was invited to go to, and to participate as an ex-officio member, and it’s like “OK, what is our role? We’re on the business subcommittee, what is our role? I don’t understand. And they’re talking for twenty minutes, and I’m sitting there and saying to myself, “A younger Chester Richardson would have just cussed every one of them out. Would have done a “beatrice” or “anthony” number on them. You’re idiots! How dare you have the audacity to say you’re going to sit on this PIC and you don’t even what you’re responsible for! But time and experience has tempered me to the point of saying “Look, if you even look at the minutes when this subcommittee was commissioned, it said that you will get together and determine how you will solicit businesses who will agree to hire these welfare-to-work participants.” That’s what our role is. Not to figure out what they need to know, not to... to identify business. That’s why you are on here, because you are in the world. Because you know that you have influence. Do you understand what your role is? It’s very
frustrating, and that clearly says that’s why we’re behind schedule. We’re not moving as
fast..., we’re not moving. Believe it or not, it is just that simple!.

My ego and my schedule is so important, that I can.... I’ve seen it so many times.
Welfare is such an old issue, how difficult can it be? I can show with 5 minutes of crash
reading, the agenda in the back, and I’m ready to address the issues as soon as I get there.
And that’s not possible. That’s not even possible and that’s why you have violations of
policy, no sense of direction, some people on one wavelength and some on another. So,
that’s the PIC. And the PIC lean heavily on the staff. And that’s another problem, the
staff, because that establishes a tremendous amount of power to decide the final outcome.
Where most staff, when you’re dealing with public forums are bureaucrats. They don’t
want to work, at all. They don’t want to take any extra effort. That’s just normal human
tendencies.

For staff, this welfare-to-work is just one program. Next six months, next year it
will be another program. All we have to do is just ride this out. All it is is just another
futile attempt to justify taxpayer’s money. So they’re not going to be risk takers. They
are not going to be innovative because they have seen it come and go. They want to be
sure they meet the minimum requirements when it comes time for evaluations to insure
that they get their funding for the next year.

q. In general do you believe most administrative committees have a realistic view of the
needs of the constituents, and specifically, on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being very bad and
10 being very good, how would you rate current SNPIC in their efforts to provide
assistance programs in accordance with the Personal Responsibility Act?
a. I’ve no contentions with the PIC. For the most part those are honorable people, good hearts. They want to do the right thing, but I would have to rate them at a five. I rate them so low because I don’t believe that.... If you’re serious, then you need to study. You need to understand what your real responsibilities are and what your scope of authority is. The PIC, if you read your “responsibility act” has been delegated with unique authority that if there is a rule or reg(ulation) that is preventing them from doing what they need to do to make a difference, they can petition for that to be waived.

PIC has been given the authority, mandated by government, to administer welfare. Welfare can’t do it or they would have already done it. We need to have a more business oriented entity, which is what the PIC is supposed to be. We need private industry coming in here and telling us, “OK, this is what we want.” And that’s the key to success. So the PIC may have good intentions, but they’re not there. They’re not there, and therefore they are failing. When you have somebody like Fernando Romero going on for an hour, talking about Nevada Business Services is no good. They don’t do this or this. But NBS is just a glorified secretary. They only carry out the policy and the mission that the PIC dictates for them to do. So the PIC says “We want to go out here and assess 200 individuals, and find out where are they in their lives and why they have not succeeded. And we want to place them in these particular jobs.” and we just give the marching orders to the staff.

q. And those 200 individuals would be members of the hardest to employ group?

a. Right. When we meet in sub-committee, we go out here and market to a business, and we say “Mr. Sears, what would it take for you to hire five of our people, we want to find out what it will take.” Well we don’t have to go out and ask Mr. Sears. You are in
business, and some components of business are the same. You want somebody who is
going to be well trained in your particular field, or is trainable, is honest, is dependable.

Some basic components that do not change. Someone who I am going to get a significant
amount of time in service. If I invest the time and energy in ‘em, I want to know I’ll get
five years, ten years, whatever out of him. I don’t want to get all this training and have
them fly away or not be able to adapt to new and innovative things that come along. So
we’re saying, we’re going to give you that type of person, but what does it cost you?

The PIC is leaning on the staff and that’s unfortunate because when they went to
do all these RFP’s, all those things we talked about. We wanted to make sure that there
was a job coach available, someone who is going to be available. I can identify with that.
I took 13 women on welfare, former ho’s and drug addicts and put them in the work force
and they were problems. But I’d come down there and have a little rap session with them,
tell ‘em one on one, give ‘em a reality check, go through the bull crap, and show ‘em what
the payoff is going to be in the end. It’s just like going through basic. Ya gotta constantly
remind ‘em. Keep that goal in front of them, because there is no other positive
reinforcement around them. They go home, they’re not getting anything at home. They
are being talked about by their boyfriends or their husbands or their wives, getting put
down. They go outside, it’s depressing, there is no positive reinforcement there. They are
not involved in terms of community organizations. It’s just them in their own world, in
their own misery. They saw an opportunity, it’s theirs, but there is no support system to
keep them going. It doesn’t stop just at the training program. It doesn’t stop just with the
job. You have to have some type of support system outside of that, and they have to have
someone that they can talk too, that can be there for them when they need it to keep them
on track. That's gotta be there until they can get over that mountain and stand on their own two feet. If they can't stand on their own two feet that's going to be a problem for society forever. **You can't just force them into the workforce.**

So the PIC board was just beginning to understand these components, and we were determined to make sure that that (job coach) was in the RFP's. We wanted to be sure that there was going to be someone there, that it was not going to be just some canned life skills training program. Life skills training program! What are you talking about, life skills! Hell that's a cliche. We don't need cliches. These people need to know when you get that first pay check, how do you prioritize. You literally have to teach some of that. You don't go out and buy a car, you don't go out and buy a new hairstyle. You don't get your nails done knowing dammned well that you gotta come back and put them in some damn commode! What kind of sense is that! Because we're temporal, self-esteem is important to us. Therefore, we want to look good, but we can't take care of the babies. And lunch. You can't go out there and buy lunch every day. You have to bring your lunch! These are basic components that we take for granted. But they don't have those basic components, and we give them a job and because they don't have the basics, they fail.

So the PIC subcommittees were understanding this, but because of the internal fighting, the political posturing between the community college and whomever, with the staff of NBS, all of that got dropped to the wayside and never got put in the RFP's or presented to the vendors. And the vendors didn't understand welfare-to-work either.
q. Just for verification, my understanding is that one of the major differences of this welfare legislation is rather than training first then working, this legislation requires that people get work, or at least a commitment of work, then they get training?

a. No. Work first, to me, means that they literally have to go and work on a job, without pay for a period of time to show that they have made a commitment that they are going to work. Once they have done that they can go in and access the funds of welfare-to-work. The welfare-to-work funds are not going to pay anybody’s salary. Not one welfare recipient gets a dime of that money in their pocket. It pays for training and for the support services.

q. How long do they have to work before they can access the funds?

a. It’s not long, maybe four or five weeks. So what can happen, in essence, is that the employer can call you in for a few weeks and... “I’m going to have you in training and you can learn some things.” You can work in that mode for a few weeks without being compensated off of welfare-to-work money. After that they will pay for child-care, transportation, uniforms, or going to education classes. But they can’t access that welfare money until they have met the work first requirement. They have to use other welfare money to cover those services, they might already have that covered by other welfare money. The welfare-to-work money is unique in that they are saying “Ok, we understand the reason...” and this is a concept that a lot of people don’t understand, “we’re already paying for their child care, their transportation, and if they want to go for training they can go to NBS if they want.” We already have these resources, why aren’t they working? Apparently there some other things that they need that we can’t cover or that haven’t been covered. So the welfare-to-work money is different. We can only cover Helen’s child
care while she is on the job. But what about if Helen has to stay three hours overtime, or what if Helen decides that she wants to advance but she needs to get to another training class and it’s not related to her job. Welfare is not going to cover that, but welfare-to-work can augment the current funding.

q. So the welfare to work money is to assist in those additional expenses?

a. Yes. They will work for free, or a non-profit organization, they may get paid, but none of the support services can come from welfare-to-work money. They put that burden on the vendor, “OK vendor, you say you are going to help 20 people get involved. We’ll pay you say, $1200 for each person, but you cannot access one dime of that money until such time as they have worked for free, or at least worked without using our money.” You (the vendor) can’t pay for their books, child care, uniforms or anything else on them until they have met that work first requirement first.

q. When you say the vendor, for example there is the Spanish language company, Camino al Futuro that has received a grant to help teach English. If they commit to help 20 people, do the 20 people go and do their 5 weeks and then go to Camino al Futuro for help?

a. Camino can train them now, but they can only get money for administrative costs, for the staff and materials, and to set up the program, but they don’t get any of that welfare-to-work money to underwrite the cost of the participant.

q. It is sometimes said that welfare recipients can often find job, but have difficulty keeping jobs. Do you have ideas about specific programs service providers or employers could offer to help welfare recipients keep a job
and achieve long-term success in the workplace?

a. I had to smile when I read that question, because the premise that they can find work but can't keep it is something I disagree with. I want to say that there is difficulty in finding jobs. The majority of people on welfare are only there temporarily. Yes, they can find jobs, but we're talking about the hardest to employ component here. Those are the individuals who can't even find jobs. They can't find jobs because they have problems.

They have to have a police card or sheriff's card to work or a gaming card, or whatever, and if you have a felony, you can't get a card. Welfare doesn't address those problems. It doesn't say how to file an appeal or make a presentation before the city council or gaming control for probationary cards. Very few casinos will give a break to anyone who has problems with the law, or credit problems, or financial problems. There is a reason they are called hardest to employ. It's not because they are lazy, but because they have barriers that prevent them from being hired. They don't even get past human resources if they list that on their application.

So until the PIC addresses those issues...But the PIC has passed that responsibility to the outside vendors. We're one of the very few PICs in the nation that does that. Normally the PICs take that responsibility themselves, they provide the training and everything. But we have contracts out for private vendors who can come in and provide those technical services. We're going to find out that they can't find a job because they have those barriers. They can't get hired. But let's say they find a job and have trouble keeping a job. Well heck yeah! Normal people have trouble keeping a job. Bus system only runs 'til 1:30. This is a 24-hour town. How are they going to get to work? So we give them a bunch of bus tokens. That doesn't help if the bus isn't running. What if they
have to go home? What if little Johnny gets sick? Day care doesn’t take sick children. They’ll call the parent and say “Come and get this child.” What if the parent works graveyard and the bus isn’t running. They might have to wait until 5:30 in the morning.

Do they teach you how to deal with conflict. Say the boss came and told me to clean this up, then he came in and said “This is not good enough. Can’t you do better than that?” I’m angry. How am I going to tell him I have a conflict at home. I cuss him out. I don’t mean I’m going to fight, that’s just how we talk. Guess what, you’re insubordinate, you’re fired! Do we teach them how to deal with conflict, or how to respond, or not put yourself in harm’s way when receiving criticism from your superior? We take these things for granted, but these are people who have never learned those skills. Personal communication skills. I came to work one day wearing a daishiki, an African shirt, and they like to went crazy. A black man in a (undistinguishable). We can wear what we want because of what (job) we do. But when I wore that the other blacks were offended. So do they understand how to work with their co-workers. Do we explain sexual harassment. Can you, as man of color go in and tell a woman how you feel and it’s alright. We have to go an extra mile of the way to explain the rules. That’s why **individual assessment is so important.** These rules don’t apply to everybody, but when it comes to individual assessment, PIC never has it. They just don’t get it. One counselor for 300 applicants. Ya can’t do it, ya just can’t do it! It’s impossible. If I had any suggestion at all, it would be to reduce the ratio of participants to counselors. Just like a classroom and the teacher equation. It’s no different! If I have to try and figure out what your problem is, and I got 20, 30 people waiting behind you, how much time I got to cut through your bullshit and find out what the real issue is. For every 12 personal issues I
got, 9 of those were personality. So, the difficulty in keeping a job goes beyond transportation, beyond child-care. It goes to attitude. What is their self-esteem like? They are going to be ostracised. How are they going to handle it? When I started in surveillance I went through hell during that training. I was the first black. Then when I'm working in the room a gaming control agent comes into the room and says "Where is the observer who is working here?" I say, "I'm the observer." and the agent says "No, the guy who's working here." "I am." The agent says "Oh, you must be kidding." So people get angry, and we have to give them the skills or the methodology to alert someone that "Hey I'm about to lose this job because of ...this or this." And we'll have a chance to save them. "If you were having trouble, why didn't you call before you were cut off? Now you're cut off and it will be difficult to get you back in."

I've said before, I took 13 women in a pilot program. These were women who the staff hated because they come in here with a lot hate, and would make Beatrice look like a school girl. The NBS staff hated these women and they did everything in the world to try and boot them out of the program. Their supervisor had them breaking rocks when they were suposed to be learning carpentry. They did everything they could to break these women. These were 13 women who quit evrything to come into this program, because I told them it would work. I mean these women were hard core hookers and drug-addicts who had never worked a day in their lives at a legitimate job. I would meet with them, and I understood what they needed. They needed to know that the world is against you but you can make it. They are looking at you, you're the role models. Whatever the problems are, don't you address them, call me and I'll address it. And they even had problems among themselves.
So if this thing is going to work, PIC has got to make sure that the employers and the front line supervisors understand the type of individuals they’re dealing with, the barriers they have, and what type of resources are available when they do have problems. The supervisors are in charge of these people and you have to motivate them and keep them in line, and administer or recommend discipline. So now you come in there and you have a person from welfare who is the hardest to employ who is having some problems and they’re not responding. Your natural inclination is to follow the rule book. “I don’t have time to treat this person different than any of my other 25 people.” Well, if that’s the mentality, this isn’t going to work, because there is no way in the world that we can adequately orientate everybody before they go in because there is always the “x-factor” and you have to have some sort of mechanism in place to address the unexpected. If all we needed to do is get them in the door, then we wouldn’t have to do all this. They could just walk in and apply just like everyone else.

But PIC needs to understand, to work out an agreement with the employer that if they are having problems that you call us. We’ll have an ombudsman on duty, or we will take one of your existing employees and underwrite 20% or 60% or whatever part of their salary, and they will be assigned to work with those welfare-to-work individuals. That way, we’re offsetting your cost, and have someone looking after these individuals. But often the employer has to be trained in how to deal with the folks you’re dealing with. ‘Cause it’s hard to understand how anyone could sit at home and just collect a welfare check. Why would you want to degrade yourself like that?

Well, it’s hard for the PIC to understand that because most of them have been working all their lives and they cannot even fathom that anybody could be addicted to drugs. But
when you develop any kind of addiction, whether its smoking, or betting, or sex or
whatever, whatever you start to break that off, then you can start to empathize, and that’s
what has to happen. For the PIC, if they try and bring them back to the “human-factor”
and understand that it is not just cut and dried.

Why can’t we go to each individual employer and ask them what they want? We
have 4 million dollars to do this, with less than a couple of thousand people. We can do
this, we’re that small. We can literally sit down with every employer and find out what
they need. Is there some equipment that you need, or is there someone you feel
comfortable with who can give this person training that will make you comfortable in
hiring him? How much does it cost to train them in house? We’ll pay for that. You’re
hiring these people and we want to train them to your specs.

q. You mentioned earlier when we were talking about how welfare is perpetuated across
generations and the mind set of some welfare recipients about public housing, “Well,
when Gramma dies, this house will be mine.”

How much of the 30% of HTE’s are like that, and how do you stop that generational
thing?.

a. 20%. And that’s when you really get into those folks that have been left behind, some
fallen through the cracks. At school, four tardies, your suspended. Altercation? You’re
going to Opportunity School. You get there, you’re out! That’s a problem with our
school district. They have a problem dealing with minority kids. They’re frightened
because they’re bringing a lot of teachers from rural areas of Nebraska, Wyoming and all
these other places who never had to deal with minority kids. They say, “I’m not even
going to begin to address this. You raise up, you go to the Principal’s office.” They’re not
trained to deal with these inner-city kids, and our school system has a problem too because they’re not designed to deal with them. So there is always the need to just get rid of the problem. Parents don’t have time to get involved and they don’t understand the system. The dean’s got to go through so many layers just to get to the principal, and most parents don’t even see the principal. There are so many rules that are just designed to push the problem away.

Generational issues? The solution is case management. Which doesn’t exist, OK? It is only a name. When you tell a social worker, “You have to do case management” to them it’s only a name. When they look into a folder, they are only looking to see how many are in the household, what is their income, and did they go to required training? That doesn’t deal with the causes, and we don’t have real case management. If you have a family, grandmother who’s living in public housing, and she has a daughter who has a baby at 14 or 15. Well the mother says, “OK honey, you can get you that apartment over there. So and so is leaving, she died. You apply and I’ll talk to the manager and you can get your own place.” So now the daughter is in the apartment, and she doesn’t have any values, she’s going to move her boyfriend in with her and she’ll have more babies. She is not going to be in school, and she’s going to grow up without a job and that cycle is going to continue. So as soon as the mama or the daughter has a baby, the case manager looks in the file and says, “You messed up. Now, where do we go from here?” They don’t say you gotta stay in school or doen’t tell them about protection or any of that, so the cycle continues. I guess a bureaucrat understands that. Maybe when you come in they tell you the rules, give you a stack of papers, say “Fill
these out, then come see me again in three months.” Then they send you back out on the street.

In order for that to change, you need to hire true qualified and trained individuals who are actually going to do an intervention. What are your options? So many kids say “I can’t afford it.” Not realizing, at Community College you can get two classes free, under the scholarship or the Pell grant, which is still free. But the government fooled around and changed the name, and didn’t tell anybody, and they don’t even advertise it any more. Under the Paperwork Reduction Act, they put everything on one sheet, and it looks like you have to pay $12 for information, but for $12 you can apply for all the financial aid out there. Well, most kids don’t have $12. As hard as that is to believe, they don’t have it. Well for 35 cents, or whatever, you can get a Pell grant and go to community college for two years, free. But people just don’t know that. They’re just not informed. And that’s a big part of the solution is to let people know what’s out there, what’s available. This welfare-to- work money is out there, but I see it being applied in the same manner as all other money. PIC says “We don’t want to deal with this.” so they call in outside contractors or vendors to take care of the problem. PIC, and the vendors, and other applicants for this money, have not truly understood the problem.
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