Tamar M. Shaw

Omega Graduate School

Dr. Joshua Reichard, Ph.D.

Submission Date: July 1, 2023

100 Day Assignment

1. Review the Literature Review Outline you developed using the Hughes Research Design

Funnel Template, Quantitative Research [General Help],

a. Write the following in the template: purpose statement, problem statement,

thesis, significance, and background of the problem (summary).

b. Email the Professor your Funnel Template; be sure the excel file name

includes your name, Core 3, and date (e.g. Funnel\_Hughes Core 3\_04-02-2021).

2. Read the following chapters in “Writing Literature Reviews (Galvin, 2014):

a. Chapter 2: Considerations in Writing Reviews for Specific Purposes

b. Chapter 3: Selecting a Topic and Identifying Literature for review, and

c. Chapter 4: General Guidelines for Analyzing Literature

d. Chapter 5: Analyzing Quantitative Research Literature

3. Using the Assignment template (Instructions below),

a. Summarize each of the Chapters listed in #2 above in 2-3 paragraphs, identifying

what you learned and how this knowledge contributes to your understanding of

conducting a literature review.

b. On a separate page, provide an annotated outline of the literature review you

developed for the 60-Day assignment. Be sure to include headings and

subheadings that represent the logic used in organizing the outline structure.

4. Structure (Assignment evaluation includes the following structure below).

a. Download the “OGS APA Course Assignments Template 7th Ed 2021” template

from the General Helps folder in the AA-101 The Gathering Place Course on

DIAL. Using the template create the following pages.

b. Title Page (Not included in page count).

c. Copy and paste the assignment instructions from the syllabus starting

on a new page after the title page, adhering to APA 7th edition style

(APA 7 Workshop, Formatting, and Style Guide, APA 7 Quick Guide).

d. Start the assignment on a new page after the copied assignment instructions.

e. Document all sources in APA style, 7th edition (APA 7 Reference Example, APA

7 Quick Guide)

f. Include a separate Works Cited page, formatted according to APA

style, 7th edition

5. Submit through DIAL to the professor.
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**Problem Statement**

Cultural norms and societal inhibitors in Washington, D.C., are a stumbling block to low-income families living in affordable and subsidized housing. These stumbling blocks stemming from a lack of health literacy, financial literacy, social inadequacy, addictions, and other ills, lead to multigenerational dependence on housing assistance preventing families from living out theirGod-given purpose, attaining financial security and enjoying abundant life.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this study is to explore the cultural norms and social inhibitors contributing to persistence in multigenerational low-income housing among Washington, DC residents.

**Background**

To provide sufficient background of the problem stated, it is crucial to inquire of some of the social inhibitors and cultural norms outlined by previous researchers. Health and health literacy, healthy housing and socialization play a large role in stabilizing a family and enabling individuals to focus on life and career goals, planning for home ownership and building wealth.

**Safe and Transformational Housing**

Housing in not just four rooms where a family eats and sleeps. Housing is an environment and stabilizer where families are meant to relax, think, feel safe and thrive. In order for this to occur, the housing provided must be in good condition, affordable and free from criminal activity as much as possible. Kraatz et al (2022) characterized housing as critical economic and social infrastructure. Although the research by Kraatz et al (2022) does not use demography based in the U.S., their cited benefits of social infrastructure, namely housing, are beneficial none the less.

With the research being theoretical, using existing research and providing a conceptual framework, the basic premise is that housing as a commodity does not provide the same benefits to individuals and society as housing created as social infrastructure.

Kraatz et al (2022) review a span of literature and engagement from government, non-profit and industry experts. The considerations of Kraatz et al (2022) span across nine domains that affect persons in affordable housing. The nine domains are community & culture, economy, education, employment, environment, health & wellbeing, housing, social engagement, and urban amenity. The benefits provided by intentional social infrastructure range from secure housing for tenants, macroeconomic benefits, fiscal benefits through tenant engagement, social capital to increased individual productivity from employment, health and education and life cycle productivity.

Research by Bratner, Douglas and Kornberger (2023) is also theoretical in nature. Focusing their research inside urban cities, they hone in on social infrastructure as a breeding ground for communing. They postulate that social infrastructure undergirds relational communing, part of the constructed environment that nurtures social capital and promotes mutual concerns among community members. Bratner, Douglas, and Kornberger (2023) label housing complexes as social infrastructure only if they foster community involvement and maintain upkeep on the property itself. In their framework, these urban spaces are governed by partnerships between commoners, public and private organizations, and community members or residents have equal access to resources. Sources used by Bratner, Douglas and Kornberger (2023) are primarily focused on the commons, communing, collectivity, and urban spaces.

Although the population focus of Lewis et al (2022) is senior citizens, they adequately define and delineate the need for social infrastructure that can be applied to other demographics. Lewis et al (2022) characterize social infrastructure as a foundational element of urban renewal planning, committing that new buildings and their surrounding landscape foster social connection for all ages and support residents’ sense of identity, belonging, and inclusion. This would be achieved through community development, skills training, and social enterprises. Their discussion and conclusions are based on case studies, literature review, anecdotal findings and focus groups.

Laytham and Layton (2019) in their theoretical study, are not so much concerned about housing as social infrastructure as they are concerned about the infrastructural support for public cities. Laytham and Laytom (2019 present a formal definition of social infrastructure on a broader scale in stating “social infrastructure refers to the networks of spaces, facilities, institutions, and groups that create affordances for social connection”, (p. 3). Laytham and Layton (2019) draw their conclusions and findings on existing literature on the subject. One profound concept mentioned in the article, cited from (Amin, 2008), is “social surplus” which is social infrastructure that encourages trust, civility, encounter and common purpose. This concept is worth expanding upon.

The definitions, scope and use of social infrastructure presented by each author, can be applied on a micro scale to a subsidized housing complex. An apartment community can include a shared community garden, coffee house, club house, fitness center, meeting spaces and children's activity room. This type of infrastructure foster social interaction, promotes creativity and contributes to the health and well-being of a building’s tenants.

Eri Klinenberg, a seminal author on which would support my premise of social infrastructure and ibenefit Klinenberg (2018) agrees with Kraatz et al (2022) that social infrastructure nurtures economic growth. Klinenberg (2018) distinguishes between social capital and social infrastructure in that social capital is a measurement of relationships and networks and social infrastructure are the conditions that determine whether social capital develops (p. 5).Klinenberg also introduces the concept of antisocial infrastructure which divides and separates.

**Health and Wellbeing**

Research concludes that conditions in one’s housing affect their mental as well as physical health. CITINGS

Srivarathan, Lund, Christensen, & Kristiansen (2020), present a qualitative study within deprives social housing, assessing resident engagement in a community-based health promotion intervention. This intervention was also to foster social engagement and enhance social relations. The population for the study was located in Copenhagen, Denmark and participants were over forty-five either born in Denmark or Turkey. Recruitment was achieved in breakfast cafes within the housing complex, needlework classes and snowball sampling. Data was collected through audio-recorded interviews and field notes. The study found that health interventions have a great potential to enhance social relations among residents, which was the primary reason residents agreed to the project. The study was not, however, able to detail the health promotions used and how they benefited the residents’ physical wellbeing.

Ellen, Dragan and Glied (2020) studied how renovations within subsidized housing affect tenants’ health. Data was retrieved from New York States Medicaid system with one group residing in renovated buildings being compared to residents living in a similar type housing development with no renovations. No significant impact was found except for children experiencing a reduction in anxiety and depression diagnosis and reductions in primary care visits and hospitalizations while also improving housing sensitive conditions such as asthma. An overall improvement in disease burden was evident. What could not be noted was the effect of specific renovations on resident’s health.

Pomeroy, Johnson and Weinstein (2021) note the lack in research considering subsidized housing resident’s perspectives on their health and access to adequate health care. There is also a dearth in cross sectional literature assessing health care needs across housing program sectors. Pomeroy, Johnson and Weinstein (2021) note asthma and mental health as being the most cited health concerns in previous literature. The study, conducted by Virginia’s Fairfax County Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and George Mason University, focused on participants in the housing voucher (HCV) and Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) program with attention mainly on rates of asthma and depression.

A list of residents was procured through HCD, and sampling was retrieved using a random number generator. Using a qualitative method, interviews were conducted online, by phone or in person. Overall, residents reported medication cost burden and the findings concluded high rates of asthma and depression. Depression was particularly among voucher recipients. Other chronic health conditions such as diabetes and obesity were also higher among voucher recipients than RAD recipients. The limitations to the study were a small sampling size and low rate response rate. These findings are cause to focus my research on voucher holders versus any other type of subsidized housing.

Depression is frequently noted in studies assessing the correlation between health and housing (Ellen, Dragan & Glied, 2020; Pomeroy, Johnson and Weinstein 2021). An incorporation of depression and its effects on decision-making, joy and future planning is worth the consideration for my own research goals.

**Social Capital**

Social capital defined as measurement of relationships and networks, Klinenberg 2018) is in my assertion, a necessary social benefit to advance one socially, economically and even enhances one’s quality of life. Amongst society, low-income families have the least opportunity for social capital and may need it the most.

Social capital or the lack thereof can affect education trajectories and career advancement (Social Sciences, 2021). Social Sciences (2021) interviewed thirty secondary school students in a low-income neighborhood in Ontario, Canada. The research looked at which type of social capital students used to make decisions about their education and career goals. Their study found that students whose ties stem from bonding capital (family and friends) caused students to be misaligned in their decision making. Students whose ties came from bridging capital (institutional agents, such as guidance counselors) were more aligned with potentially successful decision-making surrounding their post-secondary education.

This research supports the notion that social capital gained through networks and social relationships outside of one’s low-income socio-economic status are the most beneficial. The analysis used research mostly from sources that focused on social capital and its correlation with future educational goals such as college and academic success. Most of these researchers used qualitative analysis.

Au (2019) presents a theoretical framework for social capital, elaborating on its benefits and shortcomings. One element presented is the necessity for a diverse network. This supports the premise that if low-income families cannot access social relationships outside of their milieu, they are left at a disadvantage. Au (2019) supports the argument that because of a person’s location, they may lack access to the right network therefore creating inequality.

Further exploration is needed on the access to social capital by low-income and affordable housing residents and how bridging social capital can improve their circumstances.

However, the influence of such ties for educational decision-making has been missing from the literature. Social Sciences (2021)

**Significance**

This study will contribute to the gap in the literature of social capital theory and its correlation to living in subsidized housing by identifying how social networks are created within the community itself and how social networks are created or sought out across socio-economic and cultural spheres. Public, low-income or affordable housing as a micro-community, social infrastructure and environment for breeding social capital has not been thoroughly explored. Kraatz, Reid & Caldera (2022) in identifying housing as critical social infrastructure revealed a gap in the literature that captures the benefits of this concept. The study will also contribute to the gap in literature on how depression affects decision-making, attitudes and habits and how socially transforming housing infrastructures may attribute to good mental health, financial independence and create opportunities for wealth building*.* International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health (2022) cites “A clearer understanding of the exact health effect for the different social capital indicators used in the literature is necessary to substantiate the implications of social capital research and research on neighborhood effects for public health improvements”, (p. 14)

**Research Questions**

RQ1: What physical and mental health issues and medical cost burdens exist in subsidized housing communities in Washington, D.C. that would contribute to the resident’s inability to attain career progression and perpetuate multi-generational housing?

RQ2: Are there transformational housing developments in Washington, D.C. that fit the model of social housing infrastructure and how do they support tenant’s goals of becoming mentally health, financially independent, and building wealth?

RQ3: What are the perceptions of cultural norms among multi-generational, low-income residents in Washington, D.C.?

RQ4: How extensive is subsidized residents’ knowledge of accessing social capital?

**Research Methodology**

This study will be a qualitative research analysis because research questions will be answered through inductive coding and exploratory thematic analysis.

# Theoretical/Conceptual Framework

This study is framed by a few socialization theories namely social capital theory. Cook (2022) sums it up by stating “Access to opportunity is socially structured”. Networks that link people to resources, opportunities, and norms of cooperation at the local level and general social trust make a difference not only for individuals, but also for organizations, communities, and society at large” (p. 1).

**Research Instrumentation**

Research will be conducted with residents in a particular housing assistance program located in Washington, D.C. Data will be retrieved using one-on-one interviews, computer accessed surveys, and focus groups. This study will utilize a field-tested researcher-developed questionnaire validated by feedback from 5-7 subject matter expert in the economic, sociology, and theological disciplines.

Further research might compare the low-income housing assisted African American population in Washington, D.C. and a population of a different race in a locale not in the United States, such as the UK or the Caribbean.

**Research Design**

Basic Qualitative: explore emergent themes from open-ended participant responses (qualitative, inductive)

This qualitative study will utilize a basic qualitative design because it will explore perceptions of subsidized housing among men and women and heads of households participating in housing assistant programs and assess their knowledge of social capital theory, wealth building, and abundant living.

**Population and Sampling**

The target population for this study will be residents from at least three subsidized housing communities in Washington, D.C., perhaps to conduct a cross-sectional comparison of residents in different housing programs such as HCV, RAD and LIHTC.

Purposive sampling will ensure eligible participants meet the inclusion/exclusion criteria until a sample size of fifty in each housing complex is attained. Permission to recruit participants will be secured from first establish access through the property management company, second, the property manager, and third, flyers to participate in the survey will be distributed throughout the building as well as invitations to participate in focus groups that provide snacks. Other incentives will be determined.

Snowball sampling will encourage broader participation on social media until a sample size of fifty is attained.

**Data Analysis Plan**

This study will utilize Creswell and Poth’s Data Analysis Spiral for qualitative data analysis: Step One: Managing and organizing the data (data preparation), Step Two: Reading and memoing emergent ideas, Step Three: Describing and classifying codes into themes, Step Four: Developing and assessing interpretations, Step Five: Representing and visualizing the data.
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