

*Suggested citation: Studies of Welfare Populations: Data Collection and Research Issues (). Panel on Data and Methods for Measuring the Effects of Changes in Social Welfare Programs, Michele Ver Ploeg, Robert calendrierdelascience.comt, and Constance calendrierdelascience.com, Editors.*

Please click button to get studies of welfare populations book now. This site is like a library, you could find million book here by using search box in the widget. Committee on National Statistics Language: National Academies Press Format Available: This volume, a companion to *Evaluating Welfare Reform in an Era of Transition*, is a collection of papers on data collection issues for welfare and low-income populations. The papers on survey issues cover methods for designing surveys taking into account nonresponse in advance, obtaining high response rates in telephone surveys, obtaining high response rates in in-person surveys, the effects of incentive payments, methods for adjusting for missing data in surveys of low-income populations, and measurement error issues in surveys, with a special focus on recall error. The papers on administrative data cover the issues of matching and cleaning, access and confidentiality, problems in measuring employment and income, and the availability of data on children. A final paper discusses qualitative data. *Evaluating Welfare Reform in an Era of Transition* identifies the key policy questions for measuring whether our changing social welfare programs are working, reviews the available studies and research, and recommends the most effective ways to answer those questions. This book discusses the development of welfare policy, including the landmark federal law that devolved most of the responsibility for welfare policies and their implementation to the states. A thorough analysis of the available research leads to the identification of gaps in what is currently known about the effects of welfare reform. With a clear approach to a variety of issues, *Evaluating Welfare Reform in an Era of Transition* will be important to policy makers, welfare administrators, researchers, journalists, and advocates on all sides of the issue. Columbia University Press Format Available: Social service agencies are facing the same expectations in quality management and outcomes as private companies, compelling staff members and researchers to provide and interpret valid and useful research to stakeholders at all levels in the field. Child welfare agencies are particularly scrutinized. In this textbook, two highly experienced researchers offer the best techniques for conducting sound research in the field. Covering not only the methodological challenges but also the real-life constraints of research in child welfare settings, Amy J. Baker and Benjamin J. Charvat present a volume that can be used both for general research methods and as a practical guide for conducting research in the field of child welfare. Baker and Charvat devote an entire chapter to ethical issues involved in researching children and their families and the limits of confidentiality within this population. They weave a discussion of ethics throughout the book, and each chapter begins with a scenario that presents a question or problem to work through, enabling readers to fully grasp the methods in the context of a specific setting or area of concern. Special sections concentrate on the value of continuous quality-improvement activities, which enable the collection and analysis of data outside of the strictures of publishable research, and the implementation of program evaluations, which can be helpful in obtaining further research and programmatic funding.

**Chapter 2 : 23 Shocking Statistics of Welfare in America**

*Panel on Data and Methods for Measuring the Effects of Changes in Social Welfare Programs Edited by: Michele Ver Ploeg, Robert A. Moffitt, and Constance F. Citro Committee on National Statistics Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education National Research Council.*

Many studies and journalistic accounts have examined these changes, but only a handful have been expressly designed to assess what difference the new policies make. This monograph addresses this critical question by synthesizing the results from studies of 29 welfare reform initiatives conducted by the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation MDRC. Each study focused on one or more of three key program features: All the studies used a rigorous random assignment research design in which people most of them single mothers receiving welfare were assigned at random to a program group, which was subject to the welfare reforms, or to a control group, which was not. The groups were tracked over several years and compared with respect to a number of outcomes, including employment, welfare receipt, and income. Because people were assigned to the groups at random, it can be assumed that, within each study, the groups did not differ systematically at the outset and went on to experience the same general economic and social conditions. Together these studies provide a wealth of information on the effects of different welfare reform strategies and a strong foundation for future programmatic decisions and legislative deliberations. This synthesis is particularly timely because Congress will soon begin to debate reauthorization of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families TANF block grant, the federal welfare program created in the landmark federal welfare law of Key Lessons A number of programs that provided only mandatory employment services were effective, but the most successful of these programs used a mix of services – including some education and training – and strongly emphasized the need to find work. Almost all states now require adult welfare recipients to work or prepare for work, but there is much debate about the best way to do this. Over the past two decades, the pendulum has swung between an emphasis on rapid job placement and a focus on education or training. However, the job-search-first programs produced larger immediate gains and, in the medium term, led to larger gains for more disadvantaged groups, such as people without a high school credential. The job-search-first programs were also less expensive to operate. The most effective programs fell in the middle of the spectrum. In these programs, some recipients started by looking for work, while others started with education or training. This finding suggests that a more individualized approach may be most promising, but – given that not all the programs that used the mixed approach were highly successful – the types of services provided and the basis on which people are assigned to services appear to be also critical. As a result, programs that included only mandatory employment services usually left families no better off financially than they would have been without the programs, even after accounting for the federal Earned Income Credit EIC, the federal tax credit that supplements the earnings of low-income families. There is also little evidence that the programs benefited or harmed children. The only programs that both increased work and made families financially better off were those that provided earnings supplements to low-wage workers. In contrast to the programs that used only mandatory employment services, two programs that supplemented the earnings of working recipients boosted both employment and income relative to control group levels. One of these programs allowed welfare recipients who went to work to keep more of their benefits than under the old welfare system an approach now used in many states , while the other supplemented earnings outside the welfare system. Both approaches cost more than traditional welfare, but they also produced a range of positive effects for children – for example, higher levels of school achievement. Relatively little is known about the effects of welfare time limits, but the available data suggest that time limits need not cause widespread hardship, at least not in the short term. Two of the programs under study provided earnings supplements by allowing working recipients to keep more of their benefits but also imposed time limits on welfare receipt. Although these programs initially increased employment and income, the income gains disappeared after families began to reach the time limit. In fact, the programs reduced income for a small group of families, although the only such program whose evaluation has been completed did not appear to increase material

hardship. However, there are not yet enough data to warrant firm conclusions about the effects of time limits. Moreover, how families fare may depend on how time limits are implemented for example, whether and under what conditions exemptions or extensions are granted. These results suggest that policymakers face a critical choice. Most states already do this by allowing working recipients to keep part of their benefits, but the income-enhancing effects of such policies are undermined by welfare time limits. Federal and state policymakers who aim to improve outcomes for families and children may need to develop new ways of providing ongoing financial support to low-wage workers — an approach that may raise costs — while continuing to test strategies for raising wages through education and training.

### Chapter 3 : The politics and demographics of food stamp recipients | Pew Research Center

*The papers on welfare leavers and welfare dynamics cover a comparison of existing welfare leaver studies, data from the state of Wisconsin on welfare leavers, and data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth used to construct measures of heterogeneity in the welfare population based on the recipient's own welfare experience.*

The answers we found may not be what you think. Despite improvements in the job market and a housing bounce back, there are still many people who need help to stay afloat financially. In many ways, the America of today mirrors that of the Depression-era, when the first national welfare system was introduced. In an effort to separate some of the fact from fiction, CreditDonkey conducted a comprehensive study of key welfare statistics. People who have never had to rely on welfare sometimes tend to have a set idea in their minds of who the average recipient is. To put things into perspective, we begin our study with some basic numbers on just who is reaping the benefits of welfare programs. What percentage of Americans are on welfare? Through the fourth quarter of , there were nearly million Americans receiving some form of government assistance. How many Americans receive food stamps? As of September , about How many get Medicaid benefits? Medicaid is a health care program that provides free or low-cost care to qualifying individuals and families. What is the gender breakdown of those receiving welfare? Women are more likely to seek help through welfare programs. What percentage of children are on welfare? What state has the highest number of welfare recipients? As of , California topped the list for welfare recipients, with nearly , relying on government-funded programs. What state has the most people on food stamps? Approximately , Washington, D. How long do most people participate in the program? Housing assistance programs see the most long-term participants over 3 years , while cash assistance program tend to have the most short-term participants under a year. What do most people on welfare spend the money on? Entertainment only accounts for 4. We focused on some specific demographics to paint a more accurate image of who in America gets help through public assistance. How do ethnicities break down? What percentage of welfare recipients are immigrants? There are approximately 40 million immigrants living in the U. How many senior citizens are on welfare? Seniors are often overlooked in discussions about welfare. How many families seek benefits? How many single mothers receive welfare? Households headed by single mothers are the most likely to be on welfare. Is there a correlation between welfare recipients and education level? A tremendous amount of money is spent on welfare programs each year and recipients benefit more in some states than others. How much cash assistance do families get? How much does the government spend on welfare programs? There are dozens of state and federally sponsored welfare programs. Which state offers the highest welfare payout? Which state pays the least? Mississippi consistently ranks as the poorest state in the U. How rampant is welfare fraud? Gauging the scope of the welfare fraud problem is difficult. How much does welfare fraud cost? CONCLUSION While there are inevitably going to be some bad apples in the bunch, many of the people who get help from welfare programs do so as a short-term fix while they take steps to improve their financial well-being.

**Chapter 4 : STUDIES OF WELFARE POPULATIONS Data Collection and Research Issues potx**

*Studies of Welfare Populations: Data Collection and Research Issues [National Research Council, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, Committee on National Statistics, Panel on Data and Methods for Measuring the Effects of Changes in Social Welfare Programs, Constance F. Citro, Robert A. Moffitt, Michele Ver Ploeg.*

Beginning in the late s with welfare reform initiatives in a few states around the country and continuing in the first half of the s as more states made changes in their income support programs, welfare reform culminated at the federal level with the passage of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act PRWORA in . The legislation imposed several new requirements on state TANF programs, including lifetime limits on receipt of benefits, minimum work requirements, and requirements for unmarried teenage parents to reside with an adult and continue their education in order to receive benefits. Otherwise, it allowed states to configure their programs as they see fit, continuing a trend of devolving the design and control of familial assistance programs from the federal government to state governments that began earlier in the s. The enactment of PRWORA provided the impetus for a large volume of research studies aimed at studying its impact and that of changes in other federal income support programs, such as the Food Stamp Program. These studies are now yielding results and reporting new findings on an almost-daily basis. PRWORA is slated to come up for reauthorization in , and it is already clear that research findings will play a significant role in the debate over the directions that welfare reform should take from here. Department of Health and Human Services through a congressional appropriation, the panel has issued interim and final reports National Research Council, . The panel concluded that national-level surveys were being put under great strain for PRWORA research given their small sample sizes, limited welfare policy- related content, and, often, high rates of nonresponse see also National Research Council, . State-level administrative data sets, the panel concluded, are of much more importance with the devolution of welfare policy but are difficult to use for research because they were designed for management purposes. In addition, although they have large sample sizes, their content is limited. Surveys for specific states with more detailed content have been only recently attempted—usually telephone surveys of leavers—and the panel expressed concern about the capacity and technical expertise of state governments to conduct such surveys of adequate quality. To date, for example, many surveys of welfare leavers have unacceptably high rates of nonresponse. Overall, the panel concluded that major new investments are needed in the data infrastructure for analysis of welfare and low-income populations. This concern led the panel to plan a workshop on data collection on welfare and low-income populations for which experts would be asked to write papers addressing in detail not only what the data collection issues are for this population, but also how the quality and quantity of data can be improved. A workshop was held on December , , in Washington, DC. The agenda for the workshop is listed as an Appendix to this volume. Approximately half the papers presented at the workshop concerned survey data and the other half concerned administrative data; one paper addressed qualitative data. Altogether, the papers provide a comprehensive review of relevant types of data. The volume also contains four additional papers that were commissioned to complement the conference papers. One of them discusses methods for adjusting survey data for nonresponse. The other three papers focus on welfare leavers, a subpopulation of particular interest to Congress that a number of states have studied with grants ROBERT A. After the conference, the papers were revised, following National Research Council procedures, to reflect the comments of discussants at the workshop, panel members, and outside reviewers. The additional commissioned papers also were revised in response to comments from panel members and outside reviewers. This volume contains the final versions of the papers. In this introduction, we summarize each of the 14 papers in the volume. Together, they are intended as a guide and reference tool for researchers and program administrators seeking to improve the availability and quality of data on welfare and low-income populations for state-level, as well as national-level, analysis. The volume contains six papers on survey issues. They address 1 methods for designing surveys taking into account nonresponse in advance; 2 methods for obtaining high response rates in

telephone surveys; 3 methods for obtaining high response rates in in-person surveys; 4 the effects of incentive payments; 5 methods for adjusting for missing data in surveys of low-income populations; and 6 measurement error issues in surveys, with a special focus on recall error. They also briefly review methods of weighting and imputation to adjust for nonresponse after the fact. The authors then discuss the details of the survey process, including the exact process of contacting a respondent and how barriers to that contact arise, noting that welfare reform may generate additional barriers. They propose a fairly ambitious process of interviewer questioning, which involves contingent reactions to different statements by the respondent, a process that would require expert interviewers. They conclude with a list of 10 principles for surveys of the low-income population for improvement in light of non-response. The authors note the overriding importance of recognizing language and cultural diversity among respondents and the need to take such diversity into account in designing content and deploying interviewers. They then discuss specific issues in increasing response rates, including obtaining contact information in the presurvey process. Cantor and Cunningham then review a set of telephone surveys of welfare recipients and welfare leavers. They find that response rates often are quite low and that use of the telephone alone only rarely will obtain response rates greater than 50 percent, which is a very low number by the traditional standards of survey research. They suggest that higher, acceptable response rates will almost surely require substantial in-person followup, which can move the response rate up above 70 percent. The authors note that nonresponse is mainly an issue of inability to locate respondents rather than outright refusals, which makes tracing and locating respondents of great importance. They find that many welfare records are of poor quality to assist in tracing, containing inaccurate and out-of-date locator information, and they emphasize that expertise in tracing is needed in light of the difficulties involved. Refusal conversion is also discussed, with an emphasis again on the need for trained interviewers in using this method. Finally, the authors discuss random-digit dialing telephone surveys of this population as opposed to surveys based on list samples such as those from welfare records and explore the additional difficulties that arise with this methodology. The paper by Weiss and Bailar discusses methods for obtaining high response rates from in-person surveys of the low-income population. All the surveys drew their samples from administrative lists, provided monetary incentives for survey participation, and applied extensive locating methods. Among the issues discussed are the importance of the advance letter, community contacts, and an extensive tracing and locating operation, including field-based tracing on top of office-based tracing. The authors also provide an in-depth discussion of the importance of experienced interviewers for this population, including experience not only in administering an interview, but also in securing cooperation with the survey. The use of traveling interviewers and the importance of good field supervisory staff and site management are then addressed. Reviewing both mail and telephone surveys, the authors report that incentives are, overall, effective in increasing response rates; that prepaid incentives are usually more effective than

ROBERT A. They also note that incentives appear to be effective in panel surveys, even when incentives are not as high in subsequent waves of interviews as they are in the initial wave. After discussing the evidence on whether incentives affect item nonresponse or the distribution of given responses—the evidence on the issue is mixed—the authors review what little is known about the use of incentives in low-income populations. The little available evidence suggests, again, that incentives are effective in this population as well. The authors conclude with a number of recommendations on the use of incentives, including a recommendation that payments to convert initial refusals to interviews be made sparingly. Mohadjer and Choudhry provide an exposition of methods for adjusting for missing data after the fact—that is, after the data have been collected. Their paper focuses on traditional weighting methods for such adjustment and includes methods for adjustment for noncoverage of the population as well as nonresponse to the survey. The authors present basic weighting methods and give examples of how variables are used to construct weights. They also discuss the effect of using weights derived from the survey sample versus weights obtained from outside data sets on the population as a whole. For population-based weights, they discuss issues of poststratification and raking that arise. Finally, they provide a brief discussion of the bias-variance tradeoff in designing weights, which is intrinsic to the nature of weights. Measurement error is discussed in the paper by Mathiowetz, Brown, and Bound. The paper first lists the sources of measurement error in the survey process, which include the

questionnaire itself; the respondent; the interviewer; and the conditions of the survey interviewer training, mode, frequency of measurement, etc. The authors then review issues relating to the cognitive aspects of measurement error and provide an extended discussion of the problem of questions requiring autobiographical memory. Other topics discussed in the paper include the issue of social desirability of a particular response; errors in response to sensitive questions; and errors in survey reports of earnings and income. A number of existing studies of measurement error are reviewed, but none are focused on welfare or low-income populations per se or on populations with unstable income and employment streams. The authors point out how earnings reports need to be based on salient events and give examples in which such salience is absent. A detailed review is then provided of what is known about measurement error in reports of transfer program income, child support income, hours of work, and unemployment histories. Finally, the authors list a number of issues that should be addressed that can help reduce measurement error, including proper attention by cognitive experts to comprehension of the question by respondents, care for the process of retrieval when writing questions, the use of calendars and landmark events, and a number of other questionnaire design topics. Methods for asking socially sensitive questions also are discussed. To comply with federally mandated time limits on receipt of TANF benefits, states will need to develop the capability to track recipients over time, something not usually done in the old AFDC system. Such longitudinal tracking capability should make program records more useful for analysis; however, differences in programs across states will likely make it harder to conduct cross-state analyses. Research use of administrative records, whether TANF records or records from other systems e. Four papers on administrative data covering a wide range of different topics are included in the volume. The four address 1 issues in the matching and cleaning of administrative data; 2 issues of access and confidentiality; 3 problems in measuring employment and income with administrative data compared to survey data; and 4 the availability of administrative data on children. Issues in the matching and cleaning of administrative data are discussed by Goerge and Lee. They also note the importance of matching records across multiple administrative data sets i. A number of issues are involved in the cleaning process, many of which involve methods for assessing data quality and other aspects of the variables available in the administrative data. A number of important issues in record linkage also are discussed, perhaps the most important being the availability and accuracy of matching variables. The authors discuss deterministic and probabilistic record linkage as well as data quality issues in such linkage. The paper concludes with a number of recommendations on the cleaning and linking of administrative data. Brady, Grand, Powell, and Schink discuss access and confidentiality issues with administrative data in their paper and propose ways for increasing researcher access to administrative data. The authors begin by noting that the legal barriers to obtaining access to administrative data by researchers often are formidable. Although laws in this area generally are intended to apply to private individuals interested in identifying specific persons, researcher access often is denied even though the researcher has no interest in identities and often intends to use the research results to help improve administration of the program. The authors provide a brief overview of the legal framework surrounding administrative data, confidentiality, and privacy, making a number of important distinctions between different types of issues and clarifying the content of several pieces of legislation—federal and state—governing access and confidentiality. The authors conclude that while success in dealing with access and confidentiality problems has been achieved in many cases, the methods for doing so are ad hoc, based on long-standing relationships of trust between state agencies and outside researchers, and not buttressed and supported by an adequate legal framework. Twelve key principles are laid out for governing data access and confidentiality. Finally, the authors recommend more use of masking methods as well as institutional mechanisms such as secure data centers to facilitate responsible researcher access to and use of confidential administrative data. Hotz and Scholz review the measurement of employment and income from administrative data and discuss why and whether measures taken from administrative data differ from those obtained from survey data. Employment and income are, of course, two of the key outcome variables for welfare reform evaluation and hence assume special importance in data collection. They find that there often are differences in administrative and survey data reports of employment and income and that the differences are traceable to differences in population coverage, in reporting units, in sources of income, in measurement

error, and in incentives built into the data-gathering mechanism. The authors provide a detailed review of the quality of employment and income data from, first, the major national survey data sets; then from state-level administrative data taken from Unemployment Insurance records; and, finally, from Internal Revenue Service records. They review what is known about differences in reports across the three as well. The authors conclude with several recommendations on reconciling potentially different results from these data sources. The authors first discuss the policy issues surrounding the effects of welfare reform on children and what the mechanisms for those effects might be. They identify several domains of child well-being that conceivably can be measured with administrative data, including health, safety child abuse and neglect, education, and juvenile justice. In each area, they find that a number of different administrative data sets could be matched, in principle, with welfare records. They identify the exact variables measured in each data set as well. The authors find that good health measures often are present in various data sets, but they are often inaccessible to researchers, while child abuse and neglect data are more often available but have many data quality issues that require careful attention. Education and juvenile justice data are the least accessible to researchers and also contain variables that would only indirectly measure the true outcomes of interest. The authors find that privacy and confidentiality barriers impose significant limitations on access to administrative data on children, similar to the finding in the paper by Brady et al. Although there is a fairly long history of the use of process analysis in formal evaluations, there is less history in using direct observation of study respondents or even using focus groups. Yet in attempting to learn how current or former welfare recipients are faring, qualitative data can provide information that neither survey nor administrative data offer.

**Chapter 5 : STUDIES OF WELFARE POPULATIONS Data Collection and Research Issues potx - TÃ i liá»**

*Presents a collection of papers on data collection issues for welfare and low-income populations. This work contains papers on survey issues, papers on administrative data, and papers on welfare.*

Received Jul 18; Accepted Apr This article has been cited by other articles in PMC. Youth substance use exacts costly consequences for a variety of important health outcomes. We examined and compared prevalence rates and a common set of psychosocial factors of lifetime and current substance use among child welfareâ€™involved youths and community youths from two nationally representative data sets. Using the National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being and the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, we compared prevalence rates and conducted logistic regression models for eight binary outcome measures of substance use: Substance use prevalence was higher among child welfareâ€™involved youths than community youths for lifetime marijuana use, lifetime and current inhalant use, and lifetime and current other illicit drug use. Among both child welfareâ€™involved and community youths, delinquency was the factor most strongly associated with all lifetime substance use outcomes. Notably, family structure and parental closeness were important protective factors against current substance use among child welfareâ€™involved youths. For community youths, poorer emotional health was the strongest indicator of current substance use. Substance use among all adolescents is a critical public health concern. Given the heightened vulnerability of child welfareâ€™involved youths, it is particularly important to focus prevention and early intervention efforts on this population. Further research should explore additional factors associated with substance use among these youths so that child welfare and behavioral health systems may jointly target prevention and intervention efforts. Adolescent substance use is a leading public health concern in the United States Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse, ; Fettes and Aarons, Adolescence is a crucial period for the initiation of alcohol and other drug use, setting the stage for a range of harmful consequences. Ninety percent of U. The consequences of youth substance use are staggering in both financial and human terms. Immediate health consequences of adolescent substance use include injuries Spirito et al. Substance use also is a major contributor to three leading causes of death among adolescentsâ€™accidents, homicides, and suicides Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Substance use is linked to poor academic performance and educational achievement Martins and Alexandre, and delinquency Eklund and af Klinteberg, Youths with public sector service involvement, such as those involved with the child welfare system, are at elevated risk for alcohol and drug use Aarons et al. The lives of child welfareâ€™involved youths are characterized by problems such as child abuse, neglect, poverty, domestic violence, and parental substance use problems Burns et al. In , more than , children and youths were victims of substantiated cases of child maltreatment U. Department of Health and Human Services, Although most existing research on youth substance use is conducted with community samples, some evidence links child maltreatment to substance use problems Dembo et al. Childhood maltreatment also is associated with a greater likelihood of having an alcohol use disorder Goldstein et al, as well as illicit drug use Huang et al. Previous studies have identified demographic, psychosocial, and contextual risk factors for substance use specifically among youths in child welfare, including gender, age, history of abuse, and mental health difficulties Aarons et al. Although youths in the child welfare system are subject to unique experiences that may put them at high risk for substance use problems, research specific to substance involvement in this population is scarce Ruffolo et al. Most often, this research has been limited to specific populations e. In the current study, we compared national samples of child welfareâ€™involved youths and community youths to address the public health concern over youth substance use, especially among vulnerable populations. To our knowledge, no other research has compared the prevalence of and risk factors for substance use between child welfareâ€™involved youths and a normative population of U. In this study, we drew from the framework proposed by Wills and Yaeger that focuses on family factors and youth substance use. Consistent with this framework, we included background characteristics of youths and emphasized family characteristics and emotional and behavioral health as critical components to understanding youth substance use. We examined how these factors may differ for a vulnerable population of youthsâ€™those involved in child welfareâ€™when

compared with the general population of U. Among community youths, a number of factors such as demographics, individual characteristics, and environmental variables accentuate youth substance involvement. Previous research on demographic patterns associated with substance use has found increasingly similar patterns among males and females Johnston et al. White, American Indian, Cuban American, and biracial youths exhibit the highest rates of both lifetime and current prevalence of alcohol and illicit drug use, including the use of marijuana and inhalants Wallace et al. Youths with lower socioeconomic status are more likely to develop substance use disorders Reinherz et al. Nonetheless, demographics alone account for a limited amount of variance in explaining the overall severity of youth substance involvement Blum et al. Family characteristics such as household structure and parental closeness are linked to the presence or absence of adolescent substance use. Youths whose families have experienced disruption are more likely to have ever used alcohol and marijuana Flewelling and Bauman, , with two-parent families being protective against drinking in the last year Blum et al. Parental support is linked to overall lower substance use Wills and Cleary, And, higher perceived emotional warmth and support are related to lower adolescent alcohol and illicit drug use Zhang et al. Additionally, certain psychosocial problems elevate the risk for youth alcohol and other drug involvement. Externalizing problems are consistent predictors of adolescent substance use Helstrom et al. The relationship between substance involvement and internalizing problems such as depression or anxiety is less established, although several studies have found internalizing symptoms to be associated with adolescent substance use Lewinsohn et al. Early substance use initiation has consistently been found to increase the risk of developing an addictive disorder Brook et al. For example, first use of alcohol at ages 11–14 years greatly heightens the risk of progression to the development of alcohol disorders and therefore is a reasonable target for intervention strategies that seek to delay first use as a means of averting problems later in life DeWit et al. In addition, those who begin using any addictive substance before age 15 are six and a half times as likely to develop a substance use disorder as those who delay use until age 21 or older Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse, The purpose of the current study was to use parallel, national data sources to investigate whether child welfare–involved youths are at greater risk for substance use than community youths and to determine whether factors associated with substance involvement are similar between both populations. We focused explicitly on early adolescence because of the elevated risk of developing disorders among those first using alcohol and other substances at ages 11–14. We examined both lifetime and current use for four categories of substances: Based on previous research using nonrepresentative samples of youths, we expected lifetime and current substance use to be higher for child welfare–involved than community youths. And, although prior work is limited, we anticipated that factors associated with adolescent substance use—such as family features and emotional and behavioral health—also would be influential among child welfare–involved youths, although to what degree of similarity we could not foresee. Method Participants Data were drawn from two U. NSCAW examined the experiences of children and families involved in the child welfare system, with baseline data collected from to NSCAW used stratified, two-stage cluster sampling to select sampling units from a national sampling frame. This design resulted in child-level data collected in 96 counties from 36 states. The present study used baseline data. Add Health is a nationally representative, school-based sample of adolescents in the 7th through 12th grades, with baseline data collected during the 1995–1996 academic year Harris, The Add Health primary sampling frame included all high schools in the United States that had an 11th grade and a minimum of 30 students. The final sample included schools varying in size from fewer than 10 to more than 2,000 students. Data used for the present study were from the Wave 1 survey. Concern with the 6-year difference between baseline data collections is mitigated by the pattern that both lifetime and current alcohol and illicit drug use had lower rates of usage among early adolescents in than in Johnston et al. Therefore, we expected that rates in NSCAW would be lower in than in , making our approach conservative regarding child welfare risk. The current study samples included youths ages 12–14 at the time of the first interview, whose caregiver also participated, and for whom sample weights were available. No significant differences were found between those with missing data and those with complete data; thus, only cases with complete data were included. Measures Substance use involvement. We examined lifetime and current substance use in four categories: Each variable was based on youth report and was coded as binary. Because of

slight differences in item wording, NSCAW items were categorized as substance use present for at least 1 day of use. For Add Health, substance use was categorized as present for at least one occurrence. One notable difference occurred for current alcohol use. Interpretation of differences between the samples regarding current alcohol use should be made with caution. Hereafter, parent and caregiver are referred to as parent. Household structure was a binary measure indicating the presence of two parents. Emotional and behavioral health. For parental closeness, each youth was asked two questions about their relationship with their parent: Items were combined and averaged, with the measure of closeness ranging from not at all close to very close. If the youth reported that one parent was not an active part of his or her life, only one parent was included. Harker, Depression was measured with clinical scales. The full CES-D consists of 20 items that assess depression symptoms for the previous week. Add Health used 16 of the 20 items as originally worded, plus 2 items whose wording is slightly altered from the original CES-D, and 1 item added by Garrison et al. The modifications do not meaningfully affect the internal structure of the measure Crockett et al. Because the measures were not identical, we used clinical cutoffs for depression. Thus, depression was considered a dichotomous variable indicating not depressed or depressed. Last, delinquency was assessed with 11 questions identical across the studies. Youths reported how often during the past 6 months NSCAW or past 12 months Add Health they had participated in the following activities: For more direct comparability, the Add Health scale was halved to represent a 6-month delinquency score. Statistical analysis Both NSCAW and Add Health have complex survey data, and both include adjustments for the stratification and clustering design, as well as individual grand sample weights. Accounting for the complex designs allows for generalization back to the national populations of youths in child welfare NSCAW and U. First, we assessed the difference in proportions of alcohol use and the use of other substances for child welfare and community youths. T-tests were used to compare prevalence rates across the groups. We then examined factors associated with each substance use outcome via a series of logistic regressions. For example, the gender and age distributions of the group were similar, as were depression and delinquency. Household characteristics—education and structure—were significantly different for child welfare—involved youths compared with community youths.

### Chapter 6 : How Welfare and Work Policies Affect Employment and Income | MDRC

*Studies of Welfare Populations: Data Collection and Research Issues by Panel on Data and Methods for Measuring the Effects of Changes in Social Welfare Programs, Committee on National Statistics, Commission on Behavioral and a great selection of similar Used, New and Collectible Books available now at [calendrierdelascience.com](http://calendrierdelascience.com)*

### Chapter 7 : Welfare Statistics - Statistic Brain

*Studies of Welfare Populations Similar content TANF "Leavers", Applicants, and Caseload Studies: Related Links Receipt of Unemployment Insurance Among Low-Income Single Mothers TANF "Leavers" Applicants, and Caseload Studies: Study Design TANF "Leavers", Applicants, and Caseload Studies Gaps and Strategies for Improving American Indian.*

### Chapter 8 : Studies of Welfare Populations: Data Collection and Research Issues | The National Academies

*Download studies of welfare populations or read online here in PDF or EPUB. Please click button to get studies of welfare populations book now. All books are in clear copy here, and all files are secure so don't worry about it.*

### Chapter 9 : studies of welfare populations | Download eBook PDF/EPUB

*Studies of Welfare Populations av Panel On Data And Methods For Measuring The Effects Of Changes In Social Welfare Programs, Committee On National Statistics, Commission On Behavioral And Social Sciences And Education,*

**DOWNLOAD PDF STUDIES OF WELFARE POPULATIONS**

*Division Of Behavioral And Social Sciences And Education, National Research Council pÃ¸ calendrierdelascience.com*