



Plenary Session

**Welfare Reform, Domestic Violence, and the African
American Community**

Welfare Reform, Domestic Violence, and the African American Community

Introduction

Shelia Hankins-Jarrett

The primary goals of the *Welfare Reform, Domestic Violence, and the African American Community* session were to:

- Explore the implications of the Welfare Reform Bill (Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, HR-3734) for African American families;
- Unveil the linkages between welfare reform and stress, which places families at greater risk for various types of maltreatment—emotional, physical, etc.; and
- Identify strategies to assist in resolving the transition from the old welfare system to greater levels of self-sufficiency, as required by the new law.

On August 22, 1996, President Clinton signed the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, which replaced the long-standing Federal entitlement Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). The 30-year guaranteed safety net of AFDC for poor women and children has been abolished and replaced with the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) program. Under the TANF program, each State is required to submit a general implementation plan to qualify for the allocated block grants of Federal money. States have been given the flexibility to identify the best means of addressing the needs of families within the few, yet stringent, Federal guidelines. States can use TANF funds to provide cash assistance, non-cash assistance, services, and administrative costs to assist families.

Key policies under TANF are: funds are time limited—2 years per incident and a maximum of 5 years per family; custodial and non-custodial parents should be accountable to provide financial and emotional support to the children; assistance is closely tied to applicants being prepared to move on to a working status; and good cause exemptions to time limits, although restrictive, are available. Although States will continue to receive the same allocation under TANF as was received under the AFDC system, other social service programs that also provided support for welfare recipients were reduced by nearly \$55 billion. The overall reduction in funding, coupled with the new requirements likely to be imposed by States, may result in many more children and their families becoming impoverished and could make the already poor families even poorer.

Numerous studies have established that a significant number of welfare recipients have been victims of partner abuse or are currently in violent relationships. For many women, welfare has been a life-saving means of escape for them and their children. But as welfare reform is implemented on the local level, options for poor women and children, as well as victims of domestic violence, are diminished. Studies have further indicated a high correlation between poverty, welfare, and domestic violence. Because African Americans are disproportionately over represented in the welfare system and in America's class of poor people, it is clear that the current welfare reform policies will have a devastating impact on Black families.

For decades, Black families have been stereotyped to symbolize the failure of the welfare system without much mention of possible causation. It is, therefore, critical that academicians, researchers, and practitioners conduct a critical analysis of the issues behind the need for welfare reform to examine the impact of this legislation on the Black community. Culturally relevant recommendations must be presented to policy makers, human service providers, and advocates. The Black community must galvanize around this issue to refute myths and stereotypes that have been so pervasive and to provide leadership in increasing awareness of how these reforms will support or provide additional barriers to the Black community in its basic pursuit of health, safety, self-sufficiency, and economic empowerment.

Welfare Reform, Domestic Violence and the African American Community

Presenter:

Sheila Ards, Ph.D.
Center of Excellence for Community Development
Benedict College
Columbia, SC

Introduction

The Social Security Act of 1935 sought to protect single mothers and their children by providing financial resources to the family household. Recent legislation, however, wipes away that veil of protection. On August 22, 1996, Congress dramatically changed the way government deals with America's most impoverished citizens. Public assistance to poor mothers with children is no longer a right. Welfare, as we have come to know it, no longer exists. The new policy, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act (PRWORA), limits the amount of time welfare recipients can receive benefits and requires recipients to become self-sufficient. But more importantly, this policy may promulgate domestic violence among families experiencing financial stress, which is often a catalyst for violence.

The populations most affected by welfare policies are poor and disadvantaged families with children. Since 1965, the number of individuals receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) has more than tripled. The Department of Health and Human Services estimates that 12 million children will receive AFDC benefits over the next 10 years. With few exceptions, these families are headed by females with few of the skills necessary to secure a job that pays sufficient wages to sustain a family. Furthermore, many of the jobs for which these women qualify do not provide the necessary wages or benefits to adequately meet their basic health, social, transportation, and childcare needs. For many families, public assistance provides a web of support that they are unable to obtain with low-wage employment. However, the new legislation eliminates public assistance as a means of continual support.

Although the intent of PRWORA is to encourage families to become self-sufficient, three components of the legislation could result in unintentional harm to families:

1. Time Limits

PRWORA places a constraint on the length of time a family can receive welfare benefits. Such time limits might make women with few skills or with substantial childcare responsibilities reluctant to leave an abusive relationship because they no longer have that safety net of financial resources. Moreover, the idea that one can receive welfare for only 2 years at any 1 time and 5 years in total may be perceived by women as not enough time to enable them to adequately prepare themselves to provide for their children.

2. Child Support Enforcement

The legislation places great emphasis on increasing child support. States are given mandates to establish a child support tracking system to better gauge the movement of non-custodial parents and their payment of child support. Institutional enforcement may increase friction between the parents and result in child maltreatment because of their frustrations.

3. Visitation Programs

States are encouraged to design visitation programs for non-custodial parents to spend time with their children. Through financial remuneration, States are rewarded if they show an increase in visitation between non-custodial parents and their children.

These initiatives are designed to increase the financial support of parents to their children. These initiatives, however, should not be viewed outside of the context of rising domestic violence, as there could be a number of unintended adverse impacts of these incentives on violence against women and children.

Spousal Abuse

Since the early 1970s, the number of domestic violence cases in the United States coming to public attention has increased exponentially. But many more victims have suffered silently at the hands of their abusers. One study estimates that nearly two-thirds of all marriages experience domestic violence at least once (Arts Action Against Domestic Violence, 1995). It is estimated that “one in every three women will be physically attacked by a male partner at least once during adulthood” (Browne, 1997). These victims are brought to the attention of local authorities only after the pain is too great, the bruises are too many, and the excuses no longer seem reasonable.

In 1987, there were about 405,000 female victims of violent crimes at the hands of such intimates as boyfriends or ex-spouses. The rate of single-offender violent victimizations against females perpetrated by intimates was 4 per every 1,000. These victimizations by intimates represented about 27 percent of all violent victimizations against women. In 1989, there were 586,000 female victims of violent crimes committed by intimates, accounting for some 28.1 percent of all violent victimizations against women. By 1992, there were almost 600,000 female victims of violent crimes, yielding a victimization rate of 5.5 per 1,000 or nearly a 38 percent increase over the rate in 1987 (Craven, 1996; U.S. Department of Justice, 1994).

Spousal abuse, however, is only one of the forms of domestic violence. The other is child abuse. Public officials have just recently begun to acknowledge the relationship between spousal abuse and child abuse as a two-pronged problem from the same source. Studies show that men who beat their wives also beat their children. Additionally, beaten wives inflict similar abuses on their children (Steele and Pollock, 1974).

Child Abuse

Although child abuse is a phenomenon about which hundreds of articles have been written and millions of dollars have been spent to prevent, there is no consensus on what it entails; no one knows the cause, and there is continued debate over its consequences. Since

Henry Kempe's "discovery" of child abuse in 1962, several studies have sought to estimate the incidence of child maltreatment. The understanding of the incidence of child abuse is, in part, attributable to the knowledge of cases reported to Child Protective Services (CPS). Reported child abuse cases, however, are likely to represent only a fraction of actual victimizations (Garbarino, 1989).

To be accused of child abuse is an unacceptable social stigma; therefore, no matter how well controlled a study may be, an estimate of the true incidence of abuse may be unattainable. Much abuse takes place within the confines of four walls with only the offender and the victim present. In some cases of abuse, no one outside of the family knows; in other cases, no one within the family knows; and in many cases, only the offender and the victim know. The number of cases that are known by investigative agencies, therefore, is likely just the tip of a large iceberg (Fontana, 1973).

Since the Child Abuse and Prevention Act of 1974, the first national law regarding child abuse, the number of children reported to CPS has steadily increased. Between 1976 and 1992, the number of children reported as abused in the United States rose from 669,000 to 2.9 million, representing an increase from 10.1 abused children per 1,000 children to 43 children per 1,000 children. These children suffered from physical abuse, sexual abuse, medical neglect, and emotional or psychological abuse.

Studies of child maltreatment present contradictory findings on racial differences in the incidence of child maltreatment. David Gil (1970) describes the abused population as poor, Black, and in highly mobile families. Conversely, the three National Incidence Studies conducted by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (1981, 1991, and 1996) found no significant difference in the incidence of child maltreatment by race.

Causes of Domestic Violence

Causes of Child Abuse

Causal theories of child abuse abound. Most child abuse theories have been defined along disciplinary lines. Three broad categories of theoretical approaches—psychological, ecological, and socioeconomic—are the most commonly discussed. The psychological approach to explaining the causes of child abuse centers on the emotional state of the parents. Depression, unhealthy childhood experiences, and an unhappy family life are psychological indicators of potentially abusive parents. The ecological model suggests that children are products of their environments. Garbarino (1985) notes two necessary conditions for child abuse to occur: 1) violence against children is sanctioned by the culture, and 2) the family is isolated from a potential support system. The socioeconomic theory attributes child abuse to social stress factors such as poverty, unemployment, substance abuse, and isolation (Gordon, 1975).

The Relationship to Poverty

Although several factors have been associated with child abuse, the most widely known factor is poverty (Gil, 1970; Ards, 1988; and Garbarino, 1989). Parents who are unable to

financially care for their children often abandon them, give them to relatives or public authorities, or leave them in public places for others to care for them. Additionally, parents who are unable to pay for babysitters or care providers leave their children for long periods of time while they work, tend to personal affairs, or take respite time away from the household. Poverty also results in many poor families not having insurance to provide for the health needs of their children, thus accounting for medical neglect.

The number of children living in poverty has been growing over the past 3 decades. The percentage of children living in poverty increased from 14.9 percent of all children in 1970 to 21.1 percent in 1991 (Statistical Abstract, 1993). Much of this poverty can be explained by the increase in female-headed families. Female-headed families went from 10 percent to 20 percent between 1970 and 1990 (Statistical Abstract, 1993). Although at one time these families resulted primarily from widowhood, today they are formed as a result of women never being married and divorce. By the age of 18, over 50 percent of White children and 85 percent of Black children have lived some part of their lives in a single-parent household, predominantly female headed. Recent no-fault legislation has left women and children significantly worse off after divorce.

Poverty has also been associated with the incidence of spousal/partner abuse and violent victimizations experienced by women at the hands of intimates. Women with the low incomes and younger women are far more likely than others to be the victims of violence by intimates (Bachman and Saltzman, 1995). Although there are no apparent racial differences in these victimization rates, there are important differences across family structures and the marital status of women at the time of the victimization. Separated women are many times more likely to be the victim of violence than divorced or married women are (Bachman and Saltzman, 1995).

A seemingly simple solution would be for these women to seek child support from absentee fathers. But according to government reports, some women prefer to raise their child(ren) alone, rather than seek financial resources from the father of the child(ren) (Current Population Report, 1989). These women feel that the emotional and sometimes physical abuse outweigh the potential resources to the household.

The Role of Child Support

Recent studies show a relationship between child maltreatment and the receipt of child support. More than twice as many families with child maltreatment reports have problems receiving child support than do families in the general population (Sedlak, 1988). There is also a substantial gap between partial payments received by families with substantiated reports of child abuse and neglect, as compared to families in the general population. These results suggest a possible linkage between child support enforcement efforts, the amount of support, and child abuse. Low levels of support or failure to support may generate increased friction between the father and the mother, the father and the child, and the mother and the child.

A University of Massachusetts study of AFDC recipients in the State, published in 1997, shows the prevalence of domestic violence between custodial and non-custodial parents. In the study, 65 percent of the women surveyed had “been victims of domestic violence by a boyfriend or husband or former boyfriend or husband.” Almost one-third reported problems or arguments

with a man about child support, 24 percent had problems with visitation, and 15 percent had problems with custody. Over 55 percent of the women had to “take out a restraining order against a current or former boyfriend or husband,” and 56 percent “called the police because of being hurt or threatened by a current or former boyfriend or husband” (Allard et al, 1997). One conclusion that could be drawn from this study is that a policy that encourages contact between parents who are unable to get along “could activate or reactivate contact and conflicts with abusive former partners and may prove dangerous—if not fatal—for some women and their children.”

Recent child support legislation has sought to encourage contact between custodial and non-custodial parents for financial reasons. Since 1975, four pieces of legislation have sought to increase the financial contribution of non-custodial parents to custodial parents:

- In 1975, the Child Support Enforcement and Paternity Establishment Program (Public Law 93-647) was established. This legislation required States to establish child support enforcement offices, provide parent locator and paternity establishment services, and officially establish the Federal Office of Child Support Enforcement (U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means, 1996).
- The 1984 Federal child support amendments (Public Law 98-378) encouraged States to pursue child support from non-custodial parents of non-AFDC families with the same rigor that is used toward AFDC families. Additionally, the legislation “requested States to put more emphasis on visitation rights” (Venum, 1993).
- The Family Support Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-485) mandated all States to increase paternity establishment, establish State guidelines for child support, and actively pursue interstate child support enforcement. Child support enforcement became the front-line of defense in the Federal effort to reduce welfare dependency. Enforcement was mandated through wage withholding and later, in the 1992 Child Support Recovery Act, by way of credit reporting and Federal criminal penalties (U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means, 1996).
- The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act, Public Law 104-193, 110 Stat. 2105, signed by President Clinton on August 22, 1996, requires States to increase their child support enforcement efforts of locating parents, establishing paternity, determining a child support award, and collecting child support payments.

Policy Conclusions

There is overwhelming concern that recent changes in welfare will lead to an increase in child abuse and spousal abuse. These fears are validated by studies showing the relationship between child abuse and financial stress and the relationship between welfare and partner abuse. Within each type of domestic violence scenario, financial duress is one impetus for promoting violence. For policymakers to modify a significant piece of legislation—welfare—that could have deadly implications for women and children, is inhuman, unfair, and unjust.

African American families are at a particularly great risk of increased domestic violence with welfare reform, as these families are more likely to be poor, more likely not to receive the child support award entitled, and therefore more likely to be under great financial stress. Their communities are also more likely to have fewer of the social support resources to help families. Because different communities have different problems, public policy responses must be targeted to meet the needs of diverse populations. Policymakers must consider all external factors before implementing legislation that could threaten the very lives of the people the policies are intended to help.

References

- Allard, M. A., Colten, M. E., Albelda, R., & Cosenza, C. (1997). *In harm's way? Domestic violence, AFDC receipt and welfare reform in Massachusetts*. The University of Massachusetts, Boston: McCormack Institute and the Center for Survey Research.
- Ards, Sheila D. (1990). *Child abuse patterns and reporting behavior*. Pittsburgh, PA: Carnegie Mellon University.
- Ards, Sheila D. (October 1989). Estimating local child abuse. *Evaluation Review*, 13 (5).
- Ards, Sheila D. (October 1992). Understanding patterns of child abuse. *Contemporary Policy Issues*, 10.
- Ards, Sheila D., & Harrell, Adele. (1993). Reporting of child maltreatment: A secondary analysis of the National Incidence Surveys. *Child Abuse and Neglect: The International Journal*, 17, 337-344.
- Ards, Sheila D., Chung, Chanjin, and Myers, Jr., Samuel L. (in press). The effects of sample selection bias on racial differences in child abuse reporting. *Child Abuse and Neglect: The International Journal*.
- Arts Action Against Domestic Violence. (1995). *The facts about domestic violence*.
- Bachman, Ronet, & Saltzman, Linda E. (1995). Violence against women: Estimates from the redesigned survey. *August 1995 Special Report NCJ-154348, U.S. Department of Justice*.
- Craven, Diane. (1996). Female victims of violent crime. *Bureau of Justice Statistics: Selected Findings. December 1996, NCJ-162602, U.S. Department of Justice*.
- Fontana, Vincent J. (1973). *Somewhere a child is crying: Maltreatment—Causes and prevention*. New York: Macmillan.
- Garbarino, James. (1989). The incidence and prevalence of child maltreatment. In Lloyd Ohlin and Michael Tonry (Eds.), *Family violence*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gil, David G. (1970). *Violence against children: Physical child abuse in the United States*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gordon, Linda. (1988). *Heroes of their own lives: The politics and history of family violence*. New York: Viking.
- Sedlak, Andrea. (1988). Nonpayment of child support/child maltreatment study. In *Final report*. Westat, Inc.

Steele, Brandt, & Pollock, Carl. (1974). A psychiatric study of parents who abuse infants and small children. In Ray Helfer and Henry C. Kempe (Eds.), *The battered child*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

United States Bureau of the Census. (1993). *Statistical abstract of the United States: 1993*. Washington, DC.

United States Department of Health and Human Services. (1981). *National study of the incidence and severity of child abuse and neglect*. Pub No. (OHDS) 81-30325. Washington, DC.

United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. (1991). Child support and alimony, 1989. *Current Population Reports, Series P-23, No. 173*. Washington, DC.

Venum, Jonathan. (1993). The relationship between child support and visitation: Evidence from longitudinal data. *Social Science Research, 22*, 229-244.

Domestic Violence and Welfare

Respondent:

Richard M. Tolman, Ph.D.
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI

There has been considerable concern raised regarding the potential negative impact of recent welfare policy changes for domestic violence victims. Developing solutions that will offset this negativity requires a close examination of available data to discern the extent of risk and identify areas that need additional study.

The research literature to date supports the contention that domestic violence is a significant problem for women on welfare. Results of a study completed by the University of Massachusetts' McCormack Institute and the Center for Survey Research, as well as countless other studies, indicate similar evidence as to the prevalence of domestic violence among women on welfare. The table below provides a cross-comparative analysis of the prevalence of domestic violence among welfare recipients.

Comparative Prevalence of Domestic Violence Across Four Studies

Location of Study	Study Conducted By, Date	Women Currently Abused	Women Ever Abused in Adult Life
University of Massachusetts, Boston	Allard et al, 1997	19.5%	64.9%
Passaic County	Curcio, 1996	14.9%	57.3%
Northwestern University, Chicago, Illinois	Lloyd, 1996	19.5%	33.8%*
Worcester, Massachusetts	Bassuk et al, 1996	32.3%**	61.0%

*In measuring violence “ever in life,” the Northwestern University researchers used fewer items of aggression than those used in other studies. Slapping, pushing, and shoving, for example, were not included. This probably accounts for the differences between this study and others.

**This percentage is higher because the definition used includes violence within the past 2 years, as well as with the most recent partner, not just the current partner.

Domestic violence may impact battered women's attempts to leave poverty in several ways. Their partners may interfere with their attempts to work through various forms of sabotage, harassment, and irresponsibility. Domestic violence may also result in physical and mental health problems, such as post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), that interfere with women's ability to obtain and maintain employment. For example, the University of Massachusetts study (Allard et al., 1997) found that battered women were more likely to have lower self-esteem, more symptoms of emotional distress, and a higher prevalence of physical disabilities themselves and among their children than women who were not abused. All of these factors could be barriers to employment. The Better Homes Fund study (Bassuk et al, 1996), conducted in Worcester, Massachusetts, found that rates of violent victimization, both in childhood and in adulthood, were uniformly higher in the part of the sample that had used welfare for long periods of time, as compared to short-term users. The "cyclers" who tended to receive benefits over longer cumulative time periods, as compared to continuous AFDC users, were particularly vulnerable to violent victimization. The authors of the study hypothesize that violence and its secondary effects (e.g., PTSD) may play a significant role in women's ability to stay off AFDC. These data support the contention that time limits may place domestic violence victims at risk of losing benefits.

Current research does not indicate any apparent racial differences in victimization rates for domestic violence. Recent research presented at the Trapped by Poverty/Trapped by Abuse conference—held in Evanston, Illinois, in September 1997—further supports this assertion. Lloyd and Taluc (1997) reported on additional analysis of data gathered in two low-income neighborhoods of Chicago (Lloyd, 1996). They found that when victimization rates for Blacks, Latinas, and Whites were examined, apparent racial differences existed. However, when income was controlled in the analysis, these differences disappeared. This finding is consistent with other research. While racial differences in victimization may not exist independent of economic status, Black families are overrepresented in the lowest economic groups. Policies that put poor women at risk will disproportionately disadvantage Black women and their families.

There is also some concern about child support enforcement issues that have received far too little attention to date. Child support enforcement policies also pose risks for battered women and their children. The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act (PRWORA) extends initiatives that pressure welfare recipients to identify fathers of their children and trigger intensive child support collection efforts. Recent data from Colorado (Pearson et al, 1997) suggest that some women on welfare who experience violence by the non-custodial fathers of their children may be reluctant to use the good cause exemption that would allow them to refrain from identifying paternity for the purpose of child support collection. However, many women who experienced violence did want to pursue child support and did not identify this as an additional risk. The data suggest that responses to child support enforcement in cases of domestic violence need to take into account the differing needs and desires of women who have been victims of domestic violence.

One possible arena in which men who abuse their partners and families might be productively addressed is through innovative programs that have been developed to help involve non-custodial fathers in the lives of their children. These programs seek to increase the emotional and economic support fathers provide to their children. As valuable as this support

and involvement is to children and to mothers who can then parent with greater emotional and tangible support, these efforts do not come without their own risks. Remedies must be developed to limit the danger of encouraging the involvement of abusive men with their children and former partners. The partnerships between domestic violence service providers and father involvement programs hold great promise for identifying abusers within these programs and addressing their abusive behavior in a positive manner. These partnerships could offer the opportunity to engage abusive men in settings, other than the criminal justice system, with workers who can offer them services that are culturally competent and in a context they believe to be supportive and respectful of them.

Another concern is that welfare policies that could result in sanctions for recipients might increase the risk of child abuse. Shook (1997) presented some preliminary data that address this issue. She is examining whether income loss in families receiving public aid places children at greater risk of having a substantiated abuse or neglect report or a child welfare case opening. Her preliminary findings suggest that child welfare system involvement is higher for welfare recipients who have experienced domestic violence. Child welfare involvement was also higher for women who had been sanctioned than for non-sanctioned recipients. While these results represent only preliminary trends, studies like this are needed to better understand the impact of policies on the complex relationship between welfare, domestic violence, and child abuse.

While more research is clearly needed, researchers must proceed with caution in their endeavors. There are a number of pitfalls that researchers, however well meaning they may believe themselves to be, must consider. There is a real possibility that data meant to alert others to the extent of the problem may be misused or be misunderstood. One danger in identifying domestic violence as a risk factor for women on welfare is that domestic violence will come to be seen as the cause of poverty and detract from a focus on the structural reasons for poverty. Given the history of the demonization of Black men by Whites in this country, some will unfortunately use this data to argue that violent men, especially violent Black men, are a primary cause of poverty. It is imperative not ignore the economic and social forces that interfere with Black men's attempts to support their families. It is also important to note that while some women experience violence at the hands of their partners, many women have supportive, caring men in their lives. Some women on welfare who have left abusive relationships subsequently find themselves in supportive, caring relationships with men who are not abusive. Thus, there needs to be a focus on what helps men take supportive, rather than abusive, roles in their families.

A second danger researchers must be aware of is that emphasizing abuse among families on welfare and the corresponding health and mental health problems that can result from abuse may further stigmatize welfare recipients. There is no question about the importance of alerting policymakers, service providers, and the public to the fact that domestic violence is a concern for women on welfare. However, researchers must be careful not to allow victim blaming or stigmatizing constructions of the problem to dominate the dialogue and proposed solutions.

Indeed, complexities in the relationship between poverty, child abuse, and domestic violence exist. There is no question that working against the potentially harmful impacts of current and future welfare legislation will be challenging. But overcoming these challenges is

essential to restoring the financial security that is sometimes the only recourse for women and children experiencing abuse in their homes and communities.

References

Allard, M. A., Colten, M. E., Albelda, R., & Cosenza, C. (1997). *In harm's way? Domestic violence, AFDC receipt and welfare reform in Massachusetts*. The University of Massachusetts, Boston: McCormack Institute and the Center for Survey Research.

Bassuk E., Weinreb, L., Buckner J., Browne, A., Salomon, A., & Bassuk, S. (1996). The characteristics and needs of sheltered homeless and low-income housed mothers. *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, 276 (8), 640.

Curcio, W. (1996). *The Passaic County Study of AFDC Recipients in a Welfare-to-Work Program: A preliminary analysis*. Passaic County Board of Social Services.

Lloyd, S. (1996). *The effects of violence on women's employment*. Joint Center for Poverty Research and Institute for Policy Research, Northwestern University.

Lloyd, S., & Taluc, N. (1997, September). Presentation at the Trapped by Poverty/Trapped by Abuse Conference, Evanston, IL.

Pearson, J., Griswold, E.A., & Thoennes, N. (1997). *Preliminary findings on domestic violence among applicants for public assistance: Colorado Model Office Project*.

Salomon, A., Bassuk, S., & Brooks, M. (1996). Patterns of welfare use among poor and homeless women. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 66 (4).

Shook, K. (1997, September). *The welfare and families project*. Preliminary data presented at the Trapped by Poverty/Trapped by Abuse conference, Evanston, IL.

Welfare Reform, Domestic Violence, and the African American Community

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

New welfare policies limit the length of time families are eligible to receive public assistance without considering the inordinate constraints of the state of the economy and the availability of jobs, child care, or transportation. Furthermore, policies do not reflect any consideration of illiteracy, lack of skills, mental and physical health problems, criminal history, and/or substance abuse addiction. These issues, compounded with the presence of domestic violence, manifest significant barriers to women being able to become self-sufficient within the designated window of eligibility allowed under new welfare regulations.

There is also an issue of current TANF policies providing incentives to encourage men to be directly involved with the family. This approach, while valuable to the emotional and financial support of the child, exhibits limited consideration of the safety of the women and children who are victims of domestic violence and, therefore, should avoid interaction with their batterers. Welfare recipients are being required to identify non-custodial parents for the purpose of assessing child support. As child support payments are enforced, the batterer may seek to retaliate against the victim, and the increased parental stress could result in child maltreatment. Paradoxically, while these policies encourage the continual interaction of men with their families, they do not provide the necessary funding to assist men, overwhelmed by the impact of poverty and despair, in overcoming inherent barriers to being effective and contributing parents. It is important to note that in cases where victim safety is not at question, there is value in having paternal involvement—even when the father does not have the ability to provide financial support.

Historic and institutional racism, which is compounded by the intersection with sexism, classism, etc., continues to disenfranchise the Black community. Indeed, policies that impact poor families will disproportionately disadvantage Black families. Consequences of this disenfranchisement are illustrated by the following facts:

- African American families are over represented in the lowest economic groups.
- Lower income families have higher incidents of both child abuse and violence by intimate partners.
- African Americans are over represented in the child welfare system and as recipients of AFDC.
- The criminalization of domestic violence, albeit necessary, in the context of America's criminal "injustice" system, disproportionately affects Black men. Thus, this system must be recognized as only one part of the solution for the eradication of violence against women.

Recommendations

Policy Response

There is a need to develop welfare policies that first consider the safety of the family members, and subsequently provide a means for both parents to be positioned to make necessary contributions to the well being of the family. The policy response must include the provision of a safety net of services for families that not only replace, but also enhance the former AFDC structure. Policies must provide for safe family visitation centers and adequate training for both parents where necessary. Additionally, as policies promote economic self-sufficiency, the health, skills, transportation, and childcare needs of the family must be considered.

Program Response

Model programs and public awareness campaigns must be developed for children to shift the paradigm of the normality of violence in the African American culture to one of peace and justice. Community/family intervention programs and strategies that are relevant to the Black community, protect victims of domestic violence—children, teens, and adults; and provide the necessary support systems must also be developed. And domestic violence service providers, batterers' intervention programs, and male responsibility programs should form partnerships to ensure the accountability of batterers, the safety of victims, and the development of programs that emphasize healthy relationships and families. Finally, community economic development programs must be established to ensure a long-term impact on individual self-sufficiency.

Research Response

Researchers and academicians must write on a level for the masses of people to understand, and the information must be disseminated in accessible locations. As researchers investigate and analyze the data on poverty and violence, they should caution themselves against typecasting Black men as the primary cause of poverty and violence. It is imperative that researchers recognize the economic and social forces that interfere with Black men's attempts to support their families. Similarly, in framing the construct of the mental and physical health problems caused by abuse of women on welfare, researchers must avoid victim blaming and stigmatizing.

Community Involvement

African Americans must focus on the underlying causes of poverty and the prevalence of domestic violence in Black communities. The roots and permissiveness of violence in the Black community must be questioned and squelched. It is important to examine not only the individual's responsibility, but also the systemic issues of racism, sexism, classism, etc. The Black community must also heighten its awareness of the immediate and future impact of welfare reform and take a proactive and visible stance to

help shape the local implementation plans for TANF in each State. A strategy must be developed to change the association of welfare with Black women.